

**THE**

**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**

**AND**

**EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:**

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

**ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.**

---

**EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,**

**Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.**

---

**VOLUME XVII.**

---

**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 BY WILLIAM S. YOUNG,  
173, RACE STREET.**

---

**1840—41.**

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

The seventeenth volume of the *RELIGIOUS MONITOR* is commenced under circumstances of more than ordinary discouragement. Not only are we oppressed by the existing derangement of money matters in the community at large, and a very general neglect to liquidate arrearages, but to this must also be added a feverish state of the public mind respecting minor and incidental questions which ought to be absorbed in higher considerations. To illustrate our meaning; we frequently hear complaints like the following: the *Monitor* is not sufficiently anti-slavery; it is too much so; you do not publish enough on that subject; you publish too much; it is political; it refuses to point out political abuses; it is too favourable to voluntary societies; it is too much opposed to voluntary societies; it disapproves of amalgamation; it is too favourable to amalgamation. All these conflicting reasons, and others of a like character, are sufficient inducements with many to withdraw their patronage, sometimes without making payment. The efficacy of these reasons, however, is always according to the degree of intelligence, prejudice, party-spirit, or passion of the individuals upon whom they operate. But to all these charges we plead not guilty. The *Monitor* never has been, and while we have any concern with it, never will be, prostituted to mere political or party purposes. For the great political parties which agitate the country at present, we have no sympathy, no feeling of affinity, and but little regard. But on a great variety of questions, incidental to a sound profession, and the right discharge of religious duties, public opinion rises and falls like the swells of the ocean. Amidst these fluctuations it shall be our aim to hold a steady hand. Our principles are immutable. The doctrines and practices of the Christian church lie far beyond the reach of political revolutions, or any other earthly changes. While, therefore, a reasonable latitude of discussion, and choice of subjects must be given to correspondents, or our publication would soon sink into dry uninteresting details, contributors to our pages should keep in view the *MAIN DESIGN*, namely, the edification, peace, purity, sanctification and enlargement of the church. Intelligent Christians will not object to free discussion, properly conducted; they will not take offence at the exercise in others of that Christian liberty which they claim for themselves. We go for the principles of the Reformation, as these were understood and practised three hundred years since, and as they are still set forth in the subordinate standards of the Associate Synod of North America; and we call upon our Christian brethren to bear in mind that it depends upon them to decide the question whether the church shall continue to enjoy the many obvious advantages of such a work, or whether it shall be permitted to expire through their supineness.

C. WEBSTER.

*Philadelphia, June, 1840.*



ANDOVER - HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Reind. 1718.55  
v. 17  
1840-1841

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JUNE, 1840.

---

MINUTES

OF THE ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA, AT THEIR THIRTY-  
NINTH ANNUAL MEETING, HELD IN BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 27TH,  
1840, AND CONTINUED BY ADJOURNMENT TO THE 5TH OF JUNE.

Synod met, pursuant to adjournment, and was constituted with  
prayer, by the Rev. F. W. McNaughton, Moderator.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

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

MINISTERS.

ELDERS.

*Of the Presbytery of Vermont.*

Thomas Goodwillie.

*Of the Presbytery of Cambridge.*

A. Gordon,  
A. Anderson,  
J. P. Miller,  
D. Gordon.

John Rae,  
P. McEachron,  
Wm. McGeoch,  
Robert T. Law.

*Of the Presbytery of Albany.*

Peter Campbell,  
James Martin.

David Donan,  
David Martin.\*

*Of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

F. W. McNaughton,  
J. S. Easton,  
John G. Smart,  
C. Webster,  
J. T. Cooper,  
John Adams,\*  
D. Anderson.

Wm. Porter,  
John Smith,  
Samuel Fulton,  
Wm. S. Young,  
James Wilson.\*

*Of the Presbytery of Miami.*

T. S. Kendall,  
A. Heron,  
James Wallace.\*

*Of the Presbytery of Illinois.*

James Templeton.

*Of the Presbytery of Richland.*

Samuel Hindman,  
James Law.

*Of the Presbytery of Muskingum.*

John Walker,

T. Miller.\*

## MINISTERS.

Thomas Hanna,  
S. M. Arthur.

*Of the Presbytery of Chartiers.*

Dr. Ramsay,  
Dr. Beveridge,  
Wm. M. McElwee.

*Of the Presbytery of Allegheny.*

Joseph Scroggs.\*

*Of the Presbytery of Carolinas.*

A. Whyte, jr.\*  
H. Thompson.\*

Of the Presbyteries of Indiana, Ohio, Shenango, and Stamford, none were present.

Mr. Wm. McGeoch, ruling elder from the congregation of Cambridge, being present, was, on motion, invited to a seat.

The following preamble and resolutions were offered, and adopted, namely:

"Whereas the minutes of the Synod are read and corrected at each session, resolved, that the reading of them at the beginning of the subsequent meeting be dispensed with, now, and hereafter."

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

Meeting in the morning, at 9 o'clock, adjourn at half past 12, and meet again in the afternoon at half past 2 o'clock.

Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Closed with prayer.

Thursday, May 28.

The moderator having preached last evening from 1 Cor. iv. 1, "Moreover it is required, &c."—The Synod this day met, and was opened with prayer by the moderator. Members present as above, together with Mr. John Adams, minister of the Presbytery of Philadelphia; James Wallace, minister of the Presbytery of Miami; and Dr. David Martin, ruling elder of the Presbytery of Albany.

The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Mr. Kendall was chosen moderator.

After a recess of ten minutes, the following standing committees were appointed, namely:

*Committee of Supplies*—Messrs. D. Gordon, Martin, Smart, Templeton, Hindman, Hanna, Goodwillie, McElwee, and Wallace.

*Committee of Bills and Overtures*—Dr. Ramsay, and Messrs. A. Anderson and Martin.

*Committee on the Funds*—Messrs. Hanna, Young and Easton.

*Committee on the Theological Seminary*—Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. A. Gordon and Walker.

*Committee on Appeals*—Dr. Beveridge, and Messrs. Miller and Hanna.

*Committee on Missions*—Messrs. A. Anderson, Wallace and Cooper.

*Committee to Transcribe the Minutes*—Messrs. Easton and D. Gordon.

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

No. 1. Report of the Presbytery of Allegheny, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies.

*Report of the Presbytery of Allegheny.*

To the Associate Synod of North America, to meet at Baltimore, 4th Wednesday of May, 1840.

A few changes have taken place in the congregations since last meeting of Synod. At a meeting of Presbytery, held at Conemaugh, July last, the pastoral relation existing between that congregation and Mr. Blair was dissolved. At a subsequent meeting held in September, the pastoral relation existing between Mr. Galbraith and the congregation of Warren was also dissolved; these two congregations have united in petitioning Presbytery for the moderation of a call, which has been granted. At a meeting in April last, Mr. Hindman tendered his resignation of Concord congregation, which was accepted; and the congregation of Lower Piney, having petitioned for part of his time, it was granted, and he assumed the pastoral charge thereof in connexion with the remaining branches of his former charge. The supply granted us by Synod, last year, was received, with the exception of Mr. Samuel M'Lean, who neither came nor forwarded any excuse for non-fulfilment of appointments. According to the direction of Synod, we appointed a committee to examine the "draft of the Book of Discipline," but they were not ready to report at our last meeting. Presbytery request a liberal share of the supply granted by Synod for the ensuing year.

JAMES RODGERS, *Moderator.*

No. 2. Report of the Presbytery of Indiana, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Missions and Supplies.

*Carmel, May 7, 1840.*

To the Associate Synod of North America, to convene at Baltimore on the 27th instant—

DEAR BRETHREN—We are sorry to state, that owing to peculiar circumstances, afflictive and pecuniary, it is altogether impracticable for any of our number to attend the present meeting of Synod. We think it expedient, however, to forward a report of our present condition; stating also the more important ecclesiastical matters which have transpired among us during the past year.

*Report of the Associate Presbytery of Indiana.*

In presenting this, our annual report, to Synod, we have reason to record the loving-kindness of Zion's King, for the harmony and good order which still prevail in this portion of his heritage. Since our last, we have been deprived of the labours of Mr. Hall. As was anticipated at your last meeting, Mr. Hall gave in to Presbytery, June 26, the resignation of his charge, which being accepted, these congregations have been added to our list of vacancies. At the same meeting, Mr. James A. Brown having delivered, (to the entire satisfaction of Presbytery,) the usual pieces of trial required of candidates for license, and acquitted himself satisfactorily in every part of his examination, was licensed to preach the everlasting gospel, and for a short time laboured with great acceptance in our bounds. We have also been highly favoured with some additional ministerial aid. Mr. Laughhead having accepted (through the Miami Presbytery) the call from Bloomington, and delivered with approbation the usual probationary exercises, was, on the 14th of November, 1839, solemnly ordained to the office of the ministry, and installed pastor of the Associate congregation of Bloomington. Mr. John L. M'Lean, who accepted, at your last meeting, a call from the united Associate congregations of Princeton and Midway, having also delivered the usual exercises, was, on the 22d of November, ordained to the office of the ministry, and installed pastor of said congregations. Two new congregations have been organized within our bounds, one in Laporte county, the other in Washington county, near New Philadelphia. Petitions have also been received from other parts of the State, earnestly praying for supply of gospel ordinances. The name of the congregation under the pastoral care of Mr. Dickson has, by request, been changed from Racoon to Portland. We are sorry to state farther, that there has been almost a total failure on the part of the supply allotted us last spring. Mr. Templeton, indeed, passed through the north of the state, and preached one or two Sabbaths, but neither Mr. Walker nor Mr. Imbrie have appeared in our bounds. Owing to this almost entire failure of supply during the past year, the scattered condition of our congregations, settled and vacant, and their weakness (being for the most part new settlers and in moderate circumstances,) Presbytery deem it their duty as well as privilege, to ask some aid of Synod, for the year ensuing. We feel persuaded, that if the members of our church in older and wealthier settlements only knew the situation of many earnest inquirers after truth, in this western country, they would freely contribute for their aid and cheerfully sustain Synod in sending missionaries amongst us. Under this conviction, therefore, we now humbly petition your reverend body to send us help, to the amount at least of one man's labour during the whole year, which might be

done by sending four individuals, three months each, the expense to be defrayed in part by Synod. We think that the people themselves would at least sustain one half the burden. It may be said, perhaps, that the support required by those weaker vacancies should devolve upon our settled congregations; but it should be remembered, that it requires the utmost exertions on the part of such as have obtained a stated dispensation of ordinances, to support their own pastors. Many individuals with an estate amounting to not more than one or two thousand dollars, are paying an annual stipend of from twenty to thirty dollars, and that in some instances, for one half the time; and how can such be expected to afford much pecuniary aid to their destitute brethren? Providence now appears to be opening a door in many important stations, large towns, and dense settlements, for the introduction of truth, and we are absolutely unable to improve the precious opportunity. We, therefore, ask you to aid us by sending a supply into our bounds, partly at the expense of Synod. This we wish in addition to whatever portion of supply you may think us entitled to as a Presbytery, and we hope you will make as ample provision for us in this respect as possible.

By order of Presbytery.

JAMES DICKSON, *Clerk*.

No. 3. The Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies, and also of Bills and Overtures.

*Report of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge.*

The Associate Presbytery of Cambridge have, in the good providence of God, the happiness of peace among themselves, and a good measure of harmony in sentiment and practice. The congregations under their care now enjoy comparative rest, and it is hoped that they are "edified, and are walking in the fear of the Lord." There is, however, much need of watchfulness, as schismatics are not indolent in sowing discord, nor without influence in their endeavours.

The deposed and excluded members of this Presbytery have made no acknowledgment of their offences, nor shown any disposition to return to their duty.

It appears that the members of the Associate Presbytery of Vermont have, within the past synodical year, joined with and employed Dr. A. Bullins in ministerial services, respecting which a special report will be given in to Synod.

This Presbytery and their vacancies have suffered much during the past year by failure of the appointed supply. Out of sixteen months appointed to them by Synod, they received but five. Messrs. Law and De Freest fulfilled their appointments; Messrs. Hall, Brown, and Hamilton did not appear. Mr. Brown sent an excuse which, perhaps, should justify him, and, moreover, after the time had expired for which he was appointed to the bounds of this Presbytery, he offered to make up his lack of service to them, in part, by an exchange with Mr. Smith; and though the measure failed, the Presbytery have no reason to believe that the failure was on his part. Mr. Hamilton sent no excuse, nor gave any intimation to Presbytery which might have enabled them to meet the disappointment. It is hoped that Synod will require him to give an account of his delinquency. The loss sustained by this Presbytery was, however, happily supplied in part by the very acceptable services of Messrs. D. Anderson and M'Arthur, the former labouring with us about two months, and the latter about one.

The Presbytery still ask for as large a share of Synod's disposable supply as will be consistent with the necessities of other sections of the church under their care. This Presbytery would suggest to Synod the propriety of passing an act requiring probationers and itinerating ministers who may accept calls before their synodical appointments are expired, to fulfil them, or that the Presbyteries, of which they become members, be held responsible to do it. Without this arrangement appointments are rendered uncertain, and vacancies are seriously injured; and the Presbytery which receives the additional member may well afford the supply.

A special report on the Canada vacancies, under the care of this Presbytery, will be laid before Synod.

An appeal by Thomas M'Cleery, from a decision of this Presbytery, will come before Synod with accompanying papers.

Presbytery have attended to the resolution of Synod, respecting collection for their several funds, but on account of the pressure of the times, less has been done than otherwise might have been expected.

JAMES P. MILLER, *Moderator*.

*Salem, May 13th, 1840.*

No. 4. A special Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in relation to the Presbytery of Vermont. This Report was, on motion, referred to a select Committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. Walker and Templeton.

*Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, respecting the case of Vermont Presbytery, so far as committed to them by the act of Synod last year.*

By a resolution of Synod, passed May 25th, last year, "The Presbytery of Vermont was suspended from the exercise of Presbyterianial authority until next meeting of Synod, and these brethren and all the congregations, settled and vacant, under their oversight, were committed to the care of the Presbytery of Cambridge until next meeting of Synod."

The Presbytery are not certain that the powers intended by the Synod, in this resolution, were correctly understood by them, but as the period for which the oversight of the Vermont ministers and people were committed to them, expires with the meeting of Synod, at which this report will be read, it will not now be important to inquire into the meaning of the resolution, but only to state what has been done in the case. Some time after the meeting of Synod last year, Doctor A. Bullions stated to several persons, belonging to and under the care of the Presbytery of Cambridge, that he was to go and assist the Rev. Wm. Pringle to dispense the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the congregation of Ryegate, and as Dr. Bullions went, as was commonly understood, to the state of Vermont for that purpose, the Presbytery of Cambridge appointed a committee to ascertain whether Dr. A. Bullions had been actually employed by any member of the Presbytery of Vermont to perform any of the functions of a gospel minister. The following are facts so far obtained by that committee, and which the Presbytery are assured, by responsible persons, are susceptible of proof:—"That Dr. A. Bullions did, last fall, the preceding year, exercise all the functions of the office of a gospel minister at the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the congregation of Ryegate: that both the ministers of that Presbytery countenanced Dr. Bullions in so doing, and took part with him in the public exercises on that occasion; and that a part of the elders and people of the congregations of Ryegate and Barret also countenanced Dr. Bullions; and that a part of the elders and people of both congregations did not. And that it was commonly reported, that on the Monday after that occasion, or about that time, that the members of that Presbytery met in Presbyterianial capacity, and that Dr. A. Bullions did sit and act with them, as a member, at that time; and that the Presbytery of Vermont had held a meeting and transacted Presbyterianial business at Barret on the 18th of July, last year."

Although these facts appear to have been offensive and stumbling to many of the people of these congregations, they so recently came to the certain knowledge of the Presbytery, that nothing could yet be done towards correcting their evil consequences. Hence the case is entirely submitted to Synod.

JAMES P. MILLER, *Moderator.*

*Baltimore, May 28th, 1840.*

No. 5. The Report of the Presbytery of Albany, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Bills and Overtures, and also of Supplies.

*Report of the Presbytery of Albany.*

Nothing of special interest has taken place within the bounds of this Presbytery during the past year. Former causes of dissension being removed, peace and harmony have prevailed. In general, the public ordinances have been respectably attended. Any change that has taken place has been for the better. In consequence of the aid given by Synod to the second congregation in New York, they have enjoyed constant supply of sermon during the year, and have lately given a call to Mr. Thomas Gilkerson, which has been sustained by the Presbytery. The Presbytery has also sustained a call for the same individual, from the congregation of Johnstown, who have been in a very destitute condition, as respects a supply of public ordinances, since the departure of their former pastor from them. Both these calls are herewith transmitted to Synod with the request that they be presented to Mr. Gilkerson as soon as practicable.

The Synod's fast was duly observed in all our settled congregations.

It is the Presbytery's desire that the new Book of Discipline, if possible, be enacted at the present meeting of Synod; that some effectual measures be adopted towards assisting young men in their preparatory studies for the ministry; that the Presbytery be advised as to the propriety of proceeding to higher censures in the case of their deposed brethren; and also that an adequate supply of preachers be allowed, during the ensuing year, to the Presbytery, for the benefit of its vacancies.

Respectfully submitted by order of Presbytery.

PETER CAMPBELL, *Moderator.*

*Baltimore, May 28th, 1840.*

No. 6. The Report of the Presbytery of Illinois, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies, and on the Funds.

*Report of the Presbytery of Illinois.*

To the Associate Synod, to meet at Baltimore, on the fourth Wednesday of May, 1840.

In presenting this our second annual report to Synod, we have great reason to remember the loving-kindness of the Lord, and his great goodness to this portion of his heritage, manifested, in his putting it into the hearts of many to desire a pure dispensation of Gospel ordinances, and to show a commendable attention to these when they are enjoyed.

Petitions have been presented to Presbytery from persons living in different sections of the country, praying to be supplied with ordinances, and to be organized into congregations. Some of the desired supply has been sent, and three congregations have been organized; but owing to the failure of Messrs. Walker and Imbrie, in fulfilling their appointments in our bounds, many of our vacancies have suffered, being left destitute the whole year, especially the southern ones, to which they were appointed.

A call on Mr. James Templeton, from the congregation of Hennepin, Putnam county, Illinois, has been sustained, and is now in the hands of Presbytery, ready for presentation. As the labours of Mr. Templeton were, to some extent, confined to places, from which no contributions could be expected, there remains due to him a balance of forty-five dollars, which amount Presbytery have agreed to solicit Synod to pay.

Our settled congregations are gradually increasing, and two new stations for preaching, have, during the year, been taken up by Presbytery.

The Synod's fast was observed by our members.

The peculiar location of our vacancies, situated "where Satan's seat is," the loud cries for the bread of life,—the hungering and thirsting after righteousness,—these considerations make it the indispensable duty of Presbytery, to solicit Synod for a greater proportion of ministerial aid, than has heretofore been obtained, and we must state, that if assistance is not received, this part of the church must necessarily suffer.

To accomplish, then, the ends for which our church has, in God's great name, displayed her banner, and that the wilderness and solitary place may be glad, and the desert blossom as the rose,—may the King of Zion pour upon one and all, the Spirit of love, and of a sound mind in the fear of the Lord.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM BRUCE, *Moderator.*

ANDREW RODGERS, *Pres. Clerk.*

No. 7. The Report of the Presbytery of Miami, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies, and also to a select Committee consisting of Messrs. Hindman, Smart and M'Arthur.

*Report of the Presbytery of Miami.*

The general features of the state of religion with us, we believe, are the following

A regular, and in some of our congregations, an increased attendance on ordinances; from which we hope that the Spirit of God remains among us, and we need not fear, though the floods of trouble have lifted up their voice.

An unsettledness and unsteadiness of mind marking the character of many, which gives reason to apprehend that revolutions may be near, and, perhaps, foundations may be destroyed.

The existence in many of our congregations of a spirit of readiness for faction, insubordination, and even violence, by which our peace and comfort are much impaired. We have to lament and complain to Synod, that this spirit appears in the reading and encouraging of that advocate of backsliding, from the truth and resistance of authority—the Associate P. Magazine; and that this is done by some, who have solemnly vowed to follow no divisive course.

In all or nearly all our congregations, an encouraging increase of members, and not the least so in those where disturbance has most prevailed, indicating, as we hope, that the Spirit of the Lord is lifting up a standard against the enemy coming in like a flood, and that our troubles are to be attributed to the envy and rage of Satan.

The facts, that a call from the congregation of Massie's creek had been made out, and accepted by Mr. James P. Smart, were set forth in our last report. On the ninth of July last, he was ordained and installed in the pastoral charge of that congregation. A call has been made out also from the congregation of Sugar creek, for Mr. George M. Hall, and by him accepted. On 25th October last, he was installed in the pastoral charge of that congregation. Thus the desolations of our Zion have been mercifully visited and repaired.

At the same meeting of Presbytery, at which the above was transacted, the congregation of Cherokee petitioned for an increased amount of Mr. James Wallace's

time, and, in order to this, for a dissolution of the connexion between that and the congregation of Darby, and of the pastoral relation of Mr. Wallace to the latter congregation. The petition was granted, and Darby thereby thrown as a vacancy, upon the care of Presbytery.

A call has been made out and sanctioned, from the united congregations of Darby and Sugar run, for Mr. James A. Brown, which, with accompanying papers, we transmit, earnestly hoping Synod will take measures to have it speedily presented for his acceptance. We earnestly solicit as liberal a portion of supply, as is consistent with the claims of other parts of the church. A corrected statistical table accompanies this report.

By order of Presbytery,

GEORGE M. HALL, *Moderator*, P. T.  
S. WILSON, *Clerk*.

May, 1840.

No. 8. The Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies.

*Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum.*

We have but little of general interest to report to this meeting of Synod. Our congregations, settled and vacant, continue the same as formerly reported, except that two new congregations have been recently organized, and are now to be placed on the list of our vacancies. This will increase, to some extent, our demand for supply, and as we have had but a very limited portion of the Synod's disposable aid for the last year, we hope a more liberal allowance will be made us for the time to come. The names of the new congregations are Westchester and New Washington.

We have examined and admitted to the study of theology four students: namely, Jacob Fisher, John Marshall, Joseph M'Clintock, and John Scott, all of whom attended the Theological Seminary last session.

A protest and appeal has been taken by one of our members against a decision of this Presbytery, which, together with the accompanying papers, will be laid before Synod in due time.

Respectfully submitted by order of Presbytery,

THOMAS HANNA, *Presbytery's Clerk*.

No. 9. The Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee on the Theological Seminary.

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

On the 25th of March last, the Board met according to adjournment. By the report of the professors, it appeared that the following named students attended during the last session: namely, Messrs. John Bryan, John M. French, Isaac Law, Daniel H. A. M'Lean, Archibald Reid, and George C. Vincent of the fourth year, Messrs. Ambrose Barcroft, David Bullions, Wm. J. Cleland, James R. Doig, James W. Logue, John Todd, and Thomas B. Walker of the third year. Messrs. Titus Bassfield, Robert J. Hammond, and B. F. Sawyer of the second year. Messrs. William Cunningham, Jacob Fisher, John Marshall, Joseph M'Clintock, John Scott, and Thomas Simpson of the first year.

The usual course of examination was attended to, and discourses were delivered by all the students of the second, third, and fourth years, excepting one who was excused on account of indisposition. These specimens of improvement in theological attainments, were in a high degree gratifying to the Board.

Those students who have completed the full term of study were examined separately on the distinguishing principles of our profession, and having given entire satisfaction, are hereby recommended to Synod to be taken on trial for license.

A very liberal donation, amounting to two hundred and fifty dollars, was received from an individual belonging to our communion, for the aid of Theological students, which was appropriated by the Board according to the directions of the donor. Before closing this report, the Board would suggest to Synod the propriety of changing the time of our meeting to the 3d Tuesday, instead of the 4th Wednesday of March. The present arrangement interferes with the meeting of the Board of several colleges, and some of our members are also trustees of some of those colleges.

By order of the Board,

THOMAS HANNA, *Secretary*.

P. S. The term of service of Messrs. Clokey and B. Boyd expires at this meeting of Synod. T. HANNA.

No. 10. The Report of the Presbytery of Stamford, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies, and on the Funds.

*Report of the Presbytery of Stamford.*

The supply assigned to us was not enjoyed. Our vacancies have had no sermon by appointment of Synod for more than eighteen months. Why this has been, Synod will doubtless know. Synod have not thought fit, it appears, to give us authority to retain the collections made for their funds, agreeably to a suggestion in our last report. Considering the silence of Synod as a tacit intimation that our retaining of these would not be acceptable to Synod, we forward, by Mr. William S. Young, Bookseller, Philadelphia, the sum of fifteen dollars, thirty-seven and a half cents; a collection from the congregation of Dumfries for 1839; and the sum of fourteen dollars, sixty-four cents, from Dumfries congregation for 1840: also from the congregation of York and Covington, New York, thirteen dollars, fifty cents, for 1839; and from the congregation of Stamford, ten dollars, for 1839: total fifty-three dollars, fifty-one and a half cents.

We transmit with this our report, an extract from the minutes of last meeting, accompanied with our remonstrance and petition against the procedure of Synod, in relation to a memorial received by Synod, against us and the session of Dumfries; as also a narrative subjoined to our remonstrance and petition, for the information of Synod, with regard to the memorialists and their "commissioner." From these papers, Synod will perceive that we excuse ourselves from being present at meeting of Synod, for the most weighty reasons. We have no doubt that these reasons will be sustained. We confidently hope that Synod will suffer no injustice to be done, nor illiberality to be shown to us in supply of preachers, of which we feel an urgent distressing want.

A day of fasting was observed, generally, in our congregations, not literally a Synod's fast, but in the spirit of Synod's injunction.

JOHN RUSSELL, *Moderator.*

No. 11. Papers from the above Presbytery, containing extracts from their minutes, relative to the proceedings of Synod last year in their case, and remonstrating against said procedure.—After some progress made in reading, an objection to the continuance of the reading was interposed, and the following resolution adopted, namely:

"Resolved, that the farther reading of the remonstrance from the Presbytery of Stamford be suspended, on account of its improper language, and referred to a committee to report on the same. Messrs. Wallace, Webster, and McElwee, were appointed said committee.

The Synod proceeded to hear a narrative of the facts of the above case, transmitted by said Presbytery. After some progress made, the Moderator decided the paper to be inadmissible, on account of its indecorous language, the paper was then, on motion, referred to the same committee to which the remonstrance had been referred, as related above.

On motion, it was resolved, that the extracts from the minutes of the Presbytery of Stamford in relation to the above case, with all the other papers relative to it, be referred to the same committee.

On motion, Mr. W. S. Young was appointed treasurer pro tem.

A communication from Mr. James Reid, Executor of the legacy of Mr. Smith, late of Hebron, was read, informing Synod, that he had according to their advice of last year effected a compromise in relation to the above legacy. On motion, the compromise was sanctioned by the Synod.

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 the forenoon sitting were read, corrected and approved.

The Report of the select committee on the special report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, respecting the Presbytery of Vermont, was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.



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

No. 12. A petition from Madison, Indiana, praying for an increased amount of supply, and for pecuniary aid in defraying the expense. This petition was, on motion, referred to the Committee on Missions and on the Funds.

No. 13. A call from Tuscaloosa, for Rev. Thomas S. Kendall. This call was, on motion, referred to the Presbytery of Miami, and the brethren of said Presbytery present were appointed to meet as soon as practicable.

No. 14. Extracts from the minutes of the Presbytery of Muskingum, with certain papers connected with an appeal taken by Rev. Joseph Clokey from a decision of said Presbytery, adopting certain resolutions in the case of Joseph M'Nary. After some progress made, it was, on motion, resolved, that the farther reading of these papers be suspended for the present, and that they be referred to the Committee of Appeals. Mr. Hanna was, at his own request, excused from serving on the committee in this case, and Mr. Smart appointed in his place.

During the discussion on the above papers, Rev. J. Scroggs, of the Presbytery of Allegheny, appeared and took his seat.

No. 15. A petition from certain subscribers residing in and about Canonsburgh, praying that the Synod would grant liberty for the Anti-Slavery Society to hold meetings in the Hall of the Theological Seminary.

No. 16. A representation and remonstrance by Mr. M. M'Nary, against a decision of the board of Trustees of the Theological Seminary, refusing to grant liberty to the Anti-Slavery Society to hold its meetings as above: both these papers were, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 17. Reasons of protest by Mr. Thomas M'Cleery against a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in his case, together with the Presbytery's answers to said reasons, were given in, and, on motion, referred without reading, to the Committee of Appeals.

No. 18. The Report of the Presbytery of Richland, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee on the Funds and of Supplies.

#### *Report of the Presbytery of Richland.*

In presenting our second annual report to Synod, we have to acknowledge the goodness of God, manifested to us during the past year. The unoccupied part of Mr. Hindman's time has been received by North Washington congregation. A new branch has been organized, called Red Haw, which, in connexion with Clear creek and Killbuck, has obtained the pastoral labours of Mr. Law. On the 13th instant, Mr. Law, after giving the usual probationary exercises, to the satisfaction of Presbytery, was ordained and installed as pastor of said congregation. The supply allotted, was nearly all received, and though the demand is not so great as usual, in our bounds, having but two small vacancies, yet we hope to receive a due proportion of supply. Presbytery think it necessary to call the attention of Synod to the following subject:

Some years since Mr. Hindman was sent on a mission to Canada, and though a pledge was given by Synod that his pulpit should be supplied during his absence, yet, nearly the whole time, the different branches of his congregation were left vacant, to their manifest injury. The congregation of Clear creek, being required by Presbytery to settle the whole amount of their regular salary with Mr. Hindman, before the installation of Mr. Law, complained to Presbytery on the subject of lost time. Has Clear creek congregation a claim upon Synod, for their amount of lost time? The amount of time lost to the congregation, was four Sabbaths.—The Synodical fast was generally observed in our bounds.—A corrected statistical table accompanies this report.

Respectfully submitted, by order of Presbytery.

JOSEPH M'KEE, *Clerk.*

The committee appointed last year to draught an answer to the letter of the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, presented a draught, which was read, and, on motion, laid on the table for a second reading.

No. 19. A Memorial on the practice of trafficking in ardent spirits, signed "Andrew Martin." This Memorial was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Bills and Overtures.

No. 20. A Report on the Lower Canada Mission, by Rev. D. Gordon. This Report was, on motion, referred to the Committee on Missions.

To the reverend, the Associate Synod of North America, to meet in Baltimore, May 27, 1840.

The subscriber, (though not appointed immediately by Synod,) having twice within the last year, visited the Lower Canada vacancies, which have been set off as Missionary ground, would beg leave to lay before Synod the following brief view of their case.

Two of these congregations were organized in 1836, and consisted of twenty-three and twenty-five members respectively, the third was organized in 1837, and consisted of thirty members; here and in one of the other places there was also a fair prospect of increase. Judging from visible circumstances, there can be no doubt that if these vacancies had received the attention bestowed on some, the fruit would have been equal to that of any portion of the church. But their lot has been different, for though the scale of appointments seems to give them a reasonable proportion, the whole amount actually received will average only about two Sabbaths in the year to each place, and even including what Cambridge Presbytery has been able to afford them, it is very little more than four Sabbaths each in the year.

The appointment of Synod last year was particularly liberal, and it was hoped it would be a refreshing and strengthening of that part of the weary heritage, but alas, it proved only a more severe disappointment than they had ever before experienced, by the utter failure of the whole; so that with the exception of a few Sabbaths by the subscriber, they have not had one day's preaching since 1838. It is unnecessary to say, they are discouraged, at least some of them; and when we add to the above discouragements, their unavoidable participation in the disturbances of the country, it is rather surprising that they still exist as congregations. Yet they do exist: they have had a little of the common experience, changes by death, removals, very few by defection; they have also had some additions, so that there is little variation of their former number; praying societies are supported in them all, more or less punctually; their desire for supply of preaching is unabated: they also show their willingness to contribute according to their ability, for the support of ordinances.

In one of these congregations, they have a house for public worship, and in another, they have lately shown a commendable activity for the obtaining of one, which is now, by a little assistance from brethren in other parts of the church, in a hopeful state of progress.

If there were a plentiful measure of supply afforded them, there would still be considerable hope of increase; but if they are to be furnished as heretofore, they must decay; it cannot possibly be otherwise.

Synod is therefore earnestly entreated to take their case into special consideration, and adopt some more efficient measures than hitherto.

When a people have been brought under the solemn obligations of a profession, the church is brought under a corresponding obligation to supply them to the utmost of her power, with a dispensation of ordinances according to that profession; and to neglect a people after they have been thus gathered, is a far greater evil, than seems generally acknowledged.

I would not say that Synod has neglected them, but certainly the amount of supply actually received, has been no more than tantalizing them. The following suggestions are respectfully offered for the consideration of Synod.

1. That Synod establish a missionary there permanently, that is, at least not to remove one, till another is ready to fill the place.

Many arguments might be offered in behalf of this plan; it would be incomparably better for the vacancies, far less laborious and expensive for the preacher, it is the method of other bodies by which our vacancies are surrounded, and which gives them a decided advantage; and if we expect to effect any thing by missionary operations, something of the kind is indispensable. It need hardly be remarked, that the permanent missionary ought to be an ordained minister, and furnished with some supply of means for efficiently carrying on the work.

2. That such only be appointed as voluntarily offer themselves for that service. Let preachers have an opportunity of reporting themselves to Synod, or let students

previous to license have an opportunity of giving in their names for that purpose. This is the method of those denominations who have carried on missions with the greatest success; it was formerly the practice in the Associate church in Scotland; and, of the many arguments that might be advanced, this one is sufficient to recommend it, that it would afford some pledge for the fulfilment of the appointment, whereas at present there is none. The nonfulfilment of appointments is so common, and so easily excused that we can form no calculation on the printed scale; if one, two, or six months supply are there allotted, it is still perfectly uncertain whether one day will be actually received.

The whole amount of supply from Synod intended for Lower Canada vacancies since their organization, is about fifteen months, of which eight months or more than one half, has failed; and whatever may have been the intrinsic value of any excuses offered, there can be no doubt that reluctance to that service added mightily to their weight. I shall not here dwell in commenting on such a fact, but only pray Synod to take measures for preventing the ruinous consequences of it in future.

I may observe in conclusion, that if your permanent missionary in Lower Canada, shall be as active and industrious in embracing the means of obtaining a support, and at the same time, of promoting his main object, as those in foreign countries are generally represented to be, his continuance need be no burden either to Synod or himself: there are in our congregations, more than one opportunity of teaching the young, which, if not a very lucrative employment, would be an excellent auxiliary to the missionary work.

Respectfully submitted by

D. GORDON.

On motion, resolved, that a part of to-morrow forenoon sitting be spent in religious exercises, and Messrs. D. Anderson, and Cooper were appointed to lead in these exercises.

Dr. Thomas Miller, ruling elder from the Presbytery of Muskingum, appeared and took his seat.

The Synod proceeded to the consideration of the Draught of a Book of Discipline. The first and second Chapters of the Draught were read, and on motion adopted. The third chapter was read, and certain amendments proposed and adopted. The second section of said chapter being under consideration, Dr. Beveridge and Mr. A. Gordon requested their dissent to be marked from the Synod's decision, approving the language of that section on the principle of representation.

On motion, adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Friday, May 29th.*

After the religious exercises of the morning, the Synod met, and was opened with prayer, members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read, corrected, and approved.

On motion, Mr. Scroggs was added to the Committee of Supplies.

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

No. 21. Protests of the Presbytery of Vermont against the Synod's decisions of last year in their case. This paper was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. A. Anderson, M'Naughton, and Hanna.

No. 22. A Representation from the Presbytery of the Carolinas, in reference to the deed of Synod of last year on the subject of slavery, and containing said Presbytery's declinature of the fellowship of this Synod. Before disposing of this paper, the Synod 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 the forenoon sitting were read and approved. The Synod proceeded to the consideration of the paper from the Presbytery of the Carolinas, read at the close of the forenoon sitting. On this subject, certain resolutions were offered, and

VOL. XVII.—2

amendments proposed. During the discussion of these resolutions, Mr. James Wilson, ruling elder from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, appeared and took his seat.

The committee in the case of the Presbytery of Stamford, requested and obtained leave to withdraw for the remainder of the present sitting.

The proceedings relative to the subject under discussion were, on motion, suspended, to make way for the reading of a Memorial from Bethany Congregation, North Carolina, protesting against the Synod's deeds on the subject of slavery.

The subject was then resumed, and after a free discussion, it was, on motion, resolved, that a committee be appointed to whom the several motions and amendments offered on the paper purporting to be from the Carolina Presbytery, shall be referred, to mature a report as soon as possible. Messrs. Miller, A. Anderson, and Templeton were appointed said committee.

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

No. 23. 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, it has pleased Providence to remove from among us the Rev. Thomas Allison. He departed this life suddenly, on the sixth of April last, in the 69th year of his age, and 40th of his ministry. The Synod will no doubt sympathize with us, in the removal of one whose services were so valuable as a minister and member of church courts, until his faculties were impaired by the infirmities of age. Mr. Thomas Gilkerson was licensed to preach about the beginning of July. Mr. William H. Walker, having accepted a call to the Associate congregation of Ohio, has been ordained to the ministry, and pastoral care of said congregation. Calls have been moderated in the congregations of Peter's creek and Noblestown, for Mr. James A. Brown. These have been sustained, and are forwarded to Synod for presentation, or such other disposal of them as may be judged proper. The Synod's fast was observed in all our settled congregations, and also in some of our vacancies. The Presbytery have also endeavoured to carry into effect the order of Synod in respect to the raising of funds, but we fear this effort will not be found to have been attended with general success.

At our last meeting, the congregations of Burgetstown and Mount Pleasant were disannexed, and the whole time of the Rev. Mr. Donnan is to be henceforth confined to the latter. The former congregation is, therefore, to be added to the list of our vacancies.

JAMES RAMSAY, *Clerk.*

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

*Report of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

To the Associate Synod of North America, to meet in Baltimore the fourth Wednesday of May, 1840.

We have great reason to praise the Lord for his goodness in enabling us, amid much outward opposition, faithfully to continue witnessing for the truth as it is in Jesus. We would bless and magnify his name for the good measure of success which has attended the announcement of his truths, in establishing and building up his cause in our midst. We have farther great reason humbly and thankfully to praise the Lord for outward harmony and peace amongst us.

Since our last report to Synod, Rev. Joseph T. Cooper has been ordained to the office of the holy ministry, and installed Pastor of the Second Associate Congregation of Philadelphia, on the 25th of September last.

Mr. Smith, appointed by Synod to this Presbytery, to be taken on trials for license, after the customary exercises and examination was licensed to preach the everlasting Gospel on the 10th of July.

At a meeting of Presbytery in Philadelphia on October 30th, 1839, Rev. David Anderson, from the United Secession Church in Scotland, after preaching before Presbytery, and giving his cordial approbation of our principles, was, by a unanimous vote, admitted to ministerial fellowship amongst us, and has since, for a considerable portion of the time, been supplying with great acceptance in our vacan-

cies. At the same meeting Mr. Thomas R. Simpson was admitted as a student of theology.

The report of the Presbytery to the committee on the Book of Discipline, has, according to order of Synod, been transmitted to said committee. The Rev. Samuel McLean's excuse for non-fulfilment of his appointment in Illinois was sustained, but not for his failure to supply in the Presbytery of Richland. Presbytery have agreed to establish a student's fund under their immediate care, and would respectfully suggest that Synod recommend to each Presbytery a similar plan. This is not designed to interfere with any existing arrangement made by Synod. We have unusual reason to solicit for the ensuing year as liberal a portion of supply as may be at the disposal of Synod, and consistent with the claims of other sections of the churches. From several new places, applications have been made for supply of preaching.

Synod's fast was observed as far as ascertained.

We would solicit the appointment, by Synod, of a committee to address suitable directions to our people for the right observance of days of fasting and humiliation.

Also, a committee to explain the duty of persons belonging to our communion, who may be called in Providence to reside in destitute places, where they are deprived of Gospel ordinances as dispensed by us. In closing we would earnestly suggest the propriety of Synod urging, by a particular call, upon all the people under their charge, the duty of more frequent and earnest prayer for the promotion of our religious principles. If worthy of professing and witnessing for, ought we not to show our love to the God who revealed them, to precious souls endangered by their neglect, in earnest pleadings with the God of truth on their behalf—that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified abundantly, that our ministers and people may be found living to his glory, labouring in his service, and looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.

By order of Presbytery,

JOSEPH T. COOPER, *Moderator.*

JOHN G. SMART, *Clerk pro tem.*

The following preamble and resolution were offered, viz.

Whereas, it has been intimated by a member of the Presbytery of Chartiers, that they permitted Mr. A. Wilson, one of their members, to forsake his profession, without the Presbytery taking any notice of him for so doing, the Synod therefore order said Presbytery to appear at their bar at next meeting, to answer for the same, and that the Clerk be ordered to notify them accordingly.

Before taking any order on the above preamble and resolution, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Saturday, May 30th.*

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, the following were given in and read, viz:

No. 25. A communication from Mr. D. Christy, of Oxford, Ohio, in reference to the establishment of a Calvinistic Book Concern. This communication was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Scroggs, Cooper, and Young.

No. 26. A Memorial from a Committee of the Session of Carmel, Indiana, on the subject of Occasional Hearing. This Memorial was, on motion, laid on the table for the present.

No. 27. A Memorial from the united congregations of Timber Ridge, Ebenezer, and Old Providence, Va. remonstrating against the Synod's deeds on the subject of slavery.

No. 28. A Declinature of the congregations of Neiley's Creek, and Steel Creek, on account of the Synod's action on the subject of slavery. Both these papers were, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 29. A Memorial from the Session of Caesar's Creek, requesting the correction of a mistake in the printed minutes, respecting their

memorial of last year, on the subject of Occasional Hearing. Said Memorial was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. M'Elwee, D. Gordon, and M'Arthur.

No. 30. A communication from the Trustees of the Theological Seminary, assigning reasons for their refusal of the use of the Seminary buildings to the Colonization and Anti-Slavery Societies, which, with the accompanying documents, was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 31. A communication from a committee of the Convention of Reformed Churches, transmitting a copy of the proceedings of said Convention, and inviting the co-operation of this Synod. This communication was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Martin, A. Gordon, and Law.

No. 32. A petition from the Congregations of Salem, Pistol Creek, and Big Spring, praying for one year's stated supply of Gospel ordinances.

A verbal petition was also presented, from Limestone, Washington Co. Tenn., praying for supply. Both these petitions were, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies.

According to the standing rule, Synod proceeded to the nomination of members of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, in the room of Messrs. Clokey and Boyd, whose term of service has expired, Messrs. M'Elwee, Clokey, B. Boyd, M'Arthur, and Wm. H. Walker were put in nomination.

The select committee appointed last evening, in relation to the paper from the Presbytery of the Carolinas, presented a report, which was adopted, as follows, viz.

"Whereas it appears from a communication yesterday laid on the table of Synod from the Presbytery of the Carolinas, signed by order of Presbytery, A. Whyte, Moderator, that at least the ministerial members of that Presbytery, viz. the Rev. Messrs. A. Whyte and H. Thompson, have declined the authority and the fellowship of the Associate Church, on account of the Synod's action relative to slavery—therefore resolved, that these brethren be immediately dealt with for their falling away from the fellowship of the church, and from their profession."

The Synod then resolved themselves into a committee of the whole, Mr. A. Anderson in the chair. In accordance with the above resolution the brethren of the Presbytery of the Carolinas were dealt with at some length. When the committee rose, the chairman reported that they had made no progress in the attainment of the object for which the committee met. The following resolution, then, reported by the select committee, was read, and after a brief discussion, adopted by the following vote, a brother having been previously engaged in prayer. Yeas, 28; Nays, 4; Non liquet, 5.

"Whereas, Synod in committee have not succeeded in inducing the brethren of the Presbytery of the Carolinas to withdraw their declinature, therefore resolved, That as Rev. A. Whyte, jr. and Rev. H. Thompson, members of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, have declined the authority and fellowship of the Associate Church, they be suspended from the exercise of the office of the ministry, and the fellowship of the church, until they acknowledge their sin, and return to their duty.

In pursuance of the above resolution, the sentence of suspension was then pronounced.

Mr. James Geery, ruling elder from the Presbytery of Albany, being present, was invited to a seat. Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2 o'clock, P. M.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The reading of the minutes of the forenoon sitting was, on motion, dispensed with, as the Clerk had not had leisure to write them fully out.

The calls reported by the Presbyteries of Chartiers and Miami for Mr. James A. Brown were, on motion, transmitted to the Presbytery of Miami for presentation.

The calls for Mr. Gilkerson were, on motion, transmitted for presentation to the Presbytery of Chartiers.

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

No. 33. The report of D. Houston, Treasurer—and

No. 34. The report of D. Murphy, Assistant Treasurer both of which were, on motion, referred to the Committee of the Funds.

*Daniel Houston, Treasurer, in account with Associate Synod.*

<i>Dr.</i>		<i>Contra.</i>	
To balance in Treasury, as per report to Synod, 1839. -	\$8,141.26½	By payments as per account.	1,699.20½
1839.		1840.	
May 31,		May 23, Balance in Treasurer's hand. -	7,005.49½
To cash received from New Buffalo congregation, contrib. -	9.10	The above is a correct account of Synod's Funds in my hands.	
June 4, To cash received from Deer creek congregation, contrib. -	7.10	DANIEL HOUSTON,	
July 2, To cash, from interest.	3.00	<i>Treasurer.</i>	
31, do. do. do.	24.00	23, Cash, contribution from King's creek cong. -	10.00
Sep. 25, do. do. do.	10.00	23, Cash, contribution from Service cong. -	5.50
25, Cash from Service cong. contrib. -	4.50	23, Cash, donation from Mrs. Isabella Taggart, of Wooster. -	1.00
Oct. 8, Cash, interest on Miss Moore's Legacy. -	2.00	23, Cash, contribution from Rev. S. Hindman's congregation. -	8.52½
18, Cash from first congregation in Philadelphia, [from two quarterly collections.] -	20.01		\$7,030.51½
Nov. 6, Cash, from interest. -	33.00		
1840.		The last four items of cash were received after the report was closed, and now added to report.	
Mar. 9, Cash, from interest. -	118.50	DANIEL HOUSTON.	
Apr. 14, Cash from W. Anderson, rent of seminary.	100.00	<i>Contra.</i>	<i>Cr.</i>
April 1. Cash, interest from Treasurer on Erie land.	184.80	By error corrected in report of May, 1839.	10.00
May 14, Cash contrib. from S. Buffalo cong. -	8.00	1839.	
14, Cash, contrib. from Deer creek congregation.	5.50	By cash paid sexton for Synod, 1839, per order of Synod. -	20.00
18, Cash, contribution from Chartiers cong. -	22.88½	June 4. Cash paid Rev. W. M. McElwee, order of Synod. -	16.40
18, Cash, contribution from North Buffalo cong.	10.04½	4, Cash paid postage to Rev. A. Heron. -	1.87½
19. Cash, interest on Margaret Moore's Legacy. -	1.00	4, Cash paid Rev. James Law, order of Synod.	15.00
	\$8,704.70		

14, Cash paid W. S. Young, order of Synod, [for printing and binding 1,000 Psalm Books.]	260.00	29, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, salary. - -	100.00
14, Premium on Eastern draft, for W. S. Young.	2.12½	Feb. 3, Cash paid, postage.	38½
17, Cash paid Rev. John M'Lean. - - - -	14.00	Mar. 7, Cash paid, expenses of Treasurer to Carlisle. - - - -	50.00
July, Postage paid. - - -	37½	30, Cash paid, postage.	18½
Sept. 6, Cash paid, school tax. -	6.92	April 14, Cash paid for coal for Seminary. - - - -	3.85
Oct. 3, Cash paid W. S. Young, per order, [printing and binding 2,000 copies of the Associate Testimony.] - -	390.00	14, Cash paid for student's room, rent, &c. - -	91.50
3, Premium on eastern draft.	3.90	May 9, Cash paid, postage. -	37½
8, Spurious note returned by Rev. A. Heron. -	5.00	13, Cash paid J. M. Smith for door handles. -	4.00
Nov. 1, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, salary. - -	250.00	14, Cash paid Rev. J. Ramsay, salary in full.	200.00
Cash paid, postage, -	1.12½	14, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, salary in full.	150.00
1840.		14, Cash paid Sam'l Small, repairs on Seminary doors. - - - -	1.75
Jan. 29, Cash paid, postage. -	18½	16, Cash paid, postage on Mr. Stodard's letter.	25
29, Cash paid Rev. J. Ramsay, salary. - - -	100.00		<u>\$1,699.20½</u>

*Canonsburgh, May 15, 1840.*

The undersigned having been appointed by the Board of Trustees of the Theological Seminary to audit the accounts of the Treasurer, report that they have attended to the duty assigned them, and find the accounts correct, up to the present date. The amount in the hands of the Treasurer, as exhibited by his books, is seven thousand thirty dollars, fifty-one and three-fourth cents. The amount loaned and disbursed somewhat exceeds the above sum.

THOMAS BEVERIDGE,  
D. S. STEVENSON.

*Associate Synod in account with Daniel Murphy, Assistant Treasurer.*

1839-40.	Dr.		Cr.
To cash paid the Rev. D. R. De Freest, the Rev. T. Gilkerson, and the Rev. Wm. Smith, for ministerial labour in the city of New York. - - - -	\$246.00	By balance in Treasury, as per report of May 16th, 1839. - - - -	\$478.09½
1839.		1840.	
Dec. 3. To cash paid for Books for the Theological Seminary. - - - -	100.00	May 22.	
	<u>\$346.00</u>	By cash for student's fund, from one year's dividend on Commercial Bank stock. - -	66.00
			<u>\$514.09½</u>
			346.00
		Balance. - - - -	<u>\$198.09½</u>

The above report, with the accompanying vouchers, is respectfully submitted.

DANIEL MURPHY, *Assistant Treasurer.*

The Committee of Appeals reported on the appeal of Thomas M'Cleery from a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge in his case. The report was, on motion, adopted, as follows, namely,

"The Committee of Appeals report on the appeal of Mr. M'Cleery from a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge, that the appeal appears to come regularly before the Synod, except that no extracts of minutes are furnished. It is recommended, however, that the case be issued by Synod."



The next meeting of Synod was appointed to be held at Washington, Pa. on the 4th Wednesday of May next at 4 o'clock,—Sermon at 2 P. M.

On motion, Mr. John S. Easton was appointed the Moderator's alternate, to preach the synodical sermon.

The following preamble and resolution were offered and accepted, namely,

"Whereas it is both troublesome and expensive to ministers who have been travelling for several years to take appointments to many different Presbyteries, resolved that the Committee of Supplies be directed to assign such as have been engaged in itinerating for a number of years to such particular Presbyteries as it may be thought will be most convenient, and that these Presbyteries be instructed to give them such employment in the ministry, as the circumstances of their vacancies and of these preachers may render expedient."

From the decision adopting the above resolution Mr. Hindman dissented, for reasons to be given in.

Entered upon the consideration of the appeal of Thomas M'Cleery from a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge in his case.

The reasons of protest, with the Presbytery's answers, and extracts of minutes were read, and the appellant heard in part.

Dr. D. Martin asked and obtained leave of absence during the remaining sittings of Synod. Adjourned till 9 o'clock on Monday morning. Closed with prayer.

#### *Monday, June 1.*

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

The committee appointed on the Protest of the Presbytery of Vermont asked and obtained leave to withdraw for a portion of the present sitting.

On motion, the reading of papers was dispensed with, in order to proceed with the business left unfinished on Saturday, namely, the appeal of Thomas M'Cleery.

Some additional documents were read, and the parties heard and removed.

After a free discussion, the question was put, "Sustain the appeal or not?" and carried "not sustain," by the following vote, namely, ayes 5—noes 8—non liquet 13.

Reasons of protest by Messrs. Heron and Brown against the Synod's decision of last year, refusing to re-consider their deed of the former year in relation to the Presbytery of Albany, were read, and laid on the table for the present.

On motion resolved, that Synod go into committee of the whole in the afternoon on the consideration of the above paper.

Mr. Miller requested the loan of the manuscript minutes of the Presbytery of Pennsylvania and of the Associate Synod up to 1826. The request was granted.

The records of Presbyteries were called for and referred as follows, namely,

Records of the Presbytery of Cambridge to Messrs. Templeton and Wallace.

Records of the Presbytery of Albany to Messrs. Walker and Law.

Records of the Presbytery of Philadelphia to Messrs. Hindman and M'Arthur.

The records of the Presbytery of Vermont not being present, an excuse was offered and sustained. Adjourned to 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 approved.

Papers being called for, there were given and read,

No. 35. A Representation and Petition from Rev. Messrs. S. Wilson and James P. Smart in reference to a decision of the Presbytery of Miami on a question which had been proposed to said Presbytery. This paper was, on motion, referred to a select committee consisting of Messrs. Hindman, Scroggs, and Cooper.

No. 36. The Draught of an Act for a Fast, which was read, and on motion adopted, and referred to a publishing committee, consisting of Messrs. M'Elwee and Miller.

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

Pursuant to the order of the day, the Synod went into committee of the whole on the paper of protest presented in the forenoon.

Mr. Walker in the chair.

After some time spent in free conversation, the committee rose and reported progress. It was then, on motion, resolved, that a committee be appointed, consisting of Dr. Ramsey, and Messrs. A. Anderson and Hanna, to converse with Mr. Heron in relation to his protest.

The select committee in the case of the Presbytery of Stamford reported; the report was on motion laid on the table for the present.

The committee appointed last year on the Protest of Rev. W. M. M'Elwee presented a report, which was, on motion, adopted, and is as follows, namely,

*Report of the Committee on the Appeals of the Rev. Wm. M. M'Elwee.*

The committee to whom was referred two protests, taken by the Rev. Wm. M. M'Elwee, against certain decisions of the Presbytery of Chartiers, acquitting James Harper, an elder of King's creek congregation, and David Ramsay, a member of the same, on certain charges preferred against them, beg leave respectfully to report,—

That they have fully examined all the papers connected with these cases, and calculated to give light on the subject before the Presbytery. From these papers, it appears that the charge against James Harper arose from a statement made by him in Presbytery. It was rumored that David Ramsay, when speaking to James Harper, respecting a certain compromise between him (Ramsay) and Mr. M'Elwee, had said, *on the road going home from Presbytery*, that he (Ramsay) would rather than five dollars he had not made that compromise, or dropped his libel against Mr. M'Elwee. At a subsequent meeting of Presbytery, James Harper was called on to state whether such conversation had passed, or whether such a statement was made by David Ramsay to him on the road home from Presbytery, to which Harper answered in the negative, and gave no explanation, nor offered any other testimony to direct the Presbytery in deciding any thing respecting David Ramsay. But, some time afterwards, it was found that David Ramsay had made that very statement to James Harper, but not, (as was alleged,) *on the road home from Presbytery*.

The committee are of opinion that, although the language of James Harper was, strictly speaking, not false, yet had the Presbytery decided on the statement made by him, they must, necessarily, have decided erroneously; for no criminality was attached to the *place* where it was said, but to the *fact* of its being said. The language of James Harper was deceptive, and calculated to mislead the court. He should have said that the words were *not used* by David Ramsay on the *road home from Presbytery*, but they were used at another place within a few days of that time.

The committee, therefore, for the honour of truth and the maintaining of correct testimony, submit for adoption the following resolution: namely,

*Resolved*, That the appeal of the Rev. Wm. M. McElwee, against a decision of the Presbytery of Chartiers acquitting James Harper, *be sustained*.

With respect to the case of David Ramsay, your committee respectfully report,—That the history of this case is intimately connected with the former. From the papers laid before your committee, it appears that a controversy existed between Mr. McElwee, the protester in this case, and David Ramsay,—that each party had tabled a libel before the Presbytery of Chartiers,—that the Presbytery appointed a committee to bring the parties together, and, if possible, settle the controversy without a judicial investigation. The committee succeeded in persuading the parties to drop their libels, and pledge themselves to abstain, in future, from the agitation of those matters in any way whatever. From the testimony, taken in the case of James Harper, it appears that David Ramsay said, shortly after this agreement, that he would rather than five dollars he had not dropped his libel against Mr. McElwee. This declaration having become a matter of public fame, David Ramsay is charged,

1st. With breaking the compromise agreement by saying that he would rather than five dollars he had not dropped his libel against Mr. McElwee.

2d. With denying this violation of it before Presbytery at Noblestown, and calling a witness, (James Harper,) to sustain him in this denial, and thus deceiving and misleading the Presbytery. The first, and most material question to be decided in this case is, are the words imputed to David Ramsay a breach of the compromise agreement made by the parties before a committee of Presbytery? Your committee have no hesitation in answering in the affirmative. That the words were uttered is plain from the testimony, and that they were a violation of agreement between the parties and calculated to do injury is, we think, equally evident.

Farther, the denial of the use of this language before Presbytery, and calling a witness to sustain this denial, was a very material aggravation of the offence.

Your committee, therefore, unhesitatingly recommend to Synod the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the appeal of the Rev. Wm. M. McElwee, from a deed of the Presbytery of Chartiers acquitting David Ramsay, *be sustained*.

The Committee of Appeals in the case of Mr. Samuel McNary reported, and the report was, on motion, laid on the table for the present. Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Tuesday, June 2.*

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, the following were given in and read, namely,

No. 37. A memorial from Messrs. John Harbison and James McCoy, members of the congregation of Massie's creek in relation to some of the deeds of Synod. This memorial was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 38. A question proposed by the Presbytery of Albany for the consideration of Synod, to the following effect, namely,

Is it consistent with the principles of our church for persons not in full communion to hold the office of trustees?

Said question was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Beveridge, and Messrs. Heron and Hanna.

The committee appointed last evening to converse with Mr. Heron reported the following paper, namely,

The subscriber finding that certain expressions in his reasons of protest are viewed by his brethren in the Synod in an offensive light, hereby expresses his willingness to withdraw the whole paper, as far as he is concerned in it; it being fully understood that such withdrawal is not to be construed as being a relinquishment of his protest, or as implying a renunciation of any of his individual opinions entertained respecting the Synod's acts of administration.

ANDREW HERON.

The above report was, on motion, accepted by Synod as a satisfactory termination of the case.

The Synod proceeded to the election of members of the Board of

Managers of the Theological Seminary in the room of Messrs. Boyd and Clokey, whose term of service had expired. Messrs. M'Elwee and M'Arthur were elected in their room.

The following students, recommended by the Board of Managers, were ordered to be taken on trial for license, and referred as follows: Messrs. Archibald Reid and Isaac Law to the Presbytery of Cambridge, Mr. George C. Vincent to the Presbytery of Muskingum, D. H. A. M'Lean to the Presbytery of Shenango, Messrs. John Bryan and John M. French to the Presbytery of Chartiers.

On motion, the Committee on Missions were ordered to report this afternoon. The following resolutions were offered and adopted, namely,

"Resolved that Synod send a supply of preaching into the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, by licentiates, and at least one ordained Minister, who shall make report to next meeting of Synod. The said minister to officiate for three months, commencing the 1st of July."

The appointment of the missionary was, on motion, deferred for the present.

"Resolved that in the mean time Synod address a pastoral letter to the congregations in that section of the church suited to their present circumstances."—Messrs. Martin and Beveridge were appointed a committee to draught said letter."

"Resolved that the members of the Associate Church in the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas be committed to the care of the Presbytery of Philadelphia till next meeting of Synod."

The report of the select committee on the report of the Presbytery of Miami was given in and read. While this report was under consideration, the Synod 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 approved.

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

No. 39. A Petition from certain members of the congregation of Cadiz, on the subject of voting at political meetings. This petition was, on motion, laid on the table.

The committee on missions reported, and their report was, on motion, adopted as follows, namely,

*Report of the Committee on Missions.*

The Committee on Missions report,—1. On so much of the Report of the Presbytery of Indiana as was referred to them, That the Presbytery of Indiana ask for supply to the amount of twelve months, additional to their ordinary proportion as a Presbytery, and that it be given by one missionary only at a time, and pecuniary assistance to the amount of half the additional supply received. Your Committee recommend that Synod direct the Committee of Supplies to make arrangements in compliance with the Presbytery's request in regard to supplies as far as the necessities of other portions of the church will allow, and that Synod grant pecuniary assistance to the amount asked.

2. On the petition from individuals in Madison, Indiana, for supply and funds. While Synod rejoice to see so many evidences of desire for a supply of Divine ordinances, they sympathize with these individuals and others in their privations, and regret that they are unable to give all the assistance desired. The individuals subscribing this petition, are referred to the Presbytery of Indiana for such a proportion of supply and of funds as that Presbytery can afford out of what is allotted to them by Synod.

3. On the Report by Mr. D. Gordon, respecting the vacancies in Lower Canada. In this report it is requested that Synod grant a permanent supply to that section,

that the supply be by ordained ministers, and by such as shall voluntarily offer themselves for the service. Your committee recommend to Synod to grant the request in full, and as much funds as may be necessary to supply the deficit in the contribution raised by these vacancies.

The Committee on the Theological Seminary reported as follows, in reference to the time of the annual meetings of the Board. The report was, on motion, adopted.

*Report of the Committee on the Hall.*

The committee to whom was referred the Report of the Managers of the Hall, report that, agreeably to a suggestion in that report, we would submit the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Board of Managers of the Hall shall hold their meetings at the Hall on the 3d Tuesday of March, annually.

The committee on the question from the Presbytery of Albany presented a report, which, being amended, was, on motion, adopted, as follows,

To the question proposed by the Presbytery of Albany, the committee answer, that according to the principles and usages of the Associate church, founded on their views of what is reasonable and expedient, none but such as are members in full communion are eligible to the office of trustees.

From the decision adopting the above report Mr. Hindman dissented, for reasons to be given in.

The committee to whom the reasons of protest by the Presbytery of Vermont had been referred, reported answers, which after discussion were disposed of by the following resolution, namely,

"Resolved, that the answers just read be adopted, and that it is the view of this Synod that the deed of the Synod of last year committing the members of the Vermont Presbytery to the care of the Presbytery of Cambridge would have been better expressed, had it been said they should have been *temporarily annexed* to that Presbytery."

It was then resolved that Synod proceed to deal with the Presbytery of Vermont on the charges alleged against them.

On inquiry made, and upon information given, it was resolved, that the members of the Presbytery of Vermont have been regularly cited.

Resolved also, that the Synod do not consider the objections made by the Presbytery of Vermont in their reasons of protest a sufficient bar in the way of trial.

Mr. Goodwillie was then asked whether he still adhered to these objections. He answered that he did, but that in this neither he, nor the Presbytery of Vermont intended any disrespect to Synod or declining of their authority. He was then asked whether the Presbytery of Vermont are ready for trial; for answer Mr. G. referred Synod to the concluding part of their reasons of protest.

It was inquired whether Mr. Wm. Pringle was present and ready for trial. No answer was given. The trial then, was, on motion, made the order of the day for next sitting.

The Committee on the Funds reported in part as follows, and the report was accepted.

The Committee on the Funds having examined the account presented by the Presbytery of Illinois for missionary services rendered by Rev. James Templeton within their bounds recommend that the claim be allowed, and that the Treasurer be directed to pay Mr. Templeton the sum of forty-five dollars, the amount due.

Mr. Smart was, at his own request, released from the Committee of Supplies, and Mr. John S. Easton substituted in his room.

Mr. Geery asked and obtained leave of absence for the remaining sittings of Synod. Adjourned to meet at 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer.

*8 o'clock, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above.

Proceeded to the order of the day, namely, the trial of the Presbytery of Vermont. The charge, as embodied in the report of the committee adopted last year, was read. Mr. Goodwillie, the only member of the Presbytery present, was then heard in their defence, and the members of Synod proceeded to express their views on the charge generally. After discussion, the question was put, "guilty or not guilty?" and decided in the affirmative by the following vote, yeas, 28—nays, 1—non liquet, 3.

The Synod then went into committee of the whole, Mr. Walker in the chair.

After some discussion the committee rose and reported progress. On motion, a committee was appointed to prepare a minute to issue the case, with instructions to report to-morrow morning. Dr. Beveridge, and Messrs. Martin and D. Gordon were appointed said committee. Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Wednesday, June 3.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. The minutes of the last two sittings were read, corrected, and approved.

The select committee appointed last evening to report a minute issuing the business relative to the Presbytery of Vermont, presented a report, which, being amended, was adopted as follows, namely,

"The Committee appointed to report a minute in the case of the Presbytery of Vermont, recommend the following resolutions:

1. That said Presbytery having been found guilty of the charge preferred against them of restoring Dr. A. Bullions contrary to presbyterial order, are worthy of a rebuke, and that they be now rebuked accordingly.

2. That said Presbytery be required to submit to the decision of the Synod declaring null and void their act in restoring Dr. A. Bullions to the ministry, and that they also engage to abstain from all farther communion with him, until regularly restored to the fellowship of the church.

3. That upon their compliance with the above they be restored to the full exercise of their presbyterial authority."

On motion, Dr. Beveridge was called to the chair, and Mr. Goodwillie was called upon to say whether he submits to the rebuke voted by Synod. Mr. Goodwillie answered as follows:

"I cannot answer for the Presbytery of Vermont whether that court will submit or not. As to myself, I answer that I do not submit, as I cannot conscientiously acquiesce in the specifications or charges contained under the first resolution of the report adopted by Synod last year."

On motion, a committee consisting of Dr. Ramsay and Messrs.

Scroggs and Wallace, was appointed a committee to converse with Mr. Goodwillie, and report as soon as possible.

Mr. James Wilson asked and obtained leave of absence during the remaining sittings of the Synod. Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

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

A report from a member of the committee appointed some time ago to report a digest of the acts of a permanent nature to be found in the minutes of Synod, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the Book of Discipline.

The committee to whom was referred the communications from a committee of the convention of Reformed Churches, presented a report, which, after discussion, was adopted as follows:

"The committee to whom was referred the invitation to this Synod from the convention of Reformed Churches to send delegates to the next meeting of said convention, report,

"That the acceptance of that invitation is rendered impracticable, by the convention having appointed its next meeting at a time which interferes with the usual time of holding the annual meeting of this Synod."

From the decision adopting the above report, Messrs. Miller, M'Elwee, and Heron dissented, for reasons to be given in.

A request was presented to Synod, on behalf of Rev. A. Whyte, jr., for extracts of all the minutes relating to the Presbytery of the Carolinas. The request was granted.

On motion, resolved, that a committee consisting of Dr. Beveridge, and Messrs. J. Gordon and Scroggs, was appointed to report on the propriety of abbreviating the minutes to be published.

A request was made, on behalf of the Presbytery of Illinois, that fifty copies of the Declaration and Testimony be granted to said Presbytery, for gratuitous distribution. The request was granted.

The following question was proposed, and an answer requested.

"A church member acknowledges, that he is a member of a Masonic Society, but utterly denies that it is such a society as that contemplated in our book of discipline, or that there are any such oaths as are therein condemned. Can he therefore be excluded from privileges in the church, without its being proved that he has really taken such oaths as our act on this subject condemns? and upon whom does the proof devolve?"

The former question was answered in the affirmative.

The committee appointed to converse with Mr. Goodwillie, reported that they had made no progress. It was then, on motion, resolved, that a committee, consisting of Messrs. M'Naughton, Scroggs, and Wallace, be appointed to prepare a minute, issuing the whole business, relative to the Presbytery of Vermont.

The report of the committee on the remonstrance from the Presbytery of Stamford, was taken into consideration, and after some discussion recommitted. Messrs. M'Elwee and Webster were, at their own request, released from the committee, and Dr. Beveridge and Mr. Hanna substituted in their room.

Mr. Goodwillie requested copies of certain papers, and extracts of

all the proceedings of Synod, in the case of the Presbytery of Vermont. The request was granted.

The report of the Committee of Appeals, on the papers from the Presbytery of Muskingum, in relation to the case of Samuel M'Nary, was, on motion, taken up. Reasons of appeal from the decision of the Presbytery in the above case, by Rev. Joseph Clokey, were read, together with the Presbytery's answers.

Adjourned till 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer.

*8 o'clock, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

An excuse for the absence of Mr. Clokey was offered and sustained.

Resumed the consideration of the business left unfinished in the afternoon. Mr. Clokey, the appellant, was heard, through certain papers transmitted by him, which were read. The members of the Presbytery of Muskingum were then heard, and the parties removed.

The Synod then proceeded to hear the remarks of members on the case. Before going through the roll, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Thursday, June 4.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. The minutes of the last two sittings were read, corrected, and approved.

The committee appointed to bring in a minute issuing the case of the Presbytery of Vermont, presented a report, which, after some discussion, was, on motion, recommitted.

Resumed the consideration of the business left unfinished at the close of last sitting, namely: the appeal of Mr. Clokey from the deed of the Presbytery of Muskingum, in the case of Samuel M'Nary. Before going through the roll, Mr. M'Arthur asked and obtained leave of absence from the remaining sittings of Synod. Mr. Templeton also obtained leave of absence after this evening.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

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

No. 40. A petition from Rocky Spring, Virginia, for supply of gospel ordinances, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies.

The Committee of Supplies presented a report, which after some conversation was recommitted.

The Synod resumed the consideration of the subject left unfinished in the forenoon, namely, the appeal of Mr. Clokey. After some discussion, a committee, consisting of Messrs. Miller, Beveridge, and A. Anderson, was appointed to bring in a report as soon as practicable.

Resumed the consideration of the business relative to the Presbytery of Stamford. The report of the committee, as amended, was read, and, after discussion, referred back to the original committee, in order that they may select and bring forward the papers, on which the report is founded.

The Committee appointed to prepare a pastoral letter, to the brethren in the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, presented a draught, which was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The Committee on the appeal from the Presbytery of Muskingum,



presented their report, which was read, and after amendment, adopted by the following vote. 1st Section, Ayes, 24. Nays, 1. Non liquet, 2. 2d Section, Ayes, 18. Nays, 6. Non liquet, 4. 3d Section, adopted unanimously.

The committee to whom was referred the appeal from the Presbytery of Muskingum, ask leave to report,

1. That certain general principles appear to be in some measure involved, on which they think the Synod should clearly express their mind. The committee are of opinion that the Synod should declare, for the information of all under their inspection, that neither constitutions nor laws, offices, nor citizenship, nor obligations of any kind, can justify any in acting contrary to the scriptures, and our holy profession. They think that the Synod should also declare, that men in civil authority, are amenable to the courts of Christ for their official acts, in which they may be convicted of opposing the word of God, and our acknowledged standards.

2. In respect to the particular case before the Synod, it is proposed that the appeal be rejected, inasmuch as the Presbytery had a right to direct the session of Piney-Fork, to call before them any of the members of the congregation, whom public report accused of an offence; and the opinion given respecting the offence itself, did not necessarily imply the condemnation of the offender. For the issuing of the whole case, it is also proposed, that the Presbytery of Muskingum be directed to dismiss all farther procedure.

Finally, it is proposed that the Synod should recommend to their subordinate courts great caution in dealing with persons in civil offices, respecting their official deeds; and, to all persons holding such offices, great caution in their proceedings to give no just occasion of offence by acts either really or seemingly opposite to their profession

Adjourned till 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer.

8 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Resumed the consideration of the case of the Presbytery of Stamford.

After a free discussion on the report of the Committee in said case, the report was, on motion, recommitted.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

Friday, June 5.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

The minutes of the last two sittings, were read, and approved.

The following resolution was offered, and adopted, as a standing rule of Synod.

That protestors against a decision of any Presbytery, be required to confine themselves in their reasons of protest to a simple statement of their reasons, and a brief argument in support of them; and, in like manner, that Presbyteries be required to be equally brief in their answers.

The Committee on the proposed abridgment of the minutes presented a report, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

The committee appointed to report measures for abridging the amount of minutes to be printed, recommend that a standing committee should be appointed at each meeting of the Synod, to which Presbyterial reports shall be referred, in order that a general statement of the affairs of the church may be prepared for publication, instead of the reports themselves. The committee also recommend as a standing rule, that reasons of protests and dissents, together with answers to the same, shall not be published by the Synod, except where a particular order is made to that effect.

The report of Wm. S. Young, Treasurer, pro tem., was given in, and, on motion, referred to the Committee on the Funds.

Baltimore, June 5th, 1840.

Wm. S. Young, in account with Associate Church.—Synod's Fund.

1840.			Dr.
Feb. 19,	Received from Mr. Thomas Burns, Covington, N. Y.,	.....	\$ 5.00
May 13,	" From Dumfries, U. C., for 1839, per Rev. John Russell,	.....	15.38
"	" From Stamford, do. do. by do.	.....	10.00
"	" From York, N. Y., do. by do.	.....	13.50
"	" From Dumfries, for 1840, do. by do.	.....	14.64
"	" From Wm. S. Young, in full for 1000 Psalm Books, sold for Synod, last year, .....	.....	300.00

May 28,	"	From Mr. Wm. Stevenson and wife, Cambridge, N. Y., for Missionary purposes, .....	20.00
"	"	Received of Rev. A. Anderson, for Testimonies, .....	1.00
"	"	Of Mercersburgh congregation, Penn., per Rev. F. M'Naughton, .....	15.00
"	"	Received from M'Connellsburgh congregation, Penn., by Rev. F. M'Naughton, .....	18.86
"	"	From Cambridge congregation, N. Y., by Mr. M'Geoch, .....	17.00
29,	"	From Unity do. Ohio, by Rev. J. Walker, .....	11.15
"	"	From Cadiz do. do. by Rev. Thomas Hanna, .....	10.00
"	"	From Massie's Creek congregation, Ohio, by Rev. A. Heron, .....	20.00
"	"	From Xenia congregation, Ohio, by Rev. A. Heron, ..	20.00
"	"	From Salem do. N. Y., by Rev. D. Gordon, ..	10.00
"	"	From Guinston, do. Penn., by Mr. Wilson, .....	8.50
"	"	From Albany, do. N. Y., by Rev. Jas. Martin, .....	30.00
"	"	From Argyle do. do. by Rev. Jas. P. Miller, .....	27.87
"	"	From Mr. John J. Reid, by do. .....	5.00
May 30,	"	From Baltimore congregation, by Rev. John G. Smart, ..	41.25
"	"	From Hebron do. N. Y., by Mr. Rae, .....	12.10
"	"	From Stone valley do. Pa., by Rev. J. S. Easton, .....	10.00
"	"	From East Nottingham congregation, Pa., by Rev. Wm. Easton, .....	5.00
"	"	From 1st congregation of Philadelphia, by Rev. C. Webster, .....	11.68
June 1,	"	From Truro do. Ohio, by Rev. Jas. Wallace, ..	5.13
June 8,	"	From Barnet do. Vt., by Rev. T. Goodwillie, ..	14.39
			<hr/>
			\$672.45

## CONTRA.

Treasurer *pro tem.* claims credit for the following Disbursements:

1840.			Cr.
May 29,	By cash paid Rev. A. Heron—Synod's clerk, .....		\$100.00
June 1,	" do. for Minute Book for Synod, ....		2.00
2,	" Rev. Jas. Templeton, for Missionary services, ...		45.00
"	" Wm. S. Young, for printing 1000 extra copies of Minutes for 1839. ....		124.78
June 5,	" Rev. D. R. De Freest, per Rev. Jas. Martin, for ser- vices in 2d congregation, New York, .....		66.00
"	" James Taylor, for services, as sexton, per order of Synod, .....		20.00
	Balance in favour of Synod's Fund, .....		357.78
			<hr/>
			\$672.45

WM. S. YOUNG, *Treasurer pro tem.*

Baltimore, June 2d, 1840.

Wm. S. Young, in account with Associate Church.—Student's Fund.

1840.			
May 28,	Received from 2d Philadelphia congregation, per Rev. J. T. Cooper, .....		\$36.62
"	" From Baltimore congregation, per Rev. J. G. Smart, ..		41.25
"	" From Hebron do. per Rev. A. Anderson, .....		10.22
			<hr/>
			\$88.09

WM. S. YOUNG, *Treasurer pro tem.*

Baltimore, June 2d, 1840.

Wm. S. Young in account with Foreign Missionary Fund of Associate Church.

Amount received as per last report—June, 1839, .....	\$10.00
Interest on the above for 1 year, .....	60
	<hr/>
	\$10.60

WM. S. YOUNG, *Treasurer.*

The Treasurer of the Education Fund presented a report, which was, on motion, accepted, and laid on the table.

*Report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures.—Bill on Education.*

The Committee of Bills and Overtures on so much of the Report of the Presbytery of Albany as recommends the adoption of measures for the aid of young men in prosecuting their studies, preparatory to the work of the ministry, report,—That this recommendation embraces a matter of pressing importance at this time, as the cry-

ing wants of the church call loudly for some more efficient measures for their supply than has been yet adopted. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few." Heretofore this matter has generally been left to the choice of the youth themselves, to the inclination of parents and guardians, and to their private means of effecting their object. It is, however, well known that while a few, inclined to the service of Christ in the holy ministry, are in circumstances to effect their object with ease, and many struggle through their preparatory studies with much difficulty, delay, discouragement, and sometimes fatal injury to themselves, there are also many whose desires are checked by their pecuniary circumstances, and every attempt to obtain an education is, in consequence, forbidden. Encouragement by the church should, therefore, be afforded to such young men as give promise of usefulness in the ministry; and while we "pray the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest," we should use the means which Providence has indicated for obtaining our desire. It is, therefore, recommended that Synod adopt the following regulations:

1. That Synod enjoin upon Presbyteries to look out young men of promise for the work of the ministry, and encourage them to engage in preparatory studies.
2. Let every Presbytery establish a fund to be appropriated by them to the education of those who may engage in a course of studies, and who are unable in whole, or in part, to furnish the means themselves.
3. Let the Presbytery examine those whose education they undertake, as to their natural endowments, their desires and motives, and judge of their character for industry, sobriety, prudence, morality, and piety.
4. Let the Presbytery exercise a supervision over such students as are aided by their funds, with respect to their education, their character, conduct, and principles, and withhold assistance from such as prove unworthy of it, and direct and assist them as may be judged necessary.
5. The Presbytery's education fund shall not include that required, at present, by the Synod as the student's fund.

#### The case of the Rev. Alexander Boyd.

Whereas it has been reported, that the Rev. Alexander Boyd has made unsuccessful application for admission into the communion of the Associate Reformed church, thereby evincing his want of steadfastness in his profession; and that his general conduct is not consistent with good ministerial character; and whereas the Presbytery of Shenango have made no report to this meeting, whereby it might appear whether they have dealt with him in regard to these things, or what his ministerial standing may be, therefore, resolved;—

That the above named Presbytery be directed to report their dealings with the said Alexander Boyd, or to deal with him for these offences, and report to the next meeting of the Synod.

Resolved, also, that the Synod cannot give him appointments until satisfied as to his good standing in the ministry.

A petition from the Congregation of Newark for a gratuitous supply of gospel ordinances, was presented, and read. Whereupon it was, on motion, resolved, that Synod refer the case of all such weak Congregations, as apply to Synod for pecuniary aid to their respective Presbyteries to do what may be in their power in the way of affording such aid.

The draught of a pastoral letter, addressed to the brethren, in the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas was taken up, and on motion, it was resolved, that the committee be instructed to transmit said letter in the next number of the Religious Monitor. Two hundred extra copies to be printed.

*A Letter addressed by the Associate Synod to the Congregations and People under their inspection in the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.*

DEAR BRETHREN—

Being met in a synodical capacity, we find ourselves providentially called upon to address to you a few words in the way of pastoral advice and friendly salutation. You are doubtless aware that the ministerial members of the Presbytery under whose care you have been, have abandoned the profession which they had before made in connexion with the Associate Church. After having intimated

their defection, those members presented themselves at our bar, when after long, earnest and tender, but unsuccessful dealing with them, in order to bring them to a sense of their sin and a return to their duty, they were suspended from the exercise of their ministry and from the fellowship of the church. This judicial act, to which we found ourselves painfully shut up, leaves you, dear brethren, in some respects, like sheep without a shepherd. But whatever trying and painful consequences may result to you from this exercise of discipline, they are not, we protest, to be attributed to us, but to those whose conduct rendered it necessary. You know the divine ordinance of church government and discipline must be maintained in the family of God, or the most deleterious effects will inevitably ensue. If this hedge which God has placed for protection around his vineyard be thrown down, the boar from the forest will waste it out of measure.

But as the destitute condition in which you are placed by the defection of those who formerly exercised a Presbyterial supervision over you, may, by some, be imputed to our synodical action on the subject of slavery, it may be necessary to call your attention, for a little, to that matter. We feel constrained to say, that we do not consider ourselves as having made any demands of our members in the South, relative to slavery, to which conscientious Christians, acting under the constraining influence of the love of Jesus, and with an enlightened view of the whole subject before their minds, could reasonably object. What have we done? We have been saying for forty years past that slave-holding is a moral evil, pointed out as such and condemned by the word of God. To this position, we are happy in believing, that you all profess to yield a cordial assent. We have also said that we could not allow any in our communion to be involved in this moral evil; or, in other words, that we could not tolerate any of our members in the commission of this sin against the Lord our God. And, as the essence of slavery consists in depriving a human being of his natural liberty and rights, under a claim of *property* in him, we have judicially declared that no member of the Associate Church could be tolerated in "holding a human being in the character and capacity of a *slave*;" that is, claiming and holding a human being as his *property* or *chattel*, and enjoying the avails of his unrequited labour.

But do we require, it may be asked, a *legal emancipation* of slaves on the part of those holding them? Undoubtedly we do, is our reply, when this is not rendered absolutely impracticable by civil enactments. We think the godly, conscientious and consistent Seceder will feel himself bound to do this. But in case this legal emancipation be rendered impracticable, then we think it behooves the slave-holder who would maintain a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man, to consider with himself, whether Providence be not calling upon him to arise and remove with all his household, or cause to be removed the enslaved part thereof, to one of the free states of the Union, where men are not compelled by civil enactments to continue in sin. But suppose that this step towards the performance of a high and holy act of justice, a noble and generous deed of emancipation, be also rendered impracticable from the existence of imperious circumstances, what then is to be done? We answer, if nothing better can be done, then, what we would call a *moral emancipation* should take

place. And we are far from thinking that there are no cases where this is all that duty requires. By the *moral emancipation* of a slave, we mean a solemn act performed by the master, in which he declares to the slave, that he had been wrong in ever holding and treating him as *his property*, that he now withdraws all such claim, and that so far as his interest is concerned, he regards him as free as himself. This is moral emancipation. But the master should also inform him who had before been really his slave, and who is still his slave in the eye of the civil law, of the nature and operation of that law, of the danger to which he may be exposed by remaining where he is, and of the propriety of his emigrating to a land of liberty; and in case the slave be thus minded, the master should facilitate his removal: but if he choose rather to abide in the service of one who has so generously relinquished a legal claim of property in him, he ought to be in a just and equitable manner recompensed for his labour or service, and in every respect treated as a free agent, and also as an immortal being. And, brethren, we maintain that all disastrous consequences that might afterwards arise to the slave from this kind of emancipation, can never justly be charged upon the emancipator, but upon the unjust laws of the land, or upon the delinquencies of the emancipated himself.

Thus we think that our act of 1831, which has been so much impugned by some among you, as we have heard, possesses a practicable character, if its real spirit and meaning be regarded. It was only intended as a general declaration of a term of communion, under which particular cases might arise requiring the special attention and judgment of the judicatories of the church. Such cases often arise with respect to other terms of communion, and such were expected to arise with respect to this: although, with the exception of a single instance, no such cases have yet been presented to us, either for discussion or advice.

As to the requisition of *immediate* emancipation, either legal or moral, we cannot think that we have committed any error in making it, or that we have required a thing which is not required by the law of God. For if slave-holding be a sin, as we all profess to believe, it surely cannot be abandoned too soon. The divine command is, "Cease to do evil." Terms of communion, from their very nature, require an immediate compliance on the part of those who may be desirous of enjoying the privileges of the society establishing such terms, or at least so soon as those terms come to be known and understood. And yet, as before intimated, there may arise particular cases demanding the action of the church judicatories, in order to have it determined whether they fall within the meaning of the general law, or term of communion, under which they may be supposed to be comprehended.

The recommendations appended to our act of 1831 were afterwards excinded, simply because we thought that they operated as a barrier in the way of a faithful execution of that act; and particularly because a leading feature in those recommendations was found to be utterly impracticable. We refer to the contemplated operations of an agent. As the act, therefore, now stands, we sincerely believe, that by the exercise of self-denial, the dutiful sacrificing of mere carnal interests, and an honest endeavour to obey God rather than man, on the part of those concerned, it may be complied with in its true spirit, if not in its very letter.

Thus, dear brethren, we have been somewhat minute and explicit in stating our mind to you on a subject, which, we are free to confess, is attended with many difficulties. And we are not without hopes that this "labour of love," which we are now performing for your eternal good, will be accompanied with the Divine blessing.

It has been declared unto us, brethren, that some of you are ready to make defection from your public profession, and follow the ministers above alluded to out of the fellowship of the Associate Church. We do earnestly entreat you, in the name of the God of faithfulness and truth, seriously to consider of this matter, and diligently to ponder the path of your feet. Do we impose upon you any sinful term of communion? Do we ask of you the performance of any thing which is not in itself good and agreeable to the will of God? Do we prohibit you from the performance of any known and commanded duty? or do we deny to you the right of enjoying any privilege to which the laws of the King of kings entitle you? On what justifiable ground, therefore, can you disrupt the bonds of fellowship with us? Would not your defection be regarded by all men, but more especially by that God before whom we stand, as a public declaration in the face of Heaven that you prefer slave-holding, or the interests, privileges, and emoluments arising therefrom, to the duties and privileges of your profession? The Lord be judge between you and us. "But, brethren, we hope better things of you, and things which accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

And, accordingly, we have made provision for sending to you an ordained brother to labour among you, for a time, in dispensing ordinances; and also for sending you other supplies, if it be found that you are ready to receive them.

Finally, brethren, we exhort you to be of good comfort, notwithstanding the trying and difficult circumstances in which you are placed; for at the evening time it may be light; and you may yet enjoy the blessed privilege of seeing your teachers with your eyes. God may ere long bring "back your captivity," and make your "wilderness as Eden, and your desert as the garden of the Lord." In the mean time we exhort you to stand fast in the faith. Let nothing operate upon you so as to cause you to fall from your steadfastness. We would close this, our pastoral letter, by wishing you grace, mercy, and peace, and by repeating to you the apostolical injunction, "Beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."

Transmitted by order of Synod,

THOMAS S. KENDALL, *Moderator.*

ANDREW HERON, *Synod's Clerk.*

JAMES MARTIN, }  
THOS. BEVERIDGE, } *Committee.*

On motion, Mr. Kendall was appointed the contemplated missionary to the South, and the Treasurer was ordered to advance to Mr. Kendall the sum of \$50, to defray the expenses of his mission.

It was farther resolved, that the supply of Mr. Kendall's pulpit during his mission be referred to the Committee of Supplies.

The report of the committee, on the case of the Presbytery of Vermont was taken up, and being amended was, after discussion, adopted as follows:

The committee to whom was referred the case of the Presbytery of Vermont, report:

That whereas the Presbytery of Vermont stand convicted before Synod of a flagrant violation of order, in the restoration of Dr. A. Bullions, who had been deposed from the office of the ministry, and suspended from the communion of the church, and placed under the jurisdiction of another Presbytery in whose bounds he resided; and where the process against him had originally commenced; and whereas they have acted contumaciously, in continuing to hold communion with Dr. Bullions after Synod had invalidated their deed restoring him; and whereas the member of that Presbytery who is present refuses submission to the judgment of Synod, requiring him to acknowledge their sin in this matter and submit to rebuke, therefore, resolved:

1. That Messrs. A. Anderson, Martin and Cooper, be appointed a commission to call the Presbytery of Vermont before them at a meeting to be held on the second Wednesday of July, at two o'clock, in Barnet, and signify to them the decision of Synod, and call on them for their submission to said decision, and rebuke them in the name of the Synod; and restore them to their former Presbyterial standing.

2. That, in case said Presbytery refuse to submit, the commission proceed in the name of Synod to declare:—

1. That the Presbytery of Vermont, be and are hereby dissolved.

2. That the ministerial members of that Presbytery, namely, Rev. Thos. Goodwillie and Rev. Wm. Pringle, be, and are hereby suspended from the office of the holy ministry and the communion of the church, until they acknowledge their sin and return to their duty.

3. That the members of said Presbytery be then referred to the Presbytery of Cambridge for farther dealing, in order to their repentance and restoration.

4. That the congregations be placed under the care of the Presbytery of Cambridge.

The committee on the Memorial of Mr. D. Christy presented a report, which was accepted, and ordered to be transmitted to Mr. Christy as the Synod's answer.

The same committee was, on motion, continued, and instructed to report, next meeting, a plan for the Synod's publication of such books as may be thought advisable.

The committee on Bills and Overtures, reported on the report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and the report was adopted as follows, viz:

Your committee, on so much of the Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia as was committed to them, recommend, That in accordance with the suggestions of that Presbytery, Synod appoint a committee to address to the people directions for the right observance of days of fasting and humiliation;—to show what is the duty of persons belonging to our communion, who may be called in Providence to reside in places where they are destitute of Gospel ordinances, as dispensed by the Associate church; and to urge on the people the duty of much and earnest prayer for the promotion of our religious principles.

Messrs. A. Anderson and A. Gordon, were appointed the committee contemplated in the above report.

The committee on Bills and Overtures also reported on the report of the Presbytery of Albany. The report was adopted. [This report either did not come into our hands, or it has been lost.]

The same committee presented a report on the memorial respecting the traffic in ardent spirits, which was, on motion, adopted as follows: viz:

The Committee of Bills and Overtures, on the memorial presented respecting traffic in ardent spirits, report, That the memorial justly implies that there is a distinction between the use and the abuse of ardent spirits, and between the traffic in them for necessary purposes, and for the gratifying of the flesh, and that the former is lawful and the latter is not. It is recommended that Synod adopt the following as expressing their views.

There is no sin in the use of ardent spirits in itself, as "every creature of God is

good;" the sin lies in the abuse of them. And from the danger of forming ruinous habits by the unnecessary use of ardent spirits, from the very fact that a relish for them inducing us to use them, is a threatening symptom, and from the encouragement which such a use of them gives to intemperance in others, the practice must be condemned; and for the same reason the ordinary traffic in ardent spirits by retail must be condemned as furnishing temptations to vice and affording facilities to its practice. To provide a livelihood for ourselves and for our families is our incumbent duty, but to provide this by the imminent exposure of ourselves, our families, and society at large, to sin and to ruin, and to provide it by means utterly useless to society as well as injurious, is criminal. "Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God;" and consequently as subservient to this, as well as fulfilling the law of love to our neighbour, we should pursue callings which tend to the good of society.

Synod, therefore, advise that no member of the church retail ardent spirits for ordinary use, that sessions deal with such members of the church as may be engaged in such traffic, in order to induce them to desist, and that all members of the church refuse any encouragement to those who follow such an employment.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

### *Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

On motion, Messrs. Smart and M'Naughton were appointed a committee to draught an act for a fast, to be laid before next meeting.

The committee on the case of the Presbytery of Stamford reported, and the report was, on motion, accepted. After discussion, the following resolutions issuing the case were adopted, viz:

1. Resolved, that though from any thing that appears in the evidence before Synod, Thomas M'Cleery has a right to memorialize Synod for redress in his own case, and in the case of those for whom he acts, yet as suspended from the fellowship of the church, he has no right to be heard in accusation of others in things not properly belonging to their redress.

2. Resolved, that from all the papers and facts laid before Synod, there is not sufficient evidence presented to justify their action on the case, and, therefore, that the memorial of the M'Cleerys be dismissed.

3. That the language of the remonstrance and narrative of the brethren of Stamford Presbytery, and the spirit indicated by it, are in several respects faulty, which faults are not excused by any provocation they have received, however great.

With these views, the committee recommend that a brother be appointed to address the brethren of that Presbytery in a friendly admonitory letter, respecting the language and spirit of their papers, especially their uncharitable insinuations against one of the committee appointed in this case last year.

Mr. D. Gordon was appointed, in accordance with the above resolutions, to address the brethren of the Presbytery of Stamford.

Thomas M'Cleery requested to have the papers relating to his case as before the Presbytery of Cambridge, returned to him. The request was granted.

Mr. Hindman requested extracts from the papers of the Presbytery of Stamford, which request was granted.

The Committee of Supplies presented their report as amended, which was farther amended, and adopted as follows:

### *Scale of Appointments.*

Rev. D. Anderson, Philadelphia, June, July, August, September; Chartiers, October, November, December; Muskingum, January, February; Allegheny, March; Philadelphia, April, May.

Mr. William Hamilton, Allegheny, till next meeting of Synod.

J. A. Brown, Miami, June, July, August; Chartiers, September, and till next meeting of Synod.

William Smith, Tennessee, June, July, August, September; Illinois, October, November; Indiana, December, January; Miami, February; Muskingum, March; Ohio, April; Shenango, May.



Thomas Gilkerson, Albany, June, July; Allegheny, August, and till next meeting of Synod.

D. Imbrie, Ohio, June, July; Muskingum, August; Richland, September; Miami, October, November; Indiana, December, and till next meeting of Synod.

Isaac Law, Cambridge, June; Lower Canada, July, August, September; Stamford, October, November; Shenango, December; Ohio, January; Muskingum, February; Richland, March; Chartiers, April, May.

J. Bryan, Chartiers, June, July; Carolina, August, September, October; Tennessee, November, December, January; Indiana, February, March, April; Miami, May.

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

A. Reid, Cambridge, June, July, August, September; Albany, October, November; Philadelphia, December, January, February, March; Shenango, April, May.

J. French, Chartiers, June, July; Albany, August, September; Lower Canada, October, November; Albany, December, January; Cambridge, February; Albany, March, April, May.

D. H. A. McLane, Shenango, June, July, August; Ohio, September; Miami, October, November; Tennessee, December, January, February, March; Miami, April, May.

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

Rev. Thomas Ferrier, Richland, till next meeting of Synod.

Rev. S. McLean in the Presbytery where he may reside till next meeting.

On motion resolved that twenty dollars be paid to James Taylor, for his services in attending upon the sittings of Synod.

The committee appointed on the memorial for Cæsar's creek, in reference to an alleged mistake in the printed minutes of last year reported, and their report was adopted as follows:

The committee appointed to examine an alleged mistake in the printed minutes of last year in a report on a communication from Cæsar's creek, report,

That, the only discrepancy between the original paper and the report of the committee is, that the reference in the former is to a *new edition of the Testimony*, and in the latter to a *new book of Discipline*.

Whereas there seems to be a discrepancy between the minutes of the session of Dumfries, and the report of the Stamford Presbytery, the former seeming to intimate that the McCleerys were suspended indefinitely, and the latter that they were suspended in order to trial; therefore resolved, that if they were suspended without trial, the session be directed to proceed regularly to their trial.

The committee on the memorial from Messrs. Wilson and Smart reported as follows:

The committee on the memorial of two members of the Presbytery of Miami, report as follows:

These members complain that the Presbytery of Miami had given an unfaithful answer to the following question proposed to them by certain members of the Associate congregation of Cæsar's creek.

Is it consistent with our witnessing profession, for our members to associate themselves with those engaged in a course of defection from the cause and testimony of Jesus Christ, as parties to an arrangement with them, about the preaching of the word, in which there is a mutual agreement to preach in any particular place alternately?

This, it appears, was answered by the Presbytery as a practical question, in which they give their judgment on an arrangement of the kind in which one of their members, Mr. Heron, was personally concerned. This judgment they think was too favourable, and that it proceeded upon a defective view of the parties to the arrangement, a misapprehension of its main object, and of its genuine character and tendency.

In this opinion your committee, from the facts and reasonings contained in the memorial itself, feel inclined to concur; and accordingly we report, and fully recommend to Synod to pass the following resolutions.

1. That the judgment of the Presbytery of Miami on this question be reversed.

2. That Mr. Heron be required to desist from acting any longer as a party to the arrangement in question.

The Synod agree that they are not prepared to pass judgment on the first resolution at this time.

Resolved farther, that Mr. Heron be required to desist from acting as a party to the arrangement in question, until the Synod have opportunity to investigate and decide that question.

Resolved, that a committee of three be appointed to report next year on the subject contained in these papers.

Messrs. Martin, Walker and Miller were appointed said committee.

Resolved that in the case of the commission appointed to issue the business of the Vermont Presbytery, the second Friday be inserted in place of the second Wednesday of July.

Adjourned till half past eight this evening. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 8, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. The minutes of last sitting were read.

The Committee on the Funds reported, and the report was, on motion, adopted as follows:

The Committee on the Funds report:

That they have examined the accounts of the different treasurers, and find the funds of Synod to stand as follows, namely, Synod's fund.

In the hands of D. Houston, treasurer .....	\$7030 51
" " " D. Murphy, " .....	198 09
" " " Wm. S. Young, balance, .....	357 78
	<hr/>
" " " Wm. S. Young, student's fund, .....	7586 38
" " " do. do. Bible fund, .....	88 09
	593 22

From the above account it will appear that the funds of Synod have diminished within the past year, several hundred dollars. This may be owing, in part at least, to the small number of ministers who have attended the present meeting of Synod. Your committee therefore recommend, that the Synod enjoin on those ministers and congregations who have not contributed to the funds of Synod this year, to raise collections and transmit the sums thus obtained, to some one of the Synod's treasurers as soon as possible.

On motion, resolved, that the Protest from the Presbytery of Vermont, together with the answers, be not published, on account of their great length.

On motion, resolved, that the Memorialists from Cadiz, be referred for answer to the decision of Synod in the case of the appeal from the Presbytery of Muskingum.

On motion, resolved, that the Committee, who draughted the Letter to the Synod of Original Seceders, be instructed to transmit said Letter.

[This Letter will be published in the next number of the Monitor.]

The Committee to examine the minutes of the Presbytery of Albany, reported that they have examined them, and find them correct.

On motion proceeded to the consideration of the sixth chapter in the draught of a Book of Discipline, containing rules of procedure in church courts. On motion, resolved, that these rules be recommended to the church courts for their observance, until the Synod shall adopt the draught.

On motion, resolved, that the draught of a Book of Discipline be published in pamphlet form, and recommended to our church courts, to be used as a general directory, until the Synod can find time to consider and enact it. One thousand copies ordered.

Resolved, however, that this Overture is not to be understood as suspending or setting aside any rules of discipline that are now in force in this Synod.

Mr. Scroggs asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of this sitting.

On motion, resolved, that Messrs. Young, Webster, and Cooper, be appointed a committee to superintend the publication on the overture of the Book of Discipline.

On motion, resolved, that the petitions and remonstrances of the meeting of Abolition and Colonization Societies, in the Theological Hall, be laid over till next meeting of Synod.

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

The Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Fund was read and accepted, as follows, viz:

BALTIMORE, June 2, 1840.

*W. S. Young, in account with Bible Fund of Associate Church.*

1839.—		
June 7,	Balance from last year's Report, .....	\$241 42
"	Received from Mr. D. Houston, for Psalm Books, .....	260 00
	Interest from last year's balance, .....	14 49
Oct. 1,	Received from Mr. John McCall, .....	2 00
1840.—Feb. 19,	Received from Mr. Thomas Burns, Covington, .....	5 00
May 23,	Received from Hebron congregation, N. Y., per Rev. A. Anderson, .....	20 00
"	" from Rev. T. Beveridge, D. D. as the proceeds of } Bibles sent to Canonsburgh, Pa. .... }	52 80
"	" from Mrs. Eliza McClung, per A. Heron, .....	1 00
"	" from a friend, .....	50
"	" from Argyle congregation, per Rev. J. F. Miller, ....	25 00
"	" from Granville, " Illinois, per Rev. J. Templeton, .....	3 81
"	" from Baltimore, " Md. per Rev. J. G. Smart, ....	26 75
		<hr/> \$652 77

1839.—	CONTRA.	
	Amount of Bibles sent to Baltimore congregation, .....	\$25 95
Nov. 12,	Amount of do. sent to Argyle, N. Y., .....	31 60
1840.—May 20,	Amount of do. sent to Granville, Illinois, .....	2 00
		<hr/> 59 55
June 3,	Balance due Bible Fund, .....	593 22
		<hr/> \$652 77

W. S. YOUNG.

On motion, resolved, that any Bibles issuing from the Depository of this Synod, shall be without the frontispiece and other plates usually accompanying modern editions.

Resolved, that on application the executive committee be authorized to furnish copies of the Scriptures to our ministers and travelling preachers for gratuitous distribution, where such distribution may be called for.

On motion, resolved, that all persons or societies contributing shall, if they desire it, be entitled to receive Bibles to the full amount of their contributions.

On motion, resolved, that the officers of last year be re-elected.

When the committee rose, it was, on motion, resolved, that the minutes be published in the Religious Monitor. One thousand extra copies were ordered.

The minutes of the present sitting were read and approved, and after prayer, singing part of the seventy-second Psalm, and the apostolical benediction pronounced by the Moderator, the Synod adjourned to meet at Washington, Pa., on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1841, at 2 o'clock P. M.

ANDREW HERON, *Synod's Clerk.*

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CHARTIERS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Wm. Wilson	Monteur's Run	Clinton . . .	Allegheny	Penn.	40	140
	Robinson, . .	Washington	do	do	43	90
David Thompson	Mt. Hope . .	W. Middletown	do	do	33	83
	Cross Creek . .	Brooke . .	do	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	80	163
Wm. M. McElwee	Service & King's c.	Frankfort . .	Beaver . . .	do	116	264
Bankhead Boyd	Pigeon Creek .	McCullough's	Washington	do		
T. Beveridge, D.D.	Washington . .	Washington .	do	do	25	72
James McCarrell	Tumbleston's Run	do . . . . .	do	do	31	53
Wm. H. Walker	Ohio . . . . .	Economy . .	Beaver . . .	do	70	146
	Noblestown . .	do . . . . .	Allegheny	do	50	
	Peter's Creek .	Washington	do	do		
Vacancies . . .	Bethesda . . .	W. Alexandria	do	do		
	Wheeling . . .	Claysville . .	do	do		
	Burgetstown . .	Washington	do	do	85	180

## 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 . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
Joseph Scroggs . .	Fairfield . . .	Ligonier . . .	Westmoreland	do
	Donegal . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
David Blair . . .	Indiana . . . .	Indiana . . .	Indiana . . .	do
	Crooked Creek .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
	Mahoning . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
John Hindman . .	Glade Run . . .	Glade Run . .	Armstrong .	do
	Lower Piney . .	Kittaning . .	Armstrong .	do
	Berachah . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
Wm. Galbraith . .	Freeport . . . .	Freeport . . .	Armstrong .	do
	Bethel . . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
	Turtle Creek . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
John M'Auley . . .	Jefferson . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
	Upper Piney . .	Brookville . .	Jefferson . .	do
	Cherry Run . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
James Rodgers . .	Allegheny . . . .	Allegheny . .	Allegheny . .	do
	Concord . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
	Warren . . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
Vacancies . . . .	Conemaugh . . .	Saltsburgh . .	Indiana . . .	do
	Kittaning . . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do
	Gibson's . . . .	Punxsutawny .	Jefferson . .	do
	Clearfield . . .	Curwinsville .	Clearfield . .	do
Without charge				
Joseph Banks . . .		Pittsburgh . .	Allegheny . .	do

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
F. W. McNaughton	Mercersburgh .	Mercersburgh	Franklin . .	Penn.		102
	McConnellsburgh	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		
	Octorara . . . .	Sunflower . .	Lancaster . .	do		65
W. Easton . . . .	E. Nottingham	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		57
	Muddy Run . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		20
John Adams . . .	Guinston . . . .	L. Chanceford	York . . . .	do		100
	Lower Chancefd	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		50
	Stone Valley . .	Brown's Mills	Mifflin . . .	do		
John S. Easton . .	Kishacoquillas	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		
	Lewistown . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		
C. Webster . . . .	1 Cong. Phila.	Philadelphia .	Philadelphia	do	100	263
John G. Smart . .	Baltimore . . . .	Baltimore . .	Baltimore . .	Md.	39	70
Jos. T. Cooper . .	2d Cong. Phila.	Philadelphia .	Philadelphia	Penn.	45	120
	Carlisle . . . .	Carlisle . . .	Cumberland	do		
	Dickinson . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		
	Wheatfield . . .	do . . . . .	do . . . . .	do		
Vacancies . . . .	Huntingdon . . .	Huntingdon . .	Huntingdon .	do		
	Belfonte . . . .	Belfonte . . .	Centre . . .	do		
	Sinking Creek .	Potter's Mills	do . . . . .	do		
	Rehoboth . . . .	do . . . . .	Union . . . .	do		

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
	do.	do.	do.	do.		
Vacancies . .	{ Johnstown . .	Johnstown . .	Montgomery	do.		
	{ Newark . . .	Newark . . .		N. J.		
Without charge						
David R. De Freest		West Troy .	Albany . .	N. Y.		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
James P. Miller	Argyle . . .	Lake P.O., N.Y.	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			L. C.		
	{ Beech Ridge .			do		
	{ Hinchingsbrook			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	do		
John France, .	Glade Run . .	Bakerstown .	Butler . . .	do	60	200
	{ Coneaut . . .	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		20	43
	{ Mount Prospect		do		25	45
Without charge	{ Mercer . . .	Mercer . . .			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
	{ Milton . . .	Warren . . .	Trumbull . .	do		
Wm. Douthet .	{ 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		
James Dickson	Portland	Portland Mills	Putnam	do	41	96
J. L. McLean	Princeton	Princeton	Gibson	do	27	56
	Midway			do		
J. N. Laughhead	Bloomington	Monroe	do	do	21	55
	Otter Creek			do		
	Madison	Bryantsburgh	Jefferson	do		
Vacancies	Big Creek					
	Laporte					
	Union					

## 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 McLean	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
	Carmel	Carrollton	Carroll	do		
Thomas Wilson	Sandy	do	do	do		
	North Union	do	do	do		
	Scroggsfield	Scroggsfield	Carroll	do	70	150
James Patterson	Yellow Creek	do	do	do		
	Glade Run	do	do	do		
Samuel McArthur	McMahon's Cr'k	St. Clairsville	Belmont	do	29	55
	Belmont	do	do	do	36	56
James McGill	Cambridge	Cambridge	Guernsey	do		
	Claysville	do	do	do		
	Clear Fork	do	do	do		
	Jefferson	Harrison	Harrison	do		
Vacancies.	Salem	do	do	do		
	Westchester					
	New Washington					

## 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. Coult's	Esquising	Esquising		U. C.		70
	London			do		11
Vacancies	Chinguacousey					25

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ILLINOIS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	State.	Fam.	Com.
James C. Bruce	Henderson	Monmouth	Warren	Ill.	83	210
William Bruce	Bethel	Ellison Creek	Warren	do	30	60
James Templeton	Granville	Granville	Putnam	do		
	Unity	Columbus	Randolph	do		
	Apple Creek	White Hall	Green	do		
	Sugar Creek		Madison	do		
	Buffalo	Louisiana	Pike	Mo.		
Vacancies	Sharon		Lincoln	do		
	Crooked Creek	Wopalaw	Louisa	Iowa		
	Edwards	Mercer		Ill.		
	Weathersfield	Henry		do		
	West Branch	Louisa		Iowa		

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	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Old Providence	Steel's Mill . .	Augusta . .	do		
	Broad Creek	Natural Bridge	Rockbridge	do		
	New Lebanon	Union . . .	Monroe . .	do		
	New Stirling	Statesville . .	Iredell 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
* Under suspension.	Little River .	Young's . .	Fairfield .	do	8	16
	Sardis . .	Smithsford . .	Union . .	do	6	14

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	91	200
James Wallace .	Cherokee . .	Cherokee . .	Logan . .	do	37	88
Thomas S. Kendall	Fork Creek . .	Madisonville .	Monroe . .	Ten.		
Jas. P. Smart .	Massie's Creek	Xenia . . .	Greene . .	Ohio	91	202
G. M. Hall . .	Sugar Creek .	Centreville . .	Montgomery	do	37	81
	Big Spring . .	do . . .	Blount . .	Ten.		
	Pistol Creek .	Maryville . .	do . . .	do		
	Salem . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Limestone . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Rocky Spring	Abingdon . .	Washington	Va.		
	Tuscaloosa . .	Tuscaloosa . .	do . . .	Ala.		
	Salt River . .	do . . .	do . . .	Ky.		
Vacancies . .	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		
	Au Gleizo . .	Wapenkonneta	Allen . .	do		
	Darby . . .	Milford . .	Union . .	do		
	Sugar Run . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF RICHLAND.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	State.	Fam.	Com.
Samuel Irvine .	Salt Creek . .	Fredricksburgh	Wayne . .	Ohio	75	120
	Millersburgh .	do . . .	do . . .			
	Mansfield . .	Mansfield . .	Richland .		22	58
Samuel Hindman	Haysville . .	Hays x roads .	do . . .	do	27	63
	N. Washington	Iberia . . .	Marion . .	do	21	49
	S. Washington	Smith's Mills .	do . . .	do	15	35
	Jona's Creek .	Wooster . .	Franklin .		17	27
David Lindsay .	Goshen . . .	do . . .	do . . .			
	Licking . . .	do . . .	do . . .			
Joseph McKee .	Wooster . . .	Wooster . .	Wayne . .		26	50
	Dover . . .	Dalton . . .	do . . .		16	42
Robert Forrester	Truro . . .	Reynoldsburgh	Franklin .		41	89
	Clear Creek .	Savannah . .	Richland .	do	11	22
James Law . .	Killbuck . .	do . . .	Wayne . .	do	16	29
	Redhaw . .	Rawsburgh . .	do . . .	do	9	19
	Mohican . .	New Pittsburgh	do . . .	do		
Vacancies . .	Delaware . .	Delaware . .	do . . .			
	Bucyrus . .	Bucyrus . .	Crawford .			
	Keene . . .	Keene . . .	Coshocton	do		

## SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TABLES.

PRESBYTERIES.						Minist.	Congregations set tled and vacant.	Families.	Communicants.
Cambridge . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	4	9	547	1431
Carolinas . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	2	19	248	554
Ohio . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	6	16	690	1431
Chartiers . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	10	17	829	1925
Miami . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	6	21	311	691
Philadelphia . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	7	20	184	847
Allegheny . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	9	24		
Muskingum . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	9	23	572	1223
Albany . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	4	6	194	451
Shenango . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	6	14	679	1557
Stamford . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	4	6	35	479
Indiana . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	5	13	158	367
Illinois . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	3	12	113	270
Richland . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	6	18	296	603
Vermont . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	2	2	145	343
Minist'ers itinerating . . . . .	.	.	.	.	.	14			
Total						97	220	5,001	12,172

*An Act for a Fast.*

Fasting being an occasional duty, depending on circumstances, there is no stated time for it appointed in the Word. The circumstances which, according to the Holy Scriptures, determine the seasonableness of this duty, are the recurrence of solemn religious duties, the prevalence of temporal judgments, and the abounding of iniquity, portentous of these judgments, and of the wrath to come. It is the duty of Christians, in general, to observe the signs of the times, that they may know what they ought to do; but lest they should fail in this important matter, it is made a special duty of the watchmen of Zion to discern the signs of the times, and under certain aspects, to sanctify a fast and call a solemn assembly. Regarding the past, and particularly the present state of things, in our beloved land, the Associate Synod did, therefore, on the day above mentioned, [see page 20,] and hereby do call the people of these United States, and particularly the people under their own immediate care, to solemn fasting, humiliation, and prayer.

"Truly God is good to Israel." He has been and is good to us. He delivered our fathers from papal superstition and oppression. He made a way for them through the great Atlantic, and conducted them in safety to the new world: he cast out the heathen before them and planted them in their land, a large good land, which the Lord our God careth for from the beginning to the end of the year. Refugees from persecution for the truths of the glorious Gospel, as most of them were, the same benign providence that prepared for them a place in the wilderness was graciously continued. As one whom his mother comforteth, so did the Lord comfort them, and at the same time guarding them on every side as with a wall of fire, they were wonderfully increased. "The little one became a thousand, and the small one a strong nation, for the mouth of the Lord had spoken it." In the revolutionary struggle, a struggle of the few



with the many, of the weak with the powerful, a struggle for that liberty which they had exiled to secure and enjoy, the providence of Jehovah in behalf of our fathers was *very remarkable*. "His hand was known toward his servants, and his indignation toward their enemies, for behold! he came with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire." He infused weakness and terror into the hearts of our adversaries, and turned all their counsels into foolishness. He nerved our hearts and hands, he guided our counsels, he fought our battles, and led us to victory, and acknowledged independence. Not less remarkable was his beneficent providence, after the contest was ended, in preserving the states from discord, uniting them into one nation, teaching their senators wisdom, and directing them to the establishment of constitutions and laws, agreeable, for the most part, to his own blessed word. Constitution and laws that secure equal rights and privileges to all classes, and guaranty to the humblest citizen life, liberty, property, and character. Very wonderful, also, has been his goodness in filling public stations, generally, with competent, faithful incumbents, under whose administration the nation has enjoyed peace at home and abroad, with almost no interruption, and has prospered beyond a parallel in the history of nations. But the Divine benignity in planting, nourishing, and preserving the church of Christ in our land, is chiefly to be admired. The golden candlestick was early placed in our midst, and blessed be God, it is not, and, we trust, will not be removed. Glory hath had, and still has her habitation in our land. The doctrines of Christ, and the sweet influences of his Spirit have dropped as the rain, they have distilled as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass. It is a pleasure to us to speak of these things, "mentioning the loving-kindness of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel which he hath bestowed on them, according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his loving-kindnesses."

But, alas! our badness stands in mournful contrast with his goodness. "We have not rendered to the Lord according to his benefits." "Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked—he forsook God that made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation." Not a few, lifted up with pride and besotted through ignorance and carnal lusts, have adopted the fool's creed "No God," and are doing what they can to blot out his name from the memory and veneration of mankind. The half, or perhaps, more than the half of our whole population are atheists in heart and in practice, having lost sight of the being, authority, presence, power, and providence of the great God, who made and governs the world. These sins of the heart are fountains of iniquity, to which may be traced the general neglect or contempt, and the manifold corruptions of Divine ordinances—the blasphemous oaths and horrible execrations that pollute the atmosphere—the desecration of the Sabbath by servile labour on the highways, by carnal visits and amusements, and conversation, vain and frivolous, or of a worldly nature—the contempt of authority, parental, civil, and ecclesiastical, with the insubordination that has convulsed every part of our social system, threatening at times the reign of universal anarchy. The arsons, cold-hearted murders, and

vindictive assassinations that so fearfully abound, defiling the land with blood—the horrible lewdness and debauchery of many—the swindling, gambling, and over-reaching in commercial transactions that are so common, with the speculation of public functionaries, which, for a long time, was in a manner unknown in our happy republic, but of late years, has occurred with a frequency that seems to indicate, that as a people, we are becoming rotten to the very core. To the same sources may also be traced the whispering and back-biting, the deceit and double-dealing of many, and the reckless lies and heaven-daring perjuries of not a few. These things are for a lamentation to every pious heart, yea, to every lover of his country, especially when viewed in connexion with the origin that has been indicated, namely, heart atheism, springing as it always does from a malignant opposition to the being and government of the Holy One. Under this aspect vast multitudes of our fellow citizens are saying, as the Jews in the time of Ezekiel, “The Lord hath forsaken the earth, the Lord seeth not.” And if we thus speak against the Most High, what can we expect but that he will say in his wrath, “As for me, also, mine eye shall not spare, neither will I have pity; but I will recompense their way upon their head,” (Ezek. ix. 9, 10.)

But while, for the sins mentioned, the land mourneth, and we should mourn, the following iniquities deserve our more particular notice, as they seem to be characteristic of these times. First, unsoundness in the faith. Many of the Protestant churches have apostatized so long, and so far, that they have lost sight of the first principles of the reformation. In some of them a strain of legalism pervades the whole administration, turning the Gospel of Christ into another Gospel, which is not another. In some, depraved reason is exalted as the sovereign arbiter of truth, and at her bidding, and for her glory, the sublime mysteries of our holy religion, as the trinity of persons in the Godhead, the incarnation of Deity, regeneration by the Spirit, justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ, &c., are wantonly sacrificed. The horrid principles and rites of the papal superstition are growing into favour. The papacy itself, which some years ago, was ashamed to be seen, is lifting up its head and making bold efforts to establish its tyrannical dominion over the bodies and souls of free-born Americans.

Another of the evils characteristic of these times is, indifference in regard to the precious truths of Revelation. The zeal that characterized our fathers, firing them with a noble ardour in the pursuit of the truth, and in the profession and maintenance of it when attained, is subsided and gone, or if any vestiges of it remain, they are reckoned a reproach to the persons in whom they are found. “A wonderful and a horrible thing is committed in the land: the prophets prophecy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so.”

Another of these evils is, formality and deadness in devotion—the devotion of the closet, of the family, and of the public congregation. So prevalent is this great evil that the valley of vision is full of “dry bones,” and their offensive savour is a “smoke in the nose of the Holy One, a fire that burneth all the day.”

Another of these evils is a rancorous, litigious spirit in political matters; threatening the subversion of all good government, and, at the same time, eating out the vitals of religion; for the animal excite-

ment which it begets and cherishes, is inconsistent with the sober operations of conscience, and of the fear of the Lord; not less at variance, it is believed, with the true Christian spirit and conduct than the excitement of proper inebriation. How sad is it that while the greater part of our fellow citizens and church members are dead to the concerns of God's glory, and the interests of souls, so many of them are filled and carried forward with a hot, ungovernable zeal in the pursuit of their own things!

Another is covetousness. That love of money, which is the root of all evil, is widely prevalent, every one, almost, looking for his gain from his quarter; and with it is connected venality, the flagitious selling and buying of every thing sacred. Not only time and labour, but religious profession, public influence, votes at the ballot box, and in deliberative assemblies, honour, character, a good conscience, and the scriptural hope of a blessed immortality, are sold and bought, not unfrequently in the face of the sun! Yea, though by our national deeds of greatest sanctity, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are the acknowledged rights of all, yet throughout the extent of one half of this vast empire, men and women are sold and bought as brute beasts! And to make the bargain availing, the most sacred relations are sundered; the word of life, which our gracious Sovereign has laid open to all, is made forbidden fruit, being fenced about with penal enactments, lest it should be touched; and the possessor of his fellow man is clothed with plenary power to exact and coerce unrequited toils! "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord: and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

Another evil characterizing these times, is pride and self-exaltation. How few have the humility to esteem others better than themselves, giving honour to whom honour is due! How many are boasters, incontinent, fierce, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God! How many are quick to take offence, and slow to forgive! What a flood of anger, wrath, malice, envy, and bitterness, in heart, word, and deed, is flowing through the land and the church!

To this long catalogue may be added general impenitency and irreclaimableness: "I have learned and heard, but they spoke not aright; no man repented him of his wickedness, saying, what have I done? Every one turned to his course as the horse rusheth into the battle." Every method of improvement has been tried, (for what could have been done more that has not been done?) and tried in vain. The Lord has lavished all his goodness upon us, but our hearts have not been won by these means. He has chastised us, but we have refused to receive correction. His sword has been made bare, and, to some extent, bathed in blood, and his angels of destruction, the pestilence and noisome diseases, consuming flames, and the furious whirlwind have passed through city and country; but how few have laid to heart his call given in this solemn way? "Turn from iniquity, that it may not be your ruin." The ways of the people of this land, in the pursuit of their idols of gold and silver, have been obstructed, for a few years past, with the thorn hedge of unpropitious seasons, and now, latterly, though the seasons have been favourable, and the products of the earth abundant, there is a mysterious providential wall, so that they cannot find their paths. But how

few see the hand of the Lord in this, his dispensations, and say, "We will go and return to our first husband, for then it was better with us than now!" How many by disregard and contempt of these, his doings, by their murmurings and rebellion of heart against the Lord, and by dishonest artifices to build up or preserve their fortunes, are adding iniquity to iniquity! Might it not be said to us as to Israel of old, "Why should ye be chastised any more? ye will revolt yet more and more." This obduracy is undoubtedly common, and augurs the coming of more terrible judgments. "In that day did the Lord God of hosts call to weeping, and to mourning, and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth. And behold, joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh and drinking wine. And it was revealed in mine ears by the Lord of Hosts, surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die, saith the Lord God of Hosts."

Wherefore, let us observe, and consider, and sigh, and cry for the abominations done in the land. Let us rise up for the Lord against the wicked, and stand up for him against the seed of evil-doers, showing that we are with him and on his side, not only by the testimony of our lips, but of our practices. Let us especially review our own ways and heart-actings; let us consider how much we have added to the public stock of guilt by our personal sins, and to what extent we have made the public sins our own by approbation or connivance? "Are there not sins with us, even with us, against the Lord our God?"—with us, the Synod?—with us, Presbyteries?—with us, Sessions?—with us, Ministers? with you, the people?—with us, husbands? with you, wives?—with us, parents? with you children? Yea, doubtless, there are.

Wherefore, let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord. Let us beseech the Most High to spare his people, and not give his heritage to reproach; to avert deserved judgments from the nation, and to pour out his Spirit upon all flesh, especially upon our president and his cabinet council, the houses of congress, the governors of the states and their legislatures, the judges and magistrates of the land, "that so we may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty." Let us unitedly and ardently implore the reviving of religion in the churches in general, and in our own church in particular, saying with his people of old, "Wilt thou not revive us again, that thy people may rejoice in thee? Show us thy mercy, O Lord, and grant us thy salvation." Let us entreat the God of all grace to qualify, direct, and make faithful our theological professors, and to bless their labours and the studies of candidates for the ministry, that they may be workmen that need not to be ashamed. Let us beseech Him also to bless all the schools of the prophets, and all seminaries of learning, infusing the salt of his grace into these fountains, that the waters being thus sweetened may flow forth through various channels for the supply of the world.

---

*An Act to incorporate the Theological Seminary at Canonsburg, in the county of Washington, belonging to the Synod of the Associate Presbyterian Church.*

SECT. 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That Thomas Beveridge, Finley W. M'Naughton, Robert Steele, Robert Bruce, Joseph Scroggs, William Bell, James*

Ramsay, Thomas Allison, David French, Samuel Murdock, Alexander Murray, and David Scott, and their successors to be duly appointed as hereafter directed, and to be twelve in number, citizens of Pennsylvania, be and they are hereby made, declared and constituted a corporation and body politic, in law and in fact, to have continuance for twenty years, by the name, style, and title of "The Trustees of the Theological Seminary at Canonsburg, belonging to the Synod of the Associate Presbyterian church of North America."

**SECT. 2.** *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the Synod of the Associate Presbyterian church of North America may, at their discretion, as often as they hold their sessions, remove all or either of the aforesaid trustees, or such other trustees of said Theological Seminary as may hereafter be appointed; and said Synod shall have power to fill by appointment, any vacancy or vacancies in the board of trustees which may be caused by death, resignation, refusal to serve, removal, or otherwise: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the re-election of any person to that office.

**SECT. 3.** *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the said trustees and their successors shall have full power and authority to make, have, and use one common seal with such device and inscription as they shall deem proper, the same to break, alter and renew at their pleasure; and by the name, style, and title aforesaid, shall be able and capable in law to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded in every court or courts, before any judge or judges, justice or justices, in all manner of suits, complaints, pleas, causes, matters and demands whatsoever, and all and every matter and thing; to do therein in as full and effectual a manner as any other person or persons, or bodies corporate and politic.

**SECT. 4.** *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the said trustees and their successors shall have power and authority to make rules, by-laws and ordinances, and to do every thing needful for the support and good government of the affairs of the said Theological Seminary, and managing the funds of the revenues thereof: *Provided,* That the said laws, rules and ordinances, or any of them, be not repugnant to the laws and constitution of the United States, or to the constitution and laws of this commonwealth, or to this act.

**SECT. 5.** *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the corporation hereby established shall be able and capable in law to take, receive and hold all and all manner of lands, tenements, rents, annuities, franchises and hereditaments, and any sum and sums of money, and any manner and portion of goods and chattels, which have at any time heretofore been granted, bargained, sold, released, enfeoffed, devised or otherwise given, granted, or bequeathed to the Synod of the Associate Presbyterian church of North America, or to the ministers and elders of said Synod, or to the said Theological Seminary, or any person or persons in trust for said church, Synod, ministers, and elders of the Theological Seminary; and the said trustees and their successors are hereby declared to be seized and possessed of such estate therein, and for the same uses and intents as in and by the respective grant, devise, or other instrument, is set forth and limited; and moreover, the said trustees and their successors, at all times hereafter, shall be capable to purchase, take, hold and enjoy, for the use of the said Theological Seminary, any real estate in fee simple, or less estate, by gift, grant, alienation, devise or other act or instrument of and from any person or persons capable to make the same: *Provided,* That the clear yearly value or income of the messuages, houses, lands and tenements, rents, annuities, or other hereditaments and real estate of said Theological Seminary, and the interest of money, shall not exceed the sum of five hundred pounds.

**SECT. 6.** *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That no misnomer of the said trustees or their successors shall defeat or annul any gift, grant, devise or bequest to or from the said corporation; *Provided,* The intent of the parties shall sufficiently appear upon the face of the gift, grant or other writing whereby any estate or interest was intended to pass to or from said Theological Seminary.

**SECT. 7.** *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the rents, profits and interest of the real and personal estate, and the annual income of the said Theological Seminary, shall be applied by the said trustees and their successors, from time to time, for the maintenance of the professors and students in the said Theological Seminary, to procuring a library, and for purchasing and improving such lots of land, building, finishing, repairing and maintaining such houses as shall be necessary for the aforesaid purposes, and such

other pious and charitable uses as shall be thought proper by a majority of the trustees aforesaid.

SECT. 8. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That as often as it may become necessary to re-build, enlarge, or otherwise alter the house, or houses of the said Theological Seminary, or to erect any new buildings, or to make any new purchases for the use of the said Theological Seminary, the said trustees and their successors, may make sale of such part of the real or personal estate of the said Theological Seminary, as a majority of the trustees and a majority of the ministers and elders of the Synod of the Associate Presbyterian church of North America, present at any session of said Synod, shall by their vote direct; the money arising from such sale, to be laid out and applied agreeably to the vote of a majority met, as aforesaid; *Provided always nevertheless,* That no sale or alienation of the real estate of said Theological Seminary, be made by said trustees or their successors, *bona fide* and for a valuable consideration, in case the possession pass immediately to the purchaser thereof, and continue in him or her, his or her heirs or assigns, shall be impeached or called in question for want of the consent of the majority of the regular members of said Synod given as before required, unless the same be done within seven years from and after the sale and delivery of the possession to the said purchaser.

SECT. 9. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the said trustees and their successors, shall not grant or otherwise dispose of the real or personal estate of the said Theological Seminary, or charge or incur the same, except in the manner and for the purposes herein before stated; and in all cases where special instructions for the management of said Theological Seminary, and for the disposal of the funds and property thereof shall be given by the said Synod, in writing, under the hand of their clerk, it shall be the duty of the said trustees to carry such instructions into effect.

SECT. 10. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the said board of trustees shall, and may, as often as they see proper, and according to rules by them to be prescribed, choose out of their number a president and vice-president, and shall also have authority to appoint a treasurer and such other officers and servants as shall by said trustees be deemed necessary, to which officers the said corporation may assign such compensation for their services and such duties to be performed by them, to continue in office for such time and to be succeeded by others, in such way and manner as the said board of trustees shall direct.

SECT. 11. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That five members of the board of trustees, including the president, or, in his absence, the vice-president, shall be a quorum sufficient to transact the business of said board and to make by-laws, rules and regulations: *Provided,* That previous to any meeting of the board of trustees for such purposes, not appointed by adjournment, ten days' notice shall be previously given thereof in at least one of the newspapers printed in either of the cities of Philadelphia or Pittsburg, or in the borough of Washington.

SECT. 12. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That all questions before the board of trustees shall be decided by a plurality of votes, whereof each member present shall have one, except the president, or vice-president when acting as president, who shall have only the casting voice or vote in case of an equality in the votes of the other members.

SECT. 13. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the said trustees shall keep regular and fair entries of their proceedings, and a just account of their receipts and disbursements, in a book or books to be provided for that purpose, and their treasurer shall once in every year exhibit to the Synod of the Associate Presbyterian church of North America an exact state of the accounts of the corporation.

SECT. 14. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That if at any time said privileges, or any of them hereby granted shall be deemed hurtful and prejudicial to the interests of the citizens of this commonwealth, then the Legislature shall and may alter, amend, or annul all or any of them, as they may think expedient and proper.

SAM'L ANDERSON,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

THO'S RINGLAND, *Speaker of the Senate.*

APPROVED—The eighth day of April, A. D. one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three.

GEO. WOLF.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JULY, 1840.

---

ART. I.—*To the Rev. Associate Synod of Original Seceders.*

REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,—

Your communication of May 10th, 1838, was laid before the Associate Synod of North America at their meeting at Pittsburgh, May, 1839, and a committee having been appointed to prepare an answer to be laid before them at their present meeting, and the report of this committee having been considered, the Synod have agreed upon the following reply:

We heartily concur in the importance which you attach to union among the followers of Christ, while at the same time we should guard against the somewhat prevalent opinion, that unity consists in the identity of denomination. Our being distinct denominations will not prevent our unity if we be one in faith, and our being visibly united will not make us one if our faith be different. We also unite with you in regret that any thing should have occurred threatening the interruption of our fellowship as one visible society. It does not appear to us necessary to enter minutely into the consideration of those points, in which you seem to suppose that we have condemned your profession. Both you and we have stated our principles on these subjects in the Testimonies which we respectively hold, and have declared in substance that these Testimonies are so far the same, that nothing in either of them should prevent our mutual communion as one church. You will find a statement of our views on these points in our Testimony, Narrative, chap. 3, the concluding sections; Declaration and Testimony, Part 1, section 14—23; Part 3, article 5. You will perceive from these passages, to which we suppose you have access, that we adhere to the whole doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, yet declare our mind more particularly, than that Confession respecting the magistrate's power *circa sacra*. Whether our views on this subject differ from those of the Confession, or not, has been a matter of debate among ourselves. The question between voluntarism and establishments, has not been agitated among us or other denominations of Christians in this land; as, with the exception of some provision for the army, the navy, prisons, the instruction of the natives, and the employment of chaplains in legislative bodies, different Christian societies are left to provide for the support of the gospel among them according to their own pleasure. This question has not excited such attention with us as among you. The precise extent to

VOL. XVII.—5

which civil government should give its countenance to religion is a point not easily determined, and we apprehend that difference of circumstances must often lead to a different decision as to what would be right and expedient. Supposing then that we differ from you, and are under some mistake in this point, yet it might be a question with you whether this were a sufficient ground for separation from us. The right or duty of magistrates to provide for the true religion by what is called an establishment, has not been a matter of testimony among us. There is no particular opposition to it on the one hand, nor contending for it on the other; and in a word, if we fail in our Testimony, it is in respect to a truth not attained by us, and we think we should not be regarded in the same light with those who have openly abandoned and opposed a part of their former profession. It is true you may say, that if in respect to this question we vary from the fathers of the Secession, it may be regarded in the light of a defection on our part; yet you will readily see that our situation is materially different from your own, as we have been generally born and brought up in a different land, where we are called to maintain the principles of the Secession under widely different circumstances. We cannot be supposed to take the same interest in questions not agitated among us, or to have the same acquaintance with controversies connected with the circumstances of other lands, as those who dwell in these lands and are engaged in these controversies. You will also see from the passages of our Testimony above referred to, that, while we adhere to the national covenant, and to the solemn league and covenant, and regard ourselves as under the obligation of these deeds, we do not profess to approve of every thing connected with them, and particularly the blending of civil and religious things. You will see, in what is said respecting covenanting, that it is regarded by us as in the ordinary circumstances of the church, an ecclesiastical duty into which we enter as members of the church of Christ, more properly than as members of civil society. It is true that in a religious covenant of a general nature, we not only may, but must engage, either expressly or by implication, to the performance of civil duties; but it seems to us that this should be in answer to the call of the church and as members of the church. Whatever appearance we make in such deeds as citizens, we have been accustomed to regard as secondary to our character as members of the church of Christ.

While we are inclined to consider your views as generally agreeing with ours, even on the afore-mentioned subjects, yet it may be that in some things they are not exactly the same. We know that some of your number, and particularly the late venerable Dr. M'Crie, could not have subscribed to some things in our Testimony, yet he and those with whom he was connected in opposition to the Testimony of 1804, were willing to continue in communion with us under these circumstances. The same was the case with the protestors against the union in 1820, so that unless you now see differently, there could be no justifiable reason for a separation from us, while we are holding no other principles than we formerly held, while you were in fellowship with us. But that which we suppose to be the main ground of your difficulty, is the act of our Synod October 14th, 1835, explanatory of the act of 1832, declaring our continued union with you. On this act of 1835, we, therefore, beg leave to submit



a few remarks, in order, if practicable, to remove your difficulties in relation to it. This act does not rescind, but fully recognises the act of 1832, declaring our union with you. Its design was not at all to affect the original act of union, or throw any obstruction in the way of our fellowship with you, but to allay some degree of uneasiness among members of our own communion, some of whom appeared to entertain apprehensions that we had adopted your standards in addition to our own, and that they were now bound to concur with a Testimony which hardly any of them had seen, and respecting which they had been led to entertain an unfavourable opinion, so far as regards its declarations on the two points already mentioned. We accordingly, for the sake of such, declare what indeed appears on the face of the former act, though its meaning had been misapprehended, that it was not intended as a *formal* approbation of your Testimony respecting the magistrate's power *circa sacra*, and national covenanting. It was not our intention, in the original act, *formally* to condemn or approve, and we here simply assert this. In other words, we pass a judgment on your Testimony as to its agreement with ours, so far as to warrant us to declare ourselves one church with you, but we do not formally approve of it as a book henceforth to be a standard among ourselves. Neither you nor any of our brethren in Scotland ever gave a formal approbation of the Testimony which we hold. This we have never insisted on, and we could not regard it as in ordinary cases suitable to be required. We mention the two points especially, not because we are sure that we differ from you even on these, or if we differ, that this difference is material, perhaps not greater than might be found among yourselves in explaining your views individually; but we mention these because of the misapprehension which prevailed to some extent, that we had changed the views of our own standards on these points for others of a different character. It was not our intention to condemn your views on these subjects, at the same time that we did not consider ourselves called in a formal way to approve or adopt them: and we hope our brethren will not insist on any such formal deed of approbation. Among the churches of the Reformation there were many different Confessions of Faith; and though no such judicial approbation of them was given by each other, and though their language on every subject was not exactly the same, this was not allowed to interrupt their fellowship. And as we stand so much alone in contending for the principles of our reforming fathers, let us not forget this spirit of mutual forbearance in what seems to be its legitimate exercise.

The latter part of the act of which you complain, we confess appears to us to afford the most just ground for objection. It was passed by a majority, but not agreeably to the minds of a respectable minority of the Synod. Yet, after all, we hope that a few statements of facts and explanations, may go far to remove your dissatisfaction in respect to it. The provision contained in this part of the act must be taken in connexion with the reasons on which that provision is founded, and these reasons are not any opposition of sentiment between you and us, which we have ascertained and published to the world; but, first, that we do not consider ourselves called to give a formal approbation of your Testimony, and, second, because we have a Testimony of our own suited to our circumstances. *For the*

*above reason, and for this fact, as the act expresses it, we consider ourselves warranted to require that all ministers and members emigrating from your Synod into our bounds, should declare their adherence to our Testimony, in order to church fellowship with us.* This does not place you on the same footing with other denominations whose members we may freely refuse after their reading our Testimony and expressing their assent to it. It supposes you and us to be one, but in order to an intelligent and consistent fellowship in actual communion with us, it requires that our Testimony should be read; not with a view, however, to *accession*, as if to a different profession, but only for the purpose of declaring an *adherence*. If the distinction of the words be not very obvious, yet the intention is manifest from the fact that the term *accession*, though spoken of, was rejected. The language "in order to church fellowship with us," must be regarded as having reference only to *actual* communion, seeing we have before declared and still continue to declare that we are in union with you as a church of Christ; and this provision of the act must be considered as a rule laid down for the conduct of those whom we consider already as members of the same church with ourselves, and not for the admission of persons applying from another denomination. Taking the latter act in connexion with the former, this appears to be the true spirit of it, even though the words of it may not be very happily chosen, and may not appear entirely consistent with this view. Such, however, is what we now willingly express as our own sense of the act, and our intention in adopting it. Still you may say, Why require an expression of adherence to your Testimony, from those whom you own as already members of the same church with yourselves? To this we respectfully answer, that it is for the same reasons that we judged it necessary from the first to have any different Testimony from that which was held by our brethren in Scotland. If we should have a Testimony suited to our circumstances in this land, it seems to be a necessary consequence that all who unite with us should make themselves acquainted with it. This is a principle on which we were accustomed to act long ago when our union with the General Associate Synod of Scotland was most intimate, and ere it had met with any interruption. We believe that in no case were ministers, and at least in no ordinary case, were private members received among us, without first making themselves acquainted with our Testimony, and so with the particular circumstances under which they were now to appear, as witnesses for the truth. Nor is it known to us that the propriety of this was ever questioned. Perhaps our brethren would not at this time have felt any dissatisfaction on this ground, were it not for suspicions which other circumstances have naturally excited.

Our brethren are no doubt aware that our union with them has not been maintained without a considerable degree of dissension among ourselves. The act of which they complain is not perhaps what a majority of us would approve. It was in some respects contrary to the mind of the warmest friends of our union with you, in others contrary to the minds of its opponents; but it was found to be a measure in which we could unite with the greatest degree of harmony among ourselves. For this reason we feel reluctant to attempt any alteration of the act itself, and we hope that our brethren

will be satisfied with the preceding explanations, or at least, if not perfectly satisfied, that they will not find themselves obliged to declare a separation from us. The time was when such a rupture would have been exceedingly injurious to the Associate Church in America, but though at the present our circumstances be different, we would not wish, nor can we think that our brethren in Scotland would wish, to do any thing rashly to scatter still more the already widely divided followers of the Lamb. May the Lord strengthen the bonds of our union, and gather all his outcasts into one.

---

ART. II.—*Ordination Address to Mr. Walker.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

SIR,—The following remarks, delivered in the Ohio meeting-house, Beaver county, Penn., on the occasion of the ordination of the Rev. Wm. H. Walker, on the 24th of Nov., 1839, I have been requested, by several Christian friends, to forward to you for publication—hoping that, through the blessing of God, they may be of some use. I submit them, therefore, to your disposal.

WILLIAM M. McELWEE.

DEAR BROTHER,—The holy ministry to which you have been set apart, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, is an office of honour, but not of supine ease and listless inactivity. “If any man desireth the office of a bishop, he desireth,”—not an easy lucrative situation, but “a good work.” The duties of a gospel minister are many and arduous, and weighty, if responsibility be in proportion to the interests involved. It may be to your advantage on this solemn occasion, and to ours also, to take a deliberate view of some of these duties.

The first to which I shall advert, and, indeed, the principal of the duties of the ministry, is that of preaching the gospel. “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” The word gospel is not to be taken in this place in its limited and more appropriate sense; it is not to be taken as signifying solely and exclusively the good news of forgiveness and reconciliation by the blood of the cross; but more largely and generally as comprehending this, and together with it, the whole system of revealed truth. Accordingly, in rehearsing and enforcing the ministerial commission, the Holy Ghost employs this language,—“Preach the word;” and the practice of Paul, who unquestionably understood his business, and religiously confined himself to it, was to “declare the whole counsel of God.” There are persons in our times who would hear nothing but “the joyful sound.” Their cry is, “Prophecy to us smooth things.” There are others who would have “precept upon precept, precept upon precept,” thinking, it would seem, that the honest exhibition of evangelical principles can have no other effect than to inspire a delusive hope. Neither of these classes should be humoured with mean compliances. There are alternations in the kingdom of nature, and they are needful. There should be alternations in the kingdom of grace, for they are no less needful. If the gospel be preached without the law, there is danger of the hearers turning the grace of God into licentiousness. If the law be preached without the gospel, there is danger of their being infected with a legal spirit, and “going about

to establish their own righteousness," to their everlasting confusion. But if the still small voice of Mount Zion and the thunders of Sinai alternate, succeeding each other as day and night, summer and winter, these dangers may be avoided; and, with the Divine blessing, those that wait on your ministry will be established in good hope, and, at the same time, in every good word and work.

The following things will, therefore, demand your attention and care, if you would be, as doubtless is your desire, a faithful minister of Jesus Christ.

1. You must study to preach the doctrines of Christ, not the fancies of your own mind, nor the philosophical speculations of others, but the doctrines of the faith once delivered to the saints. The Bible is the depository of the sacred principles you are to inculcate; and bearing the office and name of a minister of Jesus Christ, you will be unworthy the attention of your people, yea, worthy of their detestation, should you present for their reception any other doctrines besides those that are found in the sacred pages. "To the law and to the testimony," says the prophet, "if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them;" and reiterating the same sentiment, it is said by the Master himself, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

2. It must be your care to exhibit the whole system of Christian doctrine; not some parts only that may be peculiarly pleasing to yourself or agreeable to your hearers, but all the several parts, however humiliating to the pride, or repugnant to the inclinations of the depraved heart. Jehovah said to the prophet Ezekiel, "Son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die, if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thy hand. Nevertheless, if thou warn the wicked of his way to turn from it, if he do not turn from his way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul." To Jeremiah he said, "Say not, I am a child: for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces; for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord." All the other prophets were under the same charge—a charge to communicate whatever the Lord should communicate to them, and they did so at the peril of their lives, yea, many of them actually laid down their lives in the cause of truth, sealing their testimony with their blood: so did the apostles; and can it be supposed, after all this, that a minister of Christ is allowed to conduct himself according to his own discretion, or the pleasure and caprice of his hearers? He is an ambassador for Christ; and must not an ambassador follow out his instructions? He is a steward; and is it not incumbent on a steward to be faithful in carrying out the measures and arrangements of his master? Divine truth has the same relation to the salvation of men *now*, as formerly: God is not less zealous for his own glory and the interests of his rational creatures on earth, and to mar the perfect symmetry of the truth, which he has thought proper to reveal, by suppressing and concealing a part, must be an offence of no small magnitude. "Who-soever 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."

3. But, though you are to teach all things whatsoever the Head of the Church has commanded, it is to be borne in remembrance that those principles of our holy religion, which are peculiarly important, should have the greatest room and most prominent place in your administrations. The gospel, properly so called, to wit: the incarnation of the eternal Son: his vicarious obedience, sufferings, and death as second Adam, or Head of the new covenant people: the wonderful method of the sinner's justification and acceptance with God through his righteousness: the mystery of sanctification through faith in Christ, and by the efficacy of his Spirit: &c., this gospel, together with the doctrines of man's guilt, depravity, and helplessness, upon which it is based, should be frequently exhibited, and earnestly enforced. Giving an account of his ministrations in the city of Corinth, the great Apostle expresses himself in the following terms: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you that which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory what I have preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain; for I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again according to the scriptures." In another place, touching on the same subject, he says, "I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." In the Acts of the Apostles, we are informed that Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them, which form of expression several times occurs in that divine book. From all which, we infer that a minister's great and principal business is to preach Christ. And this he may and ought to do, without neglecting other matters, for as all divine truths emanate from Christ, the fountain of light, they all may be so exhibited as to lead the sinner to him. Even the law may be handled in this way: "Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore, the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." What it has been, it may be, and will be, if skilfully used and applied. Study, therefore, always to begin and end with him, who is the Alpha and the Omega.

As to matters not so vitally important, they should be introduced as occasions in Providence and the circumstances of the people may require. And this leads me to mention to you the most difficult and at the same time the most important part of ministerial work; discerning and improving the signs of the times, discerning and faithfully pointing out the coming foe, discerning opportunities of spiritual advantage and usefulness, and stirring up the people to embrace them; discerning, in a word, the condition of the flock of which the Holy Ghost hath made you an overseer, and bringing forth, for their use, those stores of the word that meet their precise case. This is a mighty undertaking: it requires a good degree of acquaintance with the Christian world, and particularly with your own pastoral charge, and in order to this, constant watchfulness and care. It will require also an intimate knowledge of the workings of corrupt nature, of the marks and indications of true grace, and of the Lord's ways of dealing with his people,—great readiness and skilfulness in the word of

truth, much zeal for the glory of God, an animating spirit of benevolence, and fearless courage. In a faithful skillful performance of the duty in question, you will warn the unruly, however high, as to their worldly rank, or haughty and overbearing in their manners—you will alarm the careless and secure, levelling against their breasts the arrows of the Almighty—you will rebuke reckless transgressors with an air of divine authority; observing which, sinners in Zion will be afraid, and fearfulness will seize hold on hypocrites. On the other hand, you will instruct the ignorant, reprove the wayward, comfort the feeble-minded, cheer the despondent, strengthen the weak and confirm the wavering—you will suit yourself to the babes, to the little children, to the young men and maidens, the old men and matrons of the kingdom of Christ; and who is sufficient for these things? But though the work is arduous and you can hardly expect to attain perfection in the management of it, its all-important and opposing difficulties should not intimidate and dishearten, but rather stimulate to exertion, especially as He whom you serve has promised "my grace shall be sufficient for you, for my strength is made perfect in weakness." The book-stores are groaning under the weight of written sermons. The religious community are generally furnished with a liberal supply of these precious commodities, and all might be furnished at a moderate expense, but yet the King of Zion has appointed a standing ministry in the church, and requires all to attend on their ministrations. But why has He done this? Among other reasons this may certainly be assigned as one, that, however excellent the sermons of the dead may be in many respects, they are not exactly suited and adapted to the present state of the church and of the world, and so, like their authors, they are in a manner dead to us. On the whole, it is evident that much of the life and beauty, power and efficacy of preaching depends on its seasonableness, and hence the Apostle speaks of the Christian minister as meriting shame who is unskillful in dividing the word of truth: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

Thus, dear brother, you are to hold forth the word of life as its importance and particular occasions may require; and this, not only in your stated ministrations in the sacred desk, but in all your intercourse with this people and with your fellow men. Our Lord preached the word continually, and we are told of those who were scattered abroad on the occasion of the persecution that arose about Stephen, that "they went every where preaching the word." They were in earnest in their profession. They were zealous in the good cause they had espoused, and all should be so still, but especially those that bear the sacred office.

Allow me to add, that you should study to hold forth the word of life not only by speech, but also by your walk and conduct. For this end you must study to live soberly, righteously, and godly, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts: you must suppress anger, wrath and resentment, pride and ambition—you must rise above the sordid dust, in your affections, aspiring after glory, honour and immortality—you must avoid appearances of evil—approximations to iniquity, that even malignity may not find room to fasten her poisonous tooth. Finally, "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever

things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise," you must "think on these things and do them." Thus you shall be manifestly an epistle of Christ, known and read of all men; and such as will not be won by the *word*, may be won by your upright conversation.

As to the manner of ministering the Gospel, time will not allow me to speak at length. This important subject is frequently touched in the epistles, particularly in those of Paul to Timothy and Titus, which you cannot examine too frequently or carefully, if you would be a good minister of Jesus Christ. At present I shall only call your attention to a few particulars, without enlarging in the illustration of them.

1. You should study gravity. Lightness of appearance, gesture or speech, will ill accord with the solemn weighty subjects you are called to handle. The Apostle informs Timothy, and us, that a bishop must be grave. He should be so at all times, and in all places, but especially in the sanctuary.

2. You should labour to be plain. Your language should be such that those of your hearers whose information is most limited may, with attention, readily apprehend your meaning. Your method should be natural and easy, not always such as the schools teach, but such as common sense teaches—such as is most proper to unfold the subject. A dark intricate method, with great swelling words of vanity, is the way indeed to excite the wonder of the multitude, and get for yourself a name as a man of parts. But remember that you are to preach Christ, not yourself; to magnify the Lord, not your own gifts; that the immediate end of your office is to edify the people, not to feast your own eyes with their gazes of admiration. In this view of the case, it were certainly better to speak a few words to the understanding, than five thousand in an unknown tongue. "Having," says Paul, "received this ministry, we use great plainness of speech, and not as Moses, who put a veil over his face."

3. Your manner should be earnest and impressive. This is expected by the generality of hearers, and imperiously demanded by the interesting nature of Divine subjects. These conjoint calls, you cannot withstand but at the expense of very disastrous consequences. The people will be disappointed and grieved, and gradually fall off from the assembly, and, what is worse, Christ will be wounded in the house of his friends; for in despite of much and able reasonings in defence of Christian principles, the idea will secretly prevail that the belief of them does not obtain in your own breast. You are, therefore, to guard against a cold soporific manner of address, as one of the greatest of ministerial sins. At the same time there is need of watchfulness, lest, on the other hand, early zeal and youthful ardour should carry you into the wild excesses of enthusiasm. The spirit of the prophets should be subject to the prophets.

4. Your manner should be kind and affectionate. A minister may be actuated by love, even when he rebukes an offender, and rebukes him sharply; and it is possible to discharge this delicate duty in such a way, as to manifest good will for the person. This manifestation will have a very happy influence in preventing anger at the time, or, if not, in quelling resentment, upon an after review and consideration of the case—it will sweetly, but powerfully constrain the sinner to a solemn consideration of his ways. Let, therefore, the

law of kindness be in your tongue, and beware of being led by your own spirit, lest you speak unadvisedly with your lips to your own hurt, or to the hurt of others. "Speaking the truth in love," is the summary account given by Paul, of the duties of the ministry, (Eph. iv. 15,) and as Mr. Cowper very well observes, "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."

5. You should study prudence in the exercise of your ministry, "wisdom dwelt with prudence" at the beginning, and does so still. "My servant," said the Father, of Christ, "shall deal prudently," and so he did, speaking to the people in parables, as they were able to bear. Paul, great in abilities, great in labour, and great in success, used a holy caution and wise management; he became all things to all men, that by all means he might gain some: he suited himself to the various capacities of his hearers, feeding some with milk because they were not able to bear strong meat. The injunction of our Lord is still in force; "Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." Some degree of the former qualification is absolutely requisite to a minister's success: and much of it is highly needful, not only that he may conduct himself without giving unnecessary offence, but that he may improve the most opportune seasons of vindicating particular principles of truth, and employ for this purpose language forcible, and at the same time inoffensive. "A word spoken in due season, how good is it!"

6. And yet gentleness and caution should be tempered with authority and boldness: "Exhort and rebuke with all authority; let no man despise thee."

7. To all these graces, you should labour to add patience; patience in braving and enduring opposition with meekness, and in continuing in your duty, though you see not the happy fruits of your toil, nor any immediate prospect of their blooming odours. "Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering." "Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be thou also patient."

These, dear brother, are high attainments, and, that they may be yours, keep yourself in the love of God, and in the love of precious souls; avoid entangling connexions with the world, flee youthful lusts, set the Lord always before you, and make it your business to fulfil the ministry which you have received, so that you may be able, in your latter end, to say, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give unto me."

But to conclude, summing up all that has or should have been said, "be thou an example of the believer, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity: give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine: neglect not the gift that is in thee, and meditate upon these things: give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all," "take heed to thyself and unto the doctrine: continue in them, for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." Follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness: fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses. I give thee 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, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his time he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen or can see! to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen."

*Address to the Congregation.*

DEAR BRETHREN,—It is promised (Isa. xxx. 20,) "Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers, and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left." This day is this scripture fulfilled in your happy experience. You have cause therefore to admire not only the faithfulness, but the great goodness and mercifulness of the Lord our God, who taketh pleasure in the prosperity of his servants. Even if we confine our views to the present life, the stated dispensation of the gospel and its ordinances is a great mercy, a mercy pregnant with other mercies, of the most desirable nature. It is the best means the world has ever known of allaying and controlling the disorderly passions of men, softening their hearts and humanizing their manners. How wretched are those parts of the world where the gospel is not dispensed, or dispensed with great impurity and manifold corruptions! There is no safety of life or liberty, reputation or property: "by swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood." But having the gospel of peace, we sit every one under his own vine and fig-tree, and there is none to make us afraid. But in considering the utility of a dispensation of the gospel of Christ, we must not confine our views to time, but survey the vast eternity beyond. The gospel is the means of everlasting life, the means of restoration to the image and favour of God, the means of deliverance from hell, and elevation to a parity with angels. In this view, O "how blessed are the people that know the joyful sound! they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance, in thy name shall they rejoice all the day, and in thy righteousness shall they be exalted."

You are called therefore by the event of this day to give thanks for the great goodness you have received, and for the innumerable mercies, which the Lord seems to have in store for you and for your children—to favour in your hearts an institution fraught with so many blessings, to record the pious resolutions expressed in your call, praying for grace to remember and do them; and hereafter you must do as you have said: for it is better not to vow, than having vowed, not to perform. Permit me to remind you of a few things in particular: And,—

1. I would admonish you to receive our brother whom you have called, and whom we have this day set apart to your service, as sent of God; for I doubt not but you have been praying that the Lord would give you a pastor after his own heart, to feed you with knowledge and with understanding. Here, then, is the answer of your frequent, importunate petitions, receive him, therefore, not simply as a man of talent, as a man of learning, as a man of piety, but as much

more than all this, even the Lord's messenger: and say in your hearts, as often as you have an opportunity of hearing the word at his mouth, "Now are we all here before God to hear all that is commanded thee of God." To encourage you in this, it is written, "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward;" yea, we have this more pointed, heart-animating word: "He that receiveth you," namely, the messenger of Jesus Christ to the churches, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me."

2. Entertain and cherish a high esteem of him as the Lord's servant among you, holding a higher station in some respects than any crowned head on the earth. "We beseech you, brethren," says Paul to the Christians of Thessalonica, "to know them who labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake;" so do ye, and yet bear in remembrance that mortal man must not be put in Christ's stead: "call no man master on earth." There is not unfrequently a carnal estimation of a minister that is exceedingly criminal; as, when he is greatly admired and caressed for his gifts, while others, humble and useful, but not so brilliant, are despised; or he is relied upon to build up the congregation by the mighty power of his eloquence, while others, not inferior in knowledge or a devotional spirit, are scorned as unfit for any work. This is man worship, and you should sedulously watch against it.

3. Deal very tenderly with the Lord's messenger whom he hath sent to you in his great mercy; as David said to Joab and Abishai, "Deal gently for my sake with the young man, even with Absalom;" so, with a little variation, I may say to you, Deal gently with this young disciple, for the Lord's sake. Do not kill him, do not torture him, neither by the day-light arrows of uncharitable criticism and cruel reproach, nor by the mid-night stabs of whispering and back-biting suspicion. Should you discover plain undeniable imperfections, as no doubt you will, for he is lifeless that is faultless, do not blazon them before the world, as delighting in evil-speaking, but, like the affectionate sons of Noah, draw over them the veil of charitable concealment. Do not wound his pious spirit and make his life bitter by rebellious insubordination, nor by lifeless languor and cold indifference in religious duties. Remember that if he be the Lord's servant, the Lord will regard any ill treatment given to him as given to himself; and "wo to him that striveth with his Maker."

4. Do not allow yourselves to grow angry and disaffected, should he faithfully describe your sins and honestly apply the word in the way of reproof, or rebuke: consider that this is one of the great duties of his office; remember that you have invited him to come to you for this very purpose, and that it is better, a thousand times better, to suffer the rod of reproof here than to be beaten with many stripes in hell. It is said of Alexander, that he bid a philosopher who had been long with him to begone, for, said he, "So long hast thou been with me and never reprov'd me, which must needs be thy fault: for either thou sawest nothing in me worthy of reproof, which argues thy ignorance, or else thou dost not reprove me, which argues thy unfaithfulness." In like manner, you will have ground to quarrel with your pastor, should he never set your sins in order before your eyes, but not for the display of ability and faithfulness in this business.

5. Countenance, encourage and help him in the good work of the

Lord by your constant presence and fixed attention. Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is; it is greatly discouraging, it is quite heart-breaking to a pious minister when the people, to whose help he is come, in compliance with their earnest call, and for whose welfare he is labouring and watching, knowing that he must give an account, will hardly deign to witness his ministrations. Remember that you are solemnly pledged to render him all due support and encouragement in the Lord.

6. Farther, be honest and punctual in the payment of all your pecuniary dues. I mention this delicate subject with the more freedom, having heard you highly commended in regard to this matter. "Be not weary in well doing." Remember that this is a statute in Israel, as obligatory as any other precept: "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth, in all good things;"—and that it is reasonable that you should minister to the Lord's servant, in carnal things, while he ministers to you in things spiritual. "The labourer is worthy of his reward." "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes no doubt this is written; that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope."

Finally, be incessant and fervent in your supplications to the Lord, for his blessing upon the person and services of your minister. He will be that to you which the Lord is pleased to make him, but nothing more. "Neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase." The great apostle made a particular application of this supplement to himself, when he wrote to the people of Ephesus, in the following terms: "Pray alway, with all prayer and supplication, for all saints, and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel." And who was he? Paul, the disciple of Gamaliel, a man of great learning, Paul the apostle, favoured with extraordinary visions and revelations, rich in experience. Paul the aged, Paul the divine, who received his doctorate of divinity in the third heavens. He solicited the prayers of the common members of the church in his behalf; and if to him they were needful or desirable, your prayers must be even more so in the case of your minister: wherefore, as Aaron and Hur stayed up the hands of Moses, while Israel fought with Amalek, so do ye stay the hands and the heart of your pastor, in his spiritual labours by your fervent intercessions on his behalf.

If through grace you attend to these things, your minister will have the high honour and exquisite satisfaction of saying, in the great day when all the elect of God shall be gathered into one, Behold here am I, and the children whom thou gavest to me;" but, if not, your table will become a snare and a trap, and that awful word will penetrate your inmost souls and rend the caul of your heart, "I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh." But, brethren, we hope better things of you, even things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak; wherefore we commend you and your pastor to the Lord, and to the word

of his grace, which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified.

---

ART. III. *Address on Foreign Missions before the Associate Society of Inquiry. By the President of the Society. Canonsburg, March 24th, 1840.*

In order to discharge a duty enjoined by the constitution of our association, I appear before you this evening, to make some remarks on the subject of "*Foreign Missions.*" It is indeed under great embarrassment, that I approach a subject of such importance, a subject involving the eternal interests of millions of our fellow men; a subject too, on which you have been previously addressed by those, whose abilities and research would warrant such an undertaking. But whatever be the discouragements under which we are called to labour, we would certainly lay ourselves liable to the charge of criminal indifference to the highest and best interests of our race if we would refuse to contemplate *facts*, which lie before us! Facts by which alone we can arrive at any correct knowledge of what our duty is, in regard to a subject of such moment; or how our energies may be brought to bear, in order to the discharge of that duty.

As we cannot approve the course hitherto pursued by our church in regard to this subject, we hope you will receive our convictions with that candour with which they are tendered.

While other branches of the church, less orthodox in the profession of the faith, have manifested considerable zeal in the propagation of the gospel, it has been regarded with such indifference by our own, that a prejudice has pervaded the minds of many against taking the subject into consideration at all. The subject of missions has been marked as the appropriate work of enthusiasts and errorists, who, as it regards principle, have little to lose upon any adventure, as if Christianity were not *intended* for the *world*, nor the world in *need* of Christianity.

In this we appear to have forgotten some of the first rudiments of our holy religion, as taught in its primitive histories. Had Paul not embarked in *missionary enterprise*, Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, and all the places which are recorded as conforming to the faith, would have continued to this day, vain in their imaginations, paying to idols, to beasts, to reptiles, that honour which is due to God only. Had not the same Spirit in subsequent ages urged the faithful soldiers of the cross to invade the different nations in Europe, our fathers would have inevitably remained, and we with them, surrounded with heathenish darkness, slaves to all the ritual of Pagan superstition. We appear to have forgotten that the command of God binds us to send the gospel to all the world, and that guilt is accumulated every moment we are not actively contributing in some form to the attainment of that high and holy end.

It is astonishing to see the success which crowned the labours of a few weak, and apparently inefficient instruments at the first enunciation of the gospel, and to reflect that *eighteen hundred years* have elapsed and an overwhelming majority of the human race have not heard of the *name* of Jesus. After such an example of the powers of darkness falling before the armour of light, it is astonishing

that in the *nineteenth* century darkness still covers the earth, and gross darkness the mass of its inhabitants. And if we turn to the church, to which this work of illumination has been committed, the prospect is *still* dark and forbidding. The messengers have fallen out by the way, and the energies which should have been concentrated and directed against the common foe, have been divided and turned against one another. Our ranks are broken like the hosts of Midian, and all the damage that *could* have been sustained from enemies, is comparatively nothing to what has been sustained from *professed* friends. In the days of the apostles this mystery of iniquity began to work. Ages have passed, and the scene unaltered. The same tragedy acted and reacted, the sheep scattered and fleeing before the enemy, the powers of the church paralyzed, and the world lying in wickedness. The approach of the universal reign of the Redeemer which God has decreed, and of which the prophets have spoken, the advancement of which should be prominent in the prayers, contributions, and active movements of the church, we wish to be kept distinctly in view, while we endeavour to examine what is the present duty of the Secession Church, in regard to the extension of the gospel.

It is a matter beyond all dispute, that the only way by which the nations are to be delivered from darkness, is by the light of the gospel. That the ministry of reconciliation is the appointed means by which the kingdoms of this world shall be made to pass from the hands of Satan, unto God. "How can they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher?"

In order to render our subsequent remarks more intelligible, we shall state and endeavour to establish this proposition,—

*That it is the duty of the Secession Church to engage in sending the gospel to the heathen now,*—to launch immediately into the work of foreign missions, practically.

By *foreign* missions we understand, any and every place beyond the geographical precincts of our own church, whether in our own or another country; whether they speak our own or another tongue. And as to the time of commencing the work *now*. We would not be misunderstood, by limiting it to such a time as shall be found convenient, according to the present course of procedure. Neither would we subscribe the idea, that it would be the duty of *all* our present ordained ministers to give up their respective charges, and embark for heathen lands. But this we say, that sufficient measures should now be taken to send *some* to labour among those who are utterly destitute of the bread of life; and to support them by the liberality of the church at home.

But to the proof of our position, that this is the present duty of the Secession Church, we argue,—

1. From the claims of the heathen. A general picture of heathenism, alike applicable to ancient and modern times, is sketched by the finger of God, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, particularly from the twenty-sixth verse downward. A picture which we are accustomed to pass over without much emotion of any kind, referring it exclusively to ancient Rome, and to a state of things which has long since ceased to be. But this betrays a shameful ignorance, and a sinful disregard for the welfare of our

race. This scripture is of no such private interpretation. If any credit is due to the united testimony of a thousand disinterested witnesses, heathenism of the present day is a living comment on the apostle's description. It is, as was doubtless intended, a representation of the depraved and wicked working of the human heart, in every age; and in every land from which the fear of God is banished. If we could imagine a state of society where all the vices therein specified reign and rage without control, the revolting nature of the spectacle, the pain, remorse, and wretchedness, necessarily connected therewith, would perhaps exceed all our perceptions of Tophet itself.

Such indeed is the aspect of nations grovelling in the darkness of moral night, that if there was no such thing as Christianity in the world, our present philanthropic feelings, would compel us to use every means within our power, for their alleviation, if we would only acquaint ourselves intimately with their condition. But the root of the disease lies deeper than the common sympathies of our nature, and the remedy must correspond to the disease. They have hastened after other *gods*, *therefore* their sorrows are multiplied.

A question has long been disputed among politicians and others who manifest a superficial acquaintance, with the true *source* of the miseries of men,—Whether civilization should precede the introduction of Christianity, in ameliorating the condition of men in a savage state, or *vice versa*. This question appears now to be permanently settled. Christianity must be acknowledged to be the mother of civilization. No nation has ever arisen from barbarism to civilized life of itself; and there never was civilization, in the modern acceptation of the term, where the Sun of Righteousness had not shed his benign influence. Hence see the claims of Heathen lands upon the church. They have betaken themselves to idolatry. God has filled them with *their own ways*; nothing but “pure and undefiled religion,” can free them from the curse under which they are sunk. Their sin is the cause of all the natural evils under which they groan. All their calamities, social, civil, and religious, are the consequences of their “departure from the *living God*,” and all the evils which they experience in *time*, are but a prelude to the wrath which is in store for eternity. It would be a matter of comparative indifference, what were the condition of men in the present life, if they were not born to *immortality*. “If the dead rise not,” to receive that sentence which shall seal their eternal destiny, “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.” But on them that “know not God,” he will suddenly be revealed “in flaming fire taking vengeance.” This is a doctrine we have been taught from infancy, and not now to be proved,—that all are born in sin, that the numberless abominations of heathens unfit them for heaven, and consequently they have *no hope in their death*. A cloud of divine displeasure hangs over them, black with elements of destruction both for soul and body, and with all the fury of a tempest sweeps them by thousands into the gulf of eternal despair. Have then the heathen *no claims*? And let it be remembered, that while we stand idle, indifferent spectators of the awful scene, there is not one among their *hundreds of millions* to offer up on our behalf the effectual fervent prayer of righteous Stephen, “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.” Do not their claims come up, “beseeching us, by the mercies of God,”

to come to their assistance? If there be any comfort to our souls, from the love of God in Christ, let us prove our sincerity, by imparting freely to them what was freely given unto us—to *them*, sinking by millions beneath the horizon of hope. While we glory in the incomparable love of Christ, who loved us and gave his life for *our* rescue, they challenge us to prove that we have the Spirit of Christ, by communicating the same message of love to them. But their claim is stronger than a mere address to our benevolence. The gospel is theirs by *will*, and we are constituted the executors of that will. But this brings us to our second argument.

2. The positive command of Christ to the Church. "*Goye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*" An idea appears to have a place in the minds of many, that we are not obliged to send the gospel to any who have not expressed a desire for its reception by formal request; a happy thing it would be, indeed, if they were so sensible of its excellency as to induce them to make such request; but will their depth of ignorance and hatred of God prove that they do not *need* the gospel? if not, we have no excuse. The command itself knows no such exception. It is no matter to us whether the heathen are rich or poor, happy or wretched. No matter what others will do or will not do for the salvation of the heathen. No matter what the prospect, whether they desire or despise the gospel, whether our efforts on their behalf be blessed or lost. No such considerations can release us from the obligations of this last command of our Lord. The question whether it is proper for societies, organized for the express purpose, to undertake Missionary operation, we do not propose to discuss. Suffice it to say, they have *assumed* their existence, for which, as well as for every thing improperly transacted in that capacity, they are accountable. The church is a different organization. She is constituted the receptacle of divine truth, a candlestick conspicuously situated, a city set on a hill, an organization to which is intrusted the management of the affairs of the kingdom of Christ in this world.

From this description of the church in her organic form, it appears that she does not exist solely nor supremely for her *own* sake, but for those that are without; for the world; and when she ceases to answer this end, she goes far towards forfeiting her existence. If the servant who hid his master's talent in the earth, not only incurred his master's displeasure, but forfeited his right to the use of the talent also, will not a heavy charge lie against that church which has expended her talent for selfish purposes, and failed to enlighten the world? The command is of universal and perpetual obligation, while a single individual in the habitable world is ignorant of the true God and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent.

The division of the church is made an objection to entering upon a work of such importance *now*. The church, says the objector, is incapable of determining *what is truth*, of correcting herself at home, much more is she incapable of shedding the pure light of the gospel on foreign lands, and obeying the command requiring the inculcation of "all things, whatsoever is commanded." This objection comes with a peculiarly ill grace from any of those branches of the church, who by entertaining erroneous principles and practices, have *caused* these divisions. They reason as an unfaithful steward who had received funds necessary for performing a certain piece of

business, and after having squandered them for purposes prejudicial to the interests of his lord, would justify himself, from the fact that he was *unable* to perform the service.

But if the objection come from a seceder, it is difficult to tell what it means. If he has reference to the division occasioned by our own separation from other branches of the church, the argument would be that our separation has disqualified *the church* for discharging that function for which she was especially instituted. The conclusion then would be that that separation was unwarrantable, and that we are not a church at all! But the warrantableness of secession must be taken for granted, or the objector is not a seceder at all, contrary to what we have supposed. Division then, so far as we are concerned, can have no influence upon *our* duty as a church. Did we not separate for the express purpose of discharging all the duties of the church, free from embarrassment? The objector assumes, for the time being, or for present convenience, that there is no such thing as a church in existence, or if there is, she has ceased to be "the pillar and ground of the truth." At all events, he reasons here from a principle that he would admit in no other case: namely, that because others *will not* do their *duty*, we are justifiable in not *attempting* to do ours. Because other branches of the church have so corrupted their way, incapacitated themselves for discharging their duty as *the light* of the world, have become a cloud instead of a beacon placed upon a hill, we are thereby released from all obligations.

But if missionary operation is opposed on account of divisions, of which we were not the occasion, and over which we could have no control, then the restoration of other branches of the church to their primitive purity must be assumed as the *primary* object of our separate existence. But much as the divisions of Reuben should call for searchings of heart, and the peace of Jerusalem be desired, we cannot conceive that to be the principal object of our separate organization. And with regard to the healing of the church, what can we do more than we have already done? We have passed sentence upon them, and hold them under censure for their errors: we have noted them, and hold no fellowship with them, and what remains but brotherly admonition, as occasion may offer to fulfil all that the Lord our God requires of us in regard to errorists? But would this be inconsistent with our duty towards others who have never been within the pale of the church state? Nay, what higher evidence of a righteous separation, and what can give more force to our reproofs and admonitions? What more conclusive evidence that the face of God is shining upon us, than exertions vigorous and indefatigable to make his way known upon the *earth*, and "his saving health among *all nations*?"

Right and obligation, are *correlatives*. If we are under obligations to give the gospel to *all nations*, to *every* creature, it is their undoubted right to claim; and every revolving season which finds us reclining in ease and apathy, not using every means within our power for extending to them the knowledge of God's "unspeakable gift," witnesses against us as guilty of the *highest injustice*. To defraud men of temporal goods, which are justly their own, is a penal offence: to usurp dominion over the bodies of men, is a crime with scarce a parallel; but it remains for those who defraud men of their souls, to arrive at the climax of guilt and wrong. Nothing



more forcibly argues the want of the Spirit of Christ. Nothing is more conclusive evidence of disregard for the kingdom of heaven, than taking away the key of knowledge, making it morally impossible for those who would appreciate its benefits to enter.

As a church, we have assumed before God, and the world, an eminent station; and if not properly improved, becomes perilous: perilous, in an exact proportion to its prominence. "The servant who knew his masters will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." We have assumed a *separate* stand, as a church, and for what end? that we might secretly *hide our talent* in the earth? We have raised a testimony for truth, and, for what end? that we might *monopolize* the truth? Our banner is unfurled and floating in the air, but what avails so long as the soldiery have not girt on their armour; nor an invasion even contemplated on the strong holds of Satan? Such a parade will cause little alarm in the enemy's camp, and little honour will redound to the leader of such a host.

"Nor as the Lord commanded them, did they the nations slay,  
But with the heathen mingled were, and learned of them their way."

True, indeed, "learned of *them their way*," the way of worldly glory. Conquering *men* in *our own* strength, and taking honour to *ourselves*, instead of destroying the kingdom of *Satan*, through *divine* strength; and giving glory to *God*.

If the command, "go into all the world," is binding on the whole visible church; much more, yea it comes with redoubled force, to those who are disenthralled from error, and disencumbered with human institutions. If men from their ordinary business are called to arms, in defence of their country, much more those who have *volunteered* to sacrifice their lives in their country's cause. We now come to our third argument, that the church is *able* to perform this duty. The commands of God are always binding, when it is *possible* for us to obey. That insuperable difficulties do, however, sometimes prevent men from doing what, under ordinary circumstances, would be their duty, is freely conceded. For example, a man is bound to provide for the welfare and comfort of his family, but, suppose he has committed some crime, on account of which he is immured in prison; it is absolutely impossible for him to discharge that duty.

We are accordingly met on the threshold of the argument, by exclamations from a thousand tongues, pleading exemption from the duty of sending the gospel to foreign lands, on the ground, that we are *not able*. It is absolutely impossible for us to enter on that subject *now*. In order to meet this objection, let it be remembered that all inability is either *natural* or *moral*. With regard to moral ability, (if you except a willing mind,) we positively deny that ever the church *was*, or ever can be, incapacitated for evangelizing the world. All her moral strength is abundantly provided. This is simply the Scriptures, with the gifts of the Holy Spirit necessary to make known the doctrines therein contained. The Scriptures we have in rich abundance, and the gifts of the Spirit, are freely promised for this purpose expressly. With these the church is equipped for pulling down the strong holds of Satan, in every land. A plea of moral inability were blasphemous, it would deny the sufficiency of the Spirit or the truth of the promises of God. In this respect the church is always able, she is always omnipotent, she is raised to a lasting independence by bequeathment of her exalted head.

The treasures of grace, the abundance of the Spirit, the fulness of God is here.

But with regard to *natural* ability, the objection appears more plausible, and has respect to two things, namely, men, and means. The nations cannot hear without preaching, and they cannot preach, except they be sent, by the authority and liberality of the church: and it is matter of fact, we have neither men in the field, nor funds in our treasury, to warrant such an undertaking. The claims, too, of the church at home, are to be taken into consideration. We have, it is said, 210 congregations, to supply which only 90 ministers are at present engaged. Only 34 of the whole number of congregations, enjoy weekly the public ministration of ordinances, and 80 are vacant, for the supply of which, only ten itinerate. In many places also, a few families may be found without formal organization, which, if favoured with preaching, would soon grow into respectable congregations. This is especially true in our western states and territories, where the country is new, and inhabitants comparatively rare. A promising prospect is thus afforded for extending the boundaries of the church at home, and young men are called to prepare themselves to meet her demands. Thus sufficient territory is presented to occupy the labours of our present number of preachers, with all the accession we are likely to have for years. All these claims we admit in their full force; and shall only pretend to answer them, by presenting the opposite, and in our humble opinion, *paramount* claims of the heathen. Behold, here, not 80 congregations to ten labourers, not 90 pastors to 18,000 communicants; but 600,000,000 who have never heard of a communion table, who know nothing of the living God; of the blood of the everlasting covenant; of the name of Jesus, through which, alone, any of the human family can be saved. Here are Bibles, and Sabbaths, and sanctuaries. Here, the star of Bethlehem has risen to meridian height, to be beheld, admired, and acceptably worshipped by all who do not stubbornly shut their eyes against him. There a starless night broods over their destiny: emblematic of the blackness of darkness, into which they who know not God shall be promiscuously hurled. Look for a moment at this, look at their number, and look at their *hope*.

That people cannot be said to be *destitute* of ordinances, who have the word of God. Helps for understanding it, catechisms, confessions, and commentaries, associations for prayer, mutual instruction, &c.

In every nation, those who fear God and work righteousness, whether they are constantly favoured with public ordinances or not, will be accepted, but where none of these are, in a word, "where no vision is, the people perish." And though it be not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it unto dogs, it may be charity to impart some of the crumbs that fall from the master's table.

[To be concluded.]

---

ART. IV.—*The Psalms of Holy Scripture the only Songs of Zion, an Appeal to the Churches in behalf of this Ordinance of God. By Donald C. McLaren, Minister of the Gospel. "Praise ye the Lord; sing unto him; sing Psalms." Geneva, N. Y. pp. 60.*

WE have read this pamphlet with no ordinary degree of satisfaction. Its conception and execution are alike creditable to the au-

thor, and its appearance seasonable. Mr. M'Laren is a minister of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York, which appears to be considerably agitated, at present, on the subject of which he treats.\* A party in that church opposed to the *exclusive* use of a Scripture Psalmody has recently become dominant. Two years since this party judicially declared that they could not *conscientiously be restricted* to the exclusive use of a Scripture Psalmody in the praises of God; and although the constitution of that church contains in itself the germinating principle of this party, which renders it the legitimate fruit of their ecclesiastical organization, yet it is resisted by a respectable minority; and with this minority our author has taken his position—a position creditable to any minister of the gospel, who would maintain his allegiance to Zion's king in this day of defection. He does not, indeed, advert to the state of affairs in his own or any other ecclesiastical connexion; but very properly presents his readers with a straight-forward, and even masterly defence of the position taken in his title page; and concludes by answering some of the most plausible objections.

It would no doubt gratify many readers to see this pamphlet transferred entire to our pages; and did justice to the author permit, we should be inclined to copy the whole without comment: for we are confident it would be found useful, and should be in the hands of all such as desire to be found faithful to the cause of a covenanted reformation. We must, however, rest contented with several extracts, which it is hoped will lead many persons to obtain the whole.

This is a subject which, from the nature and importance of it, should be investigated strictly according to the sound protestant principles laid down in the Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 1, sec. 8. "The Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal unto them." Whatever the authentic word determines, cannot be set aside by any thing that may be lacking or imperfect in a translation of it. Whatever doctrines or duties the authentic word inculcates, should be received and obeyed in the church where translations only are in common use.

What is the true and proper end which the work of translation is designed to answer? It is simply to transfer the word of God from the original into another language. Its province is to change nothing but the language. Translations do not alter ordinances and privileges, which God hath instituted in his church; what these were before, they remain after the translation is made. Do the original scriptures confer on us the privilege, and lay on us the duty of singing inspired songs in divine praise? This should be distinct-

\* We have been informed that the subject [of Psalmody] is considerably agitated by the churches, and that the churches in turn, are considerably agitated by it.—*Ch. Magazine for April, 1840.*

ly set forth in every translation. So also, supposing the Hebrew were our common and native language, then, in that case the authentic scriptural would present us with many psalms contained in one distinct book, and all fitly prepared for our lips in singing praises to God. Every translation of the sacred books should do the same thing for those whose language it adopts, that is, should furnish a translation of the Psalms fitly prepared for being sung, and having the same relation to the original Psalms, which the other books in the translation have to their correspondent books in the original. Such a translation of the Psalms, the Church should aim to have in all languages into which the scripture is translated. Were this attained, there would then be, on the ground of divine institution, unity in the Church's praises throughout the whole earth.

These preliminary remarks are necessary to obviate misapprehensions, and to present the question under consideration in its true light. It does not directly concern the respective merits of different versions of the Psalms; but is a question involving the principle on which every version should be made, as it immediately concerns the use we are required to make of, what is antecedent to all versions, the Psalms contained in the authentic scriptures. The question about versions will be easily adjusted, when it is once settled that these Psalms were designed for universal and perpetual use in showing forth the praises of God. That they were given by their infinitely wise Author for this purpose, we shall now endeavour to prove, we hope, to the satisfaction of our readers, who are requested particularly to consider,

I. That the Book of Psalms is a *Collection of Psalms*, made by divine authority. They were dictated by the Spirit to the holy men who composed them. All the Psalms thus given at different times by inspiration were, at length, collected into one book; none of them were lost, no others were admitted. That book, proceeding from infinite wisdom, mercy and truth, is perfect and entire, and perfectly adapted to answer the end for which it was intended.

We should regard this collection as a whole, to be preserved inviolate; and every Psalm in it as a constituent and perfect part of a perfect whole. A Scriptural Psalmody is not any thing and every thing which people may choose to sing; nor should we think of a Scriptural Psalmody, as if it were, here and there, a *little* every where and the *whole* no where, broken into fragments, scattered about in all versions, tossed to and fro, by every wind and wave, on the unstable sea of "circumstances," like the floating remains of a wreck. A psalmody truly scriptural is confined to the canonical collection of Psalms. The inspired Psalms, being written at different times and by different individuals, though mostly by David, were, in the first instance, separate and disconnected from one another. They were finally all collected into one book by themselves. Now this fact, that the Book of Psalms is a collection, and that this collection was made under the immediate superintendence of God, has a direct bearing on the subject we are considering. Let it be brought to bear on all existing systems of psalmody, and what would be the effect? Let all the collections in use in the several denominations be gathered together and examined. How many of them would agree with the collection in the authentic Scriptures? Some of them would not agree with it at all? Others, like paraphrases,

in the department of Psalms, may have a general agreement with it, though in some places not even that: as collections, however, taking into view the human hymns they contain, they are far removed from being correspondent to the collection in the authentical scriptures.

As it was wholly unlawful for the Jews in old time, by any direct act, to introduce apocryphal, that is, uninspired hymns into the authorized Psalm Book, so it was equally unlawful for them to do that *indirectly*, by introducing human, that is, apocryphal hymns into the church and worship of God, or to do any thing which would imply that they were worthy to be used instead of, or to be esteemed equal to the inspired psalms. What was in this respect unlawful then, *before* the volume of inspiration was finished, must be equally unlawful now, *after* it is brought to perfection. If human odes had been thus used for the end for which inspired psalms were given, it would have been without allowance from God: in no instance could they have been thus used without casting dishonour on the canonical collection of psalms. Those who draw near to God, would meet with the inquiry, "Who hath required this at your hands?" and the pure in heart, in offering sacrifices of praise, would desire to give to that solemn inquiry the answer of a good conscience towards God. Services purporting to be acts of worship, might be costly and delightful to those who performed them; but if they contravened divine appointment, they would be a vain oblation. The most perfect concert of human voices, the sweetest melody of music that was ever heard in the temple of God would be an offence unto him, if it had been in discord with the voice of his authority and truth speaking in his word.

II. In the history of Psalmody, it is an important fact, placed beyond dispute by the highest testimony, that the church has been furnished with *only* one Book or collection of Psalms, *wholly* and *immediately* from God himself.

When this noble Book of Praises was first completed, and committed to the church, a better could not have been obtained from another source. Every one will admit, at that time, it would not have been improved, had any thing been taken from it or added to it. A deed would have been done, combining great irreverence and ingratitude toward God, if the elders and congregation of Israel had determined to suspend the adoption of that sacred book, on the judgment which uninspired poets might form respecting it. How would it appear to us in the retrospect, to see the ancient church, after receiving from heaven an inspired book, submitting it for revision to uninspired poets, however pious or renowned they might have been? And what would the ancient church have thought, had they foreseen, in the prospect, the church in the latter days, doing this very thing. Can the combined wisdom of the world make that better which God made very good? The natural genius of Homer, joined to the fervent piety of David, would have failed to produce a work comparable to the book of Psalms, which, adequately translated into the language of ancient Greece, would have far surpassed the most finished specimens of Grecian poetry. Well then—What is modern poetry but a kind of second-hand imitation of the Greek model? And is not the fine taste, predominant in the polite learning of the world, for the most part, formed according to

a standard taken from the footstool of old paganism? Shall the child of such ancestry—shall the poetry or taste of this world, though approaching in seeming meekness under a Christian garb, be allowed to intrude itself into “the house of God, which is the church of the living God,” to find fault there, and to dictate to his worshippers what and how they should sing to his praise? Meet it on the threshold. Be not lulled by its soft tones, nor shamed should it sneer, nor dazzled by its showy ornaments, nor awed by its high airs. Ask the fine poetry, which claims to have so much to do in preparing praises for the church of God, whence it came, and whence it obtained its boasted treasures? And it will gracefully point, not to Sinai, or Zion, or any other mount lighted by the truth of the true God, but to Parnassus, the mount of Apollo and of the Muses, the feigned centre and summit of heathen literature, and to the poets that served the gods, and sung in the temples and around the altars of idolatry. “Thou shalt say unto it, get thee hence.” Isa. xxx. 22. The ancient poetry of the church, like the old sun in the heavens, has no equal, and is now as full of benign brightness for the good of men and the glory of God, as it was at first.

How would it sound, for a man to publish imitations of the whole Bible, to modify and change it, from what God made it, to what an ignorant, frail mortal may think it ought to be; and then to call that an imitation? Were any one to take up the Proverbs of Solomon, or the Epistle to the Romans, and revise and transpose them, leaving out some things and inserting others, who would not question his right thus to mutilate a sacred book; and who would not at once condemn a work of that kind, instead of receiving and using it in place of the original book, of which it would pretend to be an imitation? What is wrong in such pretended imitations, in reference to *one* part of the Bible, must be wrong in them in reference to *another* part. What is unwarrantable, yea sacrilegious in *prose*, cannot be right and religious in *poetry*.

III. The significant title of this book furnishes a strong argument in favour of its continued use in religious worship.

IV. That the Psalms were designed to be sung, appears from the descriptive name or epithet applied to David, who wrote the most of them. He is called, expressly in his character of an inspired author, “the sweet psalmist of Israel,” 2 Sam. xxiii. 1.

We think it will come into the mind of every one, who attentively considers this official name of David in the place where it occurs, that his being inspired is inseparably connected with his being the Psalmist of Israel. He was a prophet, and, in common with the other prophets, “ministered unto us.” 1 Peter i. 12. But he was distinguished from other prophets, in his being the Psalmist of Israel; or in his being fully authorized and qualified to indite sacred songs for the worshippers of God. His writings, as *prophecies*, must always retain their character and place as prophecies, and the same writings, as *Psalms*, must always retain their character and place as Psalms. We have no more liberty to lay them aside as Psalms, than we have to lay them aside as prophecies. In either aspect of them, their disuse is equally and wholly unwarrantable. The inspired David is despoiled of his office; he is not in fact or in any way the *Psalmist* of Israel, among those who allow human hymns to supplant his. He is not, in their estimation, the *sweet*

**Psalmist**, when they prefer human compositions to his holy and perfect odes.

V. The Psalms, contained in the canonical or scripture psalm book, were sung in divine worship under the Old Testament dispensation. They were thus sung, during the days of David, in the daily service of the tabernacle. 1 Chron. xvi. 4; vii. 23—30. At the dedication of the temple built by Solomon, the Levites praised God in the words of the 136th Psalm, saying, "For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever;" a psalm well adapted to that august and solemn occasion. It is recorded of Hezekiah, that, in restoring the worship of God, from which there was a great declension in the reign of Ahaz, "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done." 2 Chron. xxix. 2. "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad, the king's seer, and Nathan, the prophet: for so was the commandment of the Lord, by his prophets," v. 25. "And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began." v. 27. "And moreover, Hezekiah, the king, and the princes, commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David and of Asaph, the seer; and they sang praises with gladness, and bowed their heads, and worshipped." v. 30.

There was, therefore, *as to what should be sung in devotion*, an ordinance founded on divine authority, and binding on the whole visible church. What *was* in this respect *is now*. Where that holy ordinance stood in by-gone ages, it yet stands. It is still in force. Its beauty has not faded away. Its rich fulness, it still retains. Necessity for it continues. What it *once* required, it requires *now*. The firm foundation of it in the authority of God, remains and reaches wherever the church exists, or the Bible speaks; and the obligation it imposes is of equal perpetuity, and of equal extent. This ordinance had no principle of decay in it, that it should die of itself—nothing in it, that it should expire by its own limitation—no dependence on other ordinances, of a temporary nature, that it should cease, when they ceased. It reached its perfection long after the Jewish ritual was set up, and it retains its perfection and office, uneffaced by the passing away of that ritual. The passing away of the shadows, clears the face of the psalms and reveals the brightness of their meaning. The fulfilment of the prophecies respecting Christ, with which that book abounds, adds a new, enduring—and, shall we not say, endearing lustre to its value, as a seal to confirm its truth, and a key to unlock its treasures.

VI. There was an express command repeatedly given to worship God by singing the inspired compositions contained in the Book of Psalms.

In the illustration of his *sixth* position the author quotes Psalms lxxxi. 2; xcv. 2. Ezek. xxvi. 13. Prov. xxv. 20. Ex. xv. 2. Psalms cxviii. 14. Is. xii. 2. Job xxx. 9. Ps. lxix. 12, and many other Scriptures.

When the advocates of human hymns are directed to the strong and accumulated evidence that proves psalm-singing to have been a divine ordinance under the Old Testament, and are called upon to

VOL. XVII.—7

adduce any evidence, which they may affirm exists, that that ordinance has been altered or abrogated, or to show cause, if any there be, why it should not now be obeyed, they find on trial that they cannot do this. They are, consequently, constrained to make a partial concession, amounting in words to something, but amounting to very little, in view of the grounds on which they place their concession, and the practice they connect with it. The concession is this, that the church, under the New Testament, has a right to retain the psalms of scripture, and authority to use them in religious worship. Well, then, *this authority*—is it from heaven? or, of men? Answer this. Some, that may think themselves to be great reasoners, may reason with themselves, saying, If we shall say, “From heaven,” it may be asked, Why, then, do ye not sing them, whenever and wherever ye sing praise? Why do ye sing what has not the same authority of God upon it? Others, placed in circumstances of perplexity, affecting, if not their private sentiments, their public utterance, may reason from a principle and to a result the same with that of the chief priests respecting the baptism of John, “But if we shall say, of men; They feared the people, for all men counted John, that he was a prophet indeed.” It is a poor way for men to dispose of a question of great practical importance in the worship of God, by saying, “We cannot tell.” Has the church a right to sing the scripture psalms? The right must be either from heaven or of men. If we have the authority of the Most High God to sing them, can we be authorized in this way *to do*, what we at the same time *may neglect* to do, and be blameless? Can we, in singing the psalms, say, in truth, that we have the warrant of heavenly authority for it; and yet not slight that authority nor defile our conscience, by omitting to sing them, or by singing something else whenever it suits our convenience or taste? Is the authority of God of such a weak, neutral and variable nature, that it can be made to sanction any thing? The word of Christ is not yea and nay. A warrant by divine appointment to do any thing, is connected with a moral obligation to do it, leaving us no liberty of conscience to do otherwise. If any one say, “we may sing the psalms of scripture, as we are allowed now to sing any thing we please, provided we sing nothing untrue or immoral;” in that case, so far as the singing of the psalms is concerned, the authority of God would, in reality, have nothing to do in the matter: whether they shall, or shall not be sung, is then a question *not decided already* by the will of God, but to be decided by man’s will; and the singing of them, at any time, is “Of man.” But how is it ascertained that this important matter is left to the determination of men? Is there a grant of this discretionary power made in the Bible? If not, then it is usurped, with jeopardy to the interests of God’s glory. Is it not exceedingly important that nothing false in principle, or immoral in its tendency, be introduced into the praises of his church? What can effectually guard against this? Is it any thing in man, or to be done by man of his own accord? Or is it what the Lord hath done and ordained, in providing, by inspiration, Psalms in his word for his whole church in all ages? Some persons honestly think that the old psalms were very good in their day, as good as could be expected, and that, as it is proper to show them respect, being in the Bible, we must do the best we can with them; and then to make up for their deficiencies,



add to them something better. Ask them, when they are priding themselves on their "admirable collection of psalms and hymns," Is all this of heaven or men? and they will candidly say, that they do not know that it makes much difference, whether it is from heaven or of men; they are not particular about that; great men have had this opinion, who would, of course, know if there was any thing wrong in it. That sinful security, which has been so often the fore-runner of great defections in the church, generally begins with an undue reliance on mere men. Those who, without farther inquiry or knowledge, rest their opinions, or quiet their consciences on what men have said or done, are giving a dangerous weight to the authority of human traditions; and if tradition be exalted to a place in the rule of faith and practice, in exclusion of, or into equality with the word of God, it will make little difference as to the sin of it in his sight, and the hurt of it to the sinning, whether the elders be dead or living, popish or protestant. The words of Christ suit all such cases: "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition."

Some may come forth boldly, and say, we ought not now to be restricted to the Book of Psalms. Why not? The Jews only were restricted to that book. How so? Can the *obligation*, springing from the will of God, to sing those psalms remain, and yet its *strictness*, which excluded all else from his praise, be taken away by the hand of any one whose pleasure it may be to judge it too strict? Do you strike still deeper, and affirm that the obligation itself was cancelled, when the ceremonial law ceased? That is what no man has yet been able to prove. The great duty of praising God was not ceremonial—it is essentially moral. Neither is the necessary provision which God made for the orderly and acceptable performance of the duty ceremonial, local, or national. It was a permanent provision for a perpetual duty, both ordained to go together, fitly and inseparably united, into all places and ages of the world. But if singing the psalms were a usage purely Jewish, and so entirely abolished, that we would be no more bound by it than we are by the law of sacrifices, then, on that supposition, what right would we have to sing them at all, or to sing imitations of them, any more than we have to observe holy days and feasts, in imitation of ceremonial days and feasts?

We have thus endeavoured to set forth, in the truth and power of abundant proof from the Bible, that there was for many ages in the church, an ordinance which directed and restricted the worshippers of the true God to sing to his praise the psalms contained in the Book of Psalms. Was that holy institution ever abrogated or altered? Were the commands which guarded and honoured it ever revoked? We shall proceed to prove that they were not, and that consequently, this ordinance stands in its full force and primitive strictness, unaltered by any thing that took place at or after the coming of Christ into the world.

1. Its continuance is recognised in commands given in the New Testament,

"Is any merry? Let him sing psalms." James v. 13. There is but one word in the command, *ψαλμοις*, answering to Zamar, and adequately translated, sing psalms.

We shall examine more largely another command, which is often

appealed to by persons who show that they know very little of its true meaning: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto the Lord." Col. iii. 16. Among those who put contrary constructions on this passage, in its reference to psalmody, there is an agreement in two things.

1. That, by the word of Christ, the Holy Scripture is meant.

2. That "the word of Christ" is, *in some sense*, comprehensive of "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs."

The main point of difference, regards the sense in which the word of Christ is comprehensive of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs; and this is the main point to be determined. One of two things must be true, either the word of Christ contains the very psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs intended, or it contains only the subject of them. The former view would seem the most easy and natural, inasmuch as there were well known parts of the Sacred Scriptures which had the name and nature of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, and which, by divine appointment, had long been in use in singing the praises of God. Still there are those who, in opposition to this, will insist that nothing else is intended, than that the word of Christ contains the subject of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, although they can produce none that were made, nor prove that any such were known of, in the apostles' days. This view represents that this passage requires no more, and determines no more than that the subjects treated of in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, be drawn from the Sacred Scriptures; and that, consequently, there is full warrant here furnished for composing them, and being composed, for singing them. Any one may perceive that this view is *brought* to the text, not *taken from* it; for it does not touch the text until it reaches it, step by step, in a conclusion, from premises which it, in the first place, assumes. The text speaks, not of *making* psalms and hymns, or of their *subject*, but of "*singing*" them. If this command had been enjoined on the Israelites of old, would it ever have entered into their heads, that this command conferred authority, or created any necessity, for them all or for any of them, to make psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, when they were only commanded to *sing*; and the word of God amply furnished them with what they were directed to sing? Let us see how this interpretation will stand, being tested by the passage it pretends to explain. Are all persons who are under the great duty of letting the word of Christ dwell in them, also required to teach and admonish one another in religious poetry—each one to present instructions and admonitions, when occasion required, in the form of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs? Few would have capacity to teach in this way. As a general thing, it would be impracticable. Well, then, the few must compose the psalms, hymns and songs for the many. Be it so. The above interpretation can have no other way to work in practice. But we seriously ask, can it work in this way without interfering with the claims and place of Christ's word itself? Would it not be exalting the writings of men to undue authority, to draw our instructions and admonitions from human hymn books? Would not this be using them in a way calculated to cast the holy word into the shade and back-ground? Instead of using *uninspired* compositions,

as a means of teaching and admonishing, would it not be every way better to use the word itself for this end, and to bring its light and authority to bear directly on the understandings and consciences of those we would teach, rebuke, or warn?

The above interpretation, which makes the psalms, hymns and songs to be poetry, composed by uninspired men, is liable to two special and weighty objections, grounded on the meaning it attaches to "psalms." These objections are:

1. That the word psalm in scripture phraseology never applied to uninspired poetry; and,

2. That, if the psalms here intended are composed by uninspired men, then the genuine Psalms of Scripture are not specified in this passage, and are not particularly mentioned any more than the book of Genesis. Now can an interpretation, which charges such an omission on this text, be sound? What! not mention the inspired psalms at all? No: and besides, those who, if this interpretation were true, would have the privilege of making psalms, are not required to found them on or form them after the inspired psalms, any more than in making hymns and spiritual songs to confine themselves to inspired hymns and songs. But, in making the former, as the latter, they have the whole word of Christ before them, and may make a psalm from the Book of Psalms, or the Book of Job, or any other part just as they may choose; only one limit is set round about them—only one restriction is put on them—the subject must have a scriptural origin. Do not think, reader, that we are spending too much time in pointing out the flaws, of which this interpretation is full in every part of it. You know what a vast and imposing fabric has been reared in the church by man, having its whole foundation in the meaning put on this and a parallel passage. If the foundation be weak, we should know it; if it be very weak, "wood, hay and stubble," we should not build thereon, nor value as sacred what others have built on it. Let us then take another look at it. You will agree with me, that one of two things must be true; either the psalms in this passage are the very psalms contained in scripture, or psalms composed by uninspired men. The latter they cannot be, for reasons already given. Then the scripture psalms alone are meant. The main point is now settled so that it cannot be shaken. The obscuring clouds of a false interpretation are cleared away, and we can see where we are, and where we should be willing always to remain, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms of holy scripture, singing unto the Lord. The Lord would have us, in psalms, as in all other things, to give the preference to what is his own, and we do not believe his faithful Apostle would throw any obstacle in the way of our doing so. Do you think Paul would recommend you to give up the holy poetry that came from heaven, for that which comes from man? Others may do so. Even a Christian poet may come with his fine pious poems, and urge you to sing them before the throne of God. But try him and his poems by the word of God, in the following manner:

*Reader.* What book is this which you recommend me to use in praising God?

*Poet.* It is my book of Psalms and Hymns.

*R.* Why do you call any of them psalms?

*P.* Because I composed them in imitation of the psalms in the Bible.

*R.* But you ought to be sure that you have a good right to call, what you have written, *psalms*.

*P.* I am quite sure of that, for we are required to teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs; which proves that we may compose psalms, as clearly as it proves that we may compose hymns.

*R.* But I see that you have not made your psalms on any other part of the Word of Christ than the Book of Psalms. Now I have always thought, since I knew any thing of what inspiration meant, that the inspired psalms are as good and complete psalms as they can be made, being made by Him than whom none can make a better. Why, then, do you not let them alone, and make psalms, if you are authorized to do so, on some other parts of the Bible which are not psalms already? Why do you confine yourself to the Book of Psalms?

*P.* Well! the reason of that is, that psalms are particularly mentioned by the Apostle.

*R.* So they are. But what psalms?

*P.* Why, the psalms contained in the Holy Scriptures.

*R.* So I think; and therefore, you cannot, by the help of Paul, crowd yours into their place, or with his sanction name them *psalms*. Moreover, this word cannot have in this passage, and in one and the same place in it, two entirely different senses, and have either of them, whenever fancy or theory may choose to leap from one to the other.

What has been said is sufficiently decisive of the sense in which the word of Christ is inclusive of "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs;" and is also equally decisive of the sense in which we are to understand "psalms," in the use we are here directed to make of them in teaching one another, and in praising God. This being determined, it necessarily determines the sense in which the word of Christ is inclusive of hymns and spiritual songs, and also of the sense in which we are to understand hymns and spiritual songs, in the use we are here directed to make of them, in teaching one another and in praising God. The two latter words are closely joined to the former, yea, identified with it under the same circumstances and standing in a common relation with it to the word of Christ, to instruction and admonition, and to praise. Whatever disposal the hand of interpretation makes of the former word, it must go on to make of the others. We are led to the Holy Scriptures for the psalms, and we hear nothing from the lips of our unerring guide, that requires us to look away back to our fellow men for hymns and spiritual songs. How unseemly it would be for the Apostle first to urge us to give open and free house-room in our souls to the word of Christ, holding up distinctly to our view a beautiful part of it, and directing us how to use it for the good of others and to the praise of God, and then, for him abruptly to fly off, leaving no marks by which we might follow him, fly off, we know not whither, to hymns and songs, without informing us whose they are, and meaning at the same time that they are works of man, and that we should use them in the same way, and for the same purpose, that we are to use the psalms of the Lord. No. This is not the manner of the

Apostle, nor do we believe this of him, whoever under heaven may say it.

We are, therefore, directed for hymns and spiritual songs to the scriptures. We will find them where we find the psalms. Some may reply, "we cannot find them there, nor in the Psalm Book which you have recommended so highly." We will explain this. That we may do it more to your satisfaction, we will draw a fit and helpful illustration from your own book, in which there are "Psalms, Hymns," and perhaps in the end, or if not, perhaps in the title page, spiritual songs. These respective names are given to respective parts of the book. Now you know that names are nothing without the things they signify, and are often applied arbitrarily and improperly. So that, in your book, one part may have a name without denoting any thing peculiar to that part different from what there is in the other parts. Let us, therefore, leave entirely out of view their names, and take the contents of the book. Well, then, are not all these pieces, from the first to the last, spiritual songs in your own understanding of them? Yes, they are spiritual songs. Are they not, also, all of them hymns, from the beginning to the end of the book? The question is not, what are they called? but, what are they? Is not a hymn, what is sung in honour of God? They are all hymns, then. Let us go a step farther. As to what you call psalms, have they any thing in the mode in which they are constructed—in the subjects of which they treat—in the arrangement of their parts, or in their style of language, to distinguish them from hymns? If they and the hymns were intermixed, would you, from any thing characteristic in the one different from the other, be able to distinguish them? Would any judge of poetry in the world be able to do it? Can a difference be found where none exists—or a classification be made where there is no difference? Those that are called psalms have nothing internal or inherent to distinguish them from hymns; and, therefore, the latter might be called psalms with as much propriety as the former. Taking, then, your collection as it is, aside from the titles given arbitrarily to the parts into which it is divided; judging, according to what must be your own ideas about it, all it contains are spiritual songs, and they are all hymns—and one a psalm as much as another. In truth and manifest propriety, however, there are no true psalms among them, in the sense in which psalm is taken in this passage. To alter a psalm of the Bible from what the Lord made it, by taking from it or adding to it, by transposing or omitting parts, alters it so essentially, that what the hand of man thus makes, is no more a *psalm* than it is *holy scripture*. If a paraphrase or pretended imitation of a psalm is a psalm, then a poetic paraphrase of any other part of the Bible is that part of the Bible. If an imitation of a psalm is not a psalm in reality, it is improper so to call it. We have thus shown that the advocates of human hymns have not adjusted their system, even to what they allege to be the distinct meaning of the different terms employed in this text, and that they never can adjust it to the true meaning of them.

To find a fit place for the application of these terms within the bounds of holy scripture, it is not requisite to find psalms which are not hymns, or hymns distinct from psalms, or spiritual songs distinct from both: for this plain reason, that all psalms are hymns or praises

to God, and are songs because sung with the voice, and spiritual in their origin, subject, influence and object. All these terms are applicable to one and the same book, as the scriptures are designated by two terms, each of which is applicable to the whole, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to *this word*." Isa. viii. 20. The ancient, authorized Psalter contains what were denominated psalms; all collectively, "the Psalms," each of them singly, a psalm—all hymns or praises, all songs of the Lord. Being psalms, they must from their nature be hymns and spiritual songs. It is useless to search for any thing in the poetic structure or properties of the Hebrew ode, or song of the Bible, to distinguish it specifically from the inspired hymn; or of the inspired hymn as if it was something different from the psalm. Biblical critics have undertaken to do this, but whoever has found any thing perspicuous and satisfactory in the fruit of their labours in this respect, has found what the writer has not found.

II. There are prophecies which can be fulfilled only under the New Testament, and fulfilled only in the continued use of the Psalms.

III. As the Book of Psalms honours the Lord Jesus, the Son of God, our Saviour, so it was signally honoured by him and should, therefore, be esteemed precious and honourable by his followers.

Some justify the use of human hymns, on the ground of its not being forbidden. The Lord directed that the sweet incense should be made of certain specified spices; was not that enough to forbid its being made of any other spices? The Lord requires that water be used in baptism—that bread and wine be used in the eucharist, and what he has thus ordained, includes a prohibition as absolute as it could be made in express words. For if wine be used in baptism, or water in the cup of blessing, the required element is wanting and the sacrament is profaned. So it is the appointment of God, that psalms be sung in his worship. When therefore any thing else, not appointed, is put in their place, they are so far put out of their place, and the ordinance of God so far set aside. Every command of God forbids what is contrary to itself and to its complete and constant observance.

Some persons throw out, "that there is no difference between praying and singing." The assumption is, that there is no difference between praying and singing—the conclusion, that, as we use our own words in prayer, we may in praise: both these must fall together before the force of truth, which shows that there is a material difference between these two duties, as to the outward mode of performing them. We will make a few remarks farther to expose the hollowness of this small tinkling objection which men, in other respects great, are ready to rattle, whenever mention is made in their presence of the claims of the ancient Psalm Book. When they affirm, "we may sing in our own words as we pray in our own words," what do they mean by it? They mean hymns composed by men who inserted their own thoughts in them, and expressed those thoughts in words selected according to their own taste and judgment. Now, is it not plain that they who sing those hymns, do not in fact sing their own words? When there is occasion for prayer, they pray extempore in their own words. But when they sing in praise, they sing out of a book, they sing previously pre-

pared forms. They do not use their own words, any more than they do, who pray by reading out of a Prayer Book. Let their own favourite argument be turned against themselves, and where does it leave them? It leaves them exposed, self-exposed, which is a very foolish act, to all its force, if it had any to exert. "If we have a liturgy in psalms, then we also have a liturgy in prayers. If it be wrong to introduce human composures in psalmody, it is just as unlawful to introduce human composures in prayers." This reasoning may seem to be very good against the old Psalms; but it is really just as good, or rather as bad, against all set forms of praise, or in favour of set forms of prayer; it would throw all hymn books out of the churches or bring prayer books into them all. But there is no such connexion between set forms, or a liturgy in prose, and set forms of prayer. If the ground on which this vaporous objection rests had been any thing else than a marsh, the advocates of the Prayer Book would have much easier work than they now have, in defending its claims to a place before the throne of grace. All churches agree, that previously prepared forms of praise are necessary; but they do not feel themselves bound to adopt forms of prayer also. The question is not, shall we have forms of praise? but the point in dispute is, what are the forms we should use? The Bible directs us to use those contained in the Book of Psalms. But many churches make such forms as suit themselves, and change them when they please. Ask them why they make and use forms at all? They will reply, it is because the Bible has such forms. Then we should adopt those presented to us in the oracles of God, for certain it is we will never be able to make better.

By some, favourable to scripture psalmody, it is strenuously maintained, that there are *other* inspired songs than those contained in the Book of Psalms, and that, therefore, we are not to be *restricted* to that book in singing praise. This argument against the exclusive use of the psalms is very plausible, because it honours inspiration, sanctions the use of the psalms, and professes to exclude all human hymns from the worship of God. What is plausible, however, on any important subject, should be examined. An argument may be smooth-faced, and on that account honestly entertained, and yet have a deceiving heart, unknown to those who befriend it. A sentiment may be fair and fragrant in blossom, and yet contain the germ of great error. It is well said by one of the old writers, in noting "a particular or two of Satan's cunning in affixing an error on scripture," that, "In any grand design of error, he endeavours to lay the foundation of it as near to truth as he can; but yet so that, in the tendency of it, it may go as far from truth as may be. As some rivers, whose fountains are contiguous, have, notwithstanding, a directly contrary course in their streams." This should make us cautious, lest, in entertaining what looks well, we entertain what will yet hurt us by its ill-doing.

The above objection to the exclusive use of the psalms, professes to carry out to a proper extent, the great principle, that we should sing inspired songs only; and charges those against whom it is brought with great inconsistency, and, occasionally, with something worse, because that, while they approve that principle, they will not apply it to songs out of the Book of Psalms.

To this we reply, that the great principle, as stated in the objec-

tion, is not exactly the principle it proposes to carry out, nor is it the great principle of those at whom the objection is aimed. The real principle, which it proposes to carry out and apply, is, that *all* inspired songs should be sung, and no more. The difference, between what it *professes*, that inspired songs only should be sung, and what it would *apply*, that all inspired songs should be sung, is as real as what there is between saying, "We sing only what is inspired," and saying, "We sing all that is inspired." The former, in both cases, we approve; the latter, in both cases, we oppose. We repeat it, the principle, which the objection would press into application, is *one thing*; but the principle, which is applauded and argued about by those who make this objection, is *another thing*. In consequence of their overlooking this difference, they get into confusion themselves, and are the occasion of confusing the minds of some others. Instead of taking it for granted, that the great principle they are really contending for is true, or has been proved by those who are restricted to the Book of Psalms; let them plainly state, that it can be proved from the Holy Scriptures that all the songs in the Bible, in the Psalms and out of them, should be exclusively sung in the church of God. Let this be proved: that is necessary before we can act upon it with understanding and good conscience. Can it be proved? Is the ground taken up by the statement of the principle, more than what the proof will cover? Is it one inch broader than the ground taken up by the principle, in its requiring us to conform our practice to it? Those who plead for the use of the Psalms only, do not undertake to prove that all inspired song, or that inspired song indefinitely, should be sung; but that all inspired songs, *given and ordained by the Lord* to be sung, should be sung. We find that the Psalms only were given for this end; consequently, we sing no others. Our principles require us to go no farther. It is no abstract theoretical principle of obedience to the revealed will of God. If any can prove, that other songs are given to be sung, that such is the will of God, we will sing them.

The indefinite system, in urging us not to confine ourselves exclusively to the Book of Psalms, urges to go from certainty to uncertainty, in a very important matter. It is important that we sing what is Holy Scripture, and also that we sing *those parts* of scripture which are *songs*, given and appointed by the Lord to be sung in his church. As we are not to sing the whole Bible, it is necessary for us to know what those parts are which are songs, and which it is the will of God we should not only read, but sing, with our lips as well as our hearts, in his praise. Now, we *have* this knowledge, with respect to the Book of Psalms. We do assuredly know that all the psalms contained in that sacred book are songs, designed by the Lord for our use in worship. Whatever else is dubious, *this* is certain: whatever else is controverted, this is settled and agreed upon. So far, then, all is clear. Well, then, they who exclusively sing the songs contained in the Book of Psalms, whether they are right or wrong in singing no other, are unquestionably right in singing what they do sing. It may be said they are too restricted; they do not go far enough. Be it so. Still, it must be granted, that, in going as far as they go, they go on sure and open ground, which can be seen in its length and breadth, and in its entire limits set round about by the hand of God. *Here*, then, there



is certainty, on the ground of divine warrant, as to what they *do sing* in divine praise. All this necessary and pleasing certainty we leave behind us, and we enter a region of very great uncertainty, when we follow the guidance of those who advise us to sing "other songs of scripture." For they have not agreed, among themselves, what those other songs are, nor determined upon any fixed rule by which they may be known and ascertained. Their distinguishing tenet, on the subject of psalmody, is, that all songs in the Bible should be sung. Ask them to point out in what parts of the Bible we will find all those songs? They are unable to do it. If they should attempt to make a hymn book, to contain those songs which they say should be sung, would they be able to make it so as to be sure that it contained them all, and no more? *One* might propose to insert in it only the songs which, on different occasions, were *actually* sung; but *another* might propose to insert also those parts which are *called* songs, whether they were sung or not; while a *third* might object to him, that even he acted on a rule entirely too contracted, as it limited the praises of the church to a *part* of the inspired songs, to the exclusion of other parts, and in striking disparagement of a large portion of the precious word of God. He is succeeded by *another*, who learnedly argues, that a large portion of the word of God is written in a poetic style, and, therefore, should be sung, although he does not say what, or how large that portion is. *Here*, then, is a perplexing uncertainty, when they cannot determine what parts are, and what are *not* songs. Why should they urge us, by every thing except a good reason, to carry out a principle, when they cannot tell us where to go with it, or where to stop with it.

But, let a man assume the right to apply the principle spoken of, as his judgment may dictate, in deciding what should be sung, on the assumption too, that he may sing any and every part of scripture to which he may think the principle applicable, and what is the effect? Just this—the ordinance of God, in reference to the psalms, is made of none effect, and passes for nothing. This is the way in which the indefinite system works, to the undermining and undoing of a holy ordinance of God. A man sings "other Scripture songs" than those contained in the Book of Psalms, on the principle that inspired songs should be sung. What does *that* amount to? Just to this—he sings inspired songs, because they are inspired songs. As such reasoning is not very particular, what follows? Why, a large portion of the word of God, such and such parts, are songs because he *thinks* they are. He sings then, what he thinks it is right to sing. He sings *just what he pleases*. This is the sum and end of the whole matter. All this comes from undertaking to do, what a man has no authority nor ability to do. We leave this part of the subject by saying, that the great principle of an inspired psalmody, is one of great importance, and is not left to be taken up by men as an abstract principle, and to be applied and carried out, as they may judge best, in ascertaining and settling what shall be the psalmody of the church of God.

We have no evidence, that other than the psalms were sung in the stated worship of God, for a long period, reaching down to the close of divine revelation. Is there certain evidence, that other songs were at *any time* sung in praise? We think there is no certain evidence of that, contained in the first chapter of Luke. "Elizabeth

was filled with the Holy Ghost, and *spake* out with a loud voice, and *said*," in an address to *Mary*, not to God, "Blessed art thou." "And *Mary said*." It does not appear that either of them sung. Zacharias "*spake* and praised God," that is, blessed God, gave thanks. As "Jesus took bread and blessed," where the same word is used, meaning, he "*gave thanks*," and in both cases it was done in *speaking*, not by singing. "Zacharias prophesied, *saying*." His prophecy is not called a *song*, he uttered it in his ordinary voice.

We must now close; having already gone beyond the limits we at first intended. We have endeavoured, Christian brethren, to present before you the proof we had in view, when we stated, in the beginning, that it is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, that the psalms contained in the Book of Psalms, are the only divinely authorized songs of the church. That proof is the strength, and the conclusion in which it terminates, is the point of this appeal. In handling this proof, weighty and holy as it is, and relating as it does to the high praises of the Lord of Hosts, we have felt our own weakness, and in some degree, our responsibility. We have not handled the word of God deceitfully. What we have said, in an honest and full assurance, we believe. We may be mistaken; but we ask no one to believe what we have said, in fartherance and defence of this ordinance of God, unless he find a better reason for believing, than that man hath said it. What we may say, will soon pass away. But the word of God will stand. The voice of our entreaty, true and sincere as it may be, for his name's sake, like a faint echo, will soon die away, and while it lasts, has nothing to make it heard, but what it receives from above. The voice that speaketh from above, that loudly soundeth near to you, in the word of the Lord, is always the same, self-sustained and abiding. In the voice of his awful authority, there is an appeal, strong, distinct, direct to you, to your understandings, your consciences and hearts. Listen to it.

Thus we have presented our readers with somewhat copious extracts from this valuable production. The importance of the subject must be an apology for their length. We could give nothing more useful to the serious and conscientious inquirer after truth; and all other classes of persons are generally beyond the reach of our pages. May we not hope that through the Divine blessing the weighty considerations urged in these pages will be felt in every section of the Reformed churches, especially in that section with which its respected author is more immediately connected.

---

#### ART. V.—*Ministers of Christ.*

"Compel them to come in, that my house may be filled."—*Luke xiv. 23.*

Is it so that the ministers of Christ have a power and warrant to compel sinners to come to him, that his house may be filled? Hence, see then—1st, That the ministers of Christ, who are sent of him, are clothed with authority; they are, as it were, the mouth of Christ, 2 Thess. ii. 8. They are the stars in his right hand, and co-workers with him. They are Christ's ambassadors; and as God sends Christ, so Christ sends them. They have the keys of the kingdom of hea-

ven put into their hands; and the greatness of their ministerial power is evident from the great charge given to them, Jer. i. 17, 18:—"Gird up thy loins, and arise and speak unto them that I command thee. Be not dismayed at their faces, lest I confound thee before them: for, behold, I have made thee this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls, against the kings of Judah," &c. The power and authority committed to them is that of the Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. v. 4. The greatness of their power is evident from the great challenge they get for not executing their office, and using their authority against seducers and erroneous teachers, Rev. ii. 14, 20. It is evident also from the great glory they are to have from God who faithfully execute the ministerial trust: "They shall receive a crown of righteousness, which fadeth not away," 1 Pet. v. 2, 3, 4. People ought, therefore, to regard their authority; for Christ hath said, "He that despiseth you, despiseth me." 2d, Hence see the enmity of the world against Christ, that they must be compelled to come in to him; and consequently what hard work is that of a gospel minister. If he be faithful to his trust, he cannot but meet with opposition from earth and hell. Ministers must lay their account with the contradiction of sinners against themselves, and of being every where opposed, every where spoken against. If they be faithful, they must be reckoned men of contention to the whole earth; troublers of Israel; and such as turn the world upside down. If their testimony be faithful and honest, it must torment them that dwell upon the earth; and the earth will seek to torment them again, and to kill the witnesses; but they must seek the ruin of Satan's kingdom, and the repairing of Zion's desolations; and the maintaining and defending the truth, however men and devils rage! —*Ralph Erskine.*

---

ART. VI.—"*My son, be wise, and make my heart glad.*"

Proverbs xxvii. 11.

Thy father pleads, my darling boy, let his heart be glad in thee,  
And let thy mother's counsels, a guardian angel be;  
Thy father's God forsake not, nor thy Saviour's love forget,  
When to save thy soul from perishing, the burning wrath He met,  
And quench'd its waves of vengeance, though He sank beneath the  
flood:

For you the Son of God, in death, lies cover'd with his blood;  
On Calvary's hill he suffers; to bless with peace and joy,  
And save from endless anguish, my own, my darling boy.

And can your burning heart but bless, and live upon his love?  
Who stoop'd, my child, to save us, and left His throne above,  
And veil'd his matchless glory in the humble servant's form;  
And bar'd his sinless soul, a curse, to the fury of that storm,  
Which the wrath of God commissioned, for *our guilt* to fall on Him,  
'Till the blood forsook its channels, and the eye in death grew dim,  
That justice might not strike us, nor the wrath of God destroy;  
The *blood of God* was shed for you, for you, my precious boy.

Eternity awaits thee—thy soul, thy deathless soul  
Must live, my child, in bliss or wo, while endless ages roll:

VOL. XVII.—8

O flee from sin, my precious one, and love and serve the Lord;  
 And every day approach His throne, and read his holy word,  
 And pray that He who bled, and died, in anguish on the tree,  
 May wash thy soul from every stain; may save and succour thee:  
 Then, then thy happy parents, as days and years roll on,  
 With swelling hearts, will bless their God, for thee, their darling son.

Remember thy Creator now, give Him thy heart while young,  
 And never let a lie pollute, nor slander stain thy tongue;  
 Be kind to all, and do to all, wherever you may be,  
 As you would wish that they should do, and God would prosper thee:  
 The swearer shun, and all who speak of sacred things in jest,  
 The sabbath-breaker who profanes the day of holy rest;  
 Fools only make a mock at sin, and to punishment pass on:  
 Thou wilt not fear the scorn of such, my faithful, pious son.

Then should disease thy beauteous cheek, my darling little one,  
 Pale in its bloom, and come to tell, thy course will soon be run:  
 That blessed day, (though distant far) we'll hail it even with joy,  
 For, thou'lt enter heaven an angel then, our fair, our gentle boy.  
 But God will spare, thou precious one, thy parent's earthly joy,  
 And thou *canst not* wound their trusting hearts, their peace of mind  
 destroy;  
 But shunning sin, and loving God—*God* will thy guardian be,  
 And still thy parents' hearts will trust, and joying pray for thee.

May God the Saviour bless thee; thy passions all control;  
 From every evil shield thee, and guard thy precious soul;  
 Command the desert of the heart, to blossom as the rose;  
 Be a covert from the tempest, of *all* earth's sins and woes:  
 May the Angel of the covenant, with wisdom thee endow,  
 Spread the wing of mercy o'er thee, set His seal upon thy brow: \*  
 May He bear us all in safety, where, in sweet songs of joy,  
 We shall join in endless praise to God, with thee my darling boy.

MAXTON.

Oct. 2d, 1838.

#### ART. VII.—*The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.*

EDINBURGH, MAY 21, 1840.

THE Supreme Court of the National Church met on Thursday. Lord Belhaven, Her Majesty's Lord High Commissioner to the Assembly, about twelve o'clock, proceeded in his carriage to the High Church, preceded by the Military guard. The Rev. Dr. Duncan, of Ruthwell, Moderator of the last general Assembly, preached from Psalm lxxxv. 6, "Wilt thou not revive us again; that thy people may rejoice in thee?" Public worship having been concluded, his Grace the Commissioner walked in procession to the Tron Church, where the Assembly was constituted with prayer.

#### ELECTION OF A MODERATOR.

The Moderator (of last Assembly) then rose and said, the last Moderator nominated his successor; but there were circumstances which made it his duty to decline exercising the privilege of his predecessors. He would abstain therefore from nominating a successor, leaving the matter entirely to the wisdom of this house.

Dr. Patrick Macfarlane, of Greenock, moved that the Rev. Dr. Alexander Hill be elected Moderator of this General Assembly.

\* Revelation, vii. 3.

Sir C. D. Fergusson seconded the nomination of Dr. Hill.

Principal Dewar proposed as Moderator the Rev. Dr. Angus Makellar.

Mr. Buchan, of Kelloe, seconded the motion.

The vote was taken, when there appeared—

For Dr. Makellar, . . . . .	195
For Dr. Hill, . . . . .	147
Majority for Dr. Makellar, . . . . .	—48

Dr. Makellar having been installed, the commission of his Grace the Lord High Commissioner, and also the Queen's letter, were read, and ordered to be engrossed.

EDINBURGH, MAY 26.—The assembly was occupied to-day exclusively with the consideration of what is called the Strathbogie case, which has been the immediate cause of bringing the Establishment in collision with the civil courts. The circumstances of this celebrated case may be briefly stated. The Rev. Mr. Edwards having been presented to the vacant charge of Marnock, in the Presbytery of Strathbogie, was vetoed under the Act of Assembly, 1834; but the decision of the House of Lords annulling that Act of Assembly having been pronounced in the interval Mr. Edwards applied to the Court of Session for an order upon the Presbytery to induct him into the charge, if found duly qualified. The court found in favour of the presentee, and the Presbytery proceeded to take steps in accordance with that decision. The General Assembly was not sitting at the time; but the Commission of that body invested with a delegated authority, interdicted the Presbytery Strathbogie from proceeding with the trial of Mr. Edwards. The majority of the Presbytery, however, resolved to obey the authority of the Court of Session, whereupon the Commission ordered them to be suspended from the exercise of their pastoral and ecclesiastical functions. Against this decision the Presbytery appealed to the General Assembly.

The discussion was opened by Mr. Patrick Robertson, who appeared on behalf of the suspended clergymen. The Learned Counsel asserted that the Assembly, or the Church, was inferior to the supreme civil courts in matters of a civil kind, and that the interpretation of a disputed law necessarily lay with the latter authority. He warned the Assembly lest they should, by a rash determination, strike a fatal blow at the existence of the Church of Scotland, depending as it did upon its union with the State.

Dr. COOK contending that the Commission of the Assembly had exceeded its powers, and that it had acted rashly and illegally, proposed that the Assembly disapprove of its proceedings, and rescind its decree, ordering the suspension of the majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie.

The Procurator of the church replied to Dr. Cook, and moved that the Assembly approve of the proceedings of the Commission.

A lengthened discussion ensued, which was protracted till eleven at night, when the Assembly divided. On calling over the roll, the numbers stood as follows:

For Dr. Cook's motion, - -	143
For the Procurator's, - -	227

Majority for the Procurator's, 84

Dr. Chalmers spoke for two hours. We have not room even for an outline of his speech. He advised the Assembly to support the veto and reject Lord Aberdeen's Bill. He read, however, a paper which contained the heads of a Bill, to which he thought the Assembly should agree.

#### ART. VIII.—*American Anti-Slavery Society.*

This society held its anniversary meeting in the city of New-York on the 12th of May last, and we insert, as matter worthy of record, an item of its proceedings. It is a singular historical fact, even in this remarkable period of the world. It appears to us a natural illustration of the ultimate tendency and legitimate fruit of all voluntary associations of a moral character. If others think differently, we have no desire to disturb their opinions, and certainly shall not dispute with them.

It was resolved, that a business committee of twelve be appointed, to be nominated by the Chair, and voted upon severally by the society. The President named the following: Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Mass., Chairman; Messrs. Codding, Me., Rogers; N. H., Robertson, Vt., Davis, R. I., A. A. Phelps, and Abby Kelly, Mass., W. L. Chaplin and Lewis Tappan, N. Y., Messrs. Burleigh and Gardner Pa., and Mr. Dennison, N. J. These nominations were approved without special objection by the society, except in the case of Abby Kelly. When the question on her nomination was put to the house, it was impossible to determine whether the ayes or noes had it, though the President promptly decided that she was elected. The decision was doubted, a division called for, and after considerable discussion as to the best method of ascertaining the state of the vote, in the crowded Assembly, when as yet no roll had been completed, the vote was taken by rising, with the following result:

In favor of the nomination	557
Against it	451

Majority	106
----------	-----

It is proper to remark that many, perhaps 150 women, voted in favor of Abby Kelly's appointment, while those females who were opposed to the principle, refused with few exceptions to vote at all.

Mr. Lewis Tappan then declined serving on the committee, and assigned the following reasons against the appointment of females to such duties.

1. It is opposed to the constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society.
2. It is a firebrand thrown in the Anti-Slavery ranks.
3. It is contrary to the usages of all civilized society.
4. It destroys the efficiency of female action in behalf of the cause. He therefore desired to be excused.

Mr. LORING, of Boston, replied to his objections as follows:

1. The Constitution says *all persons*, &c. Therefore Mr. Tappan must show that women are not persons, or his objection is not well founded.

2. If females come here *claiming* their rights, those throw the firebrand who attempt to deprive them of their rights.

3. As to its being contrary to the usages of civilized society, Mr. L. said slavery was according to those usages, but that did not make slavery right. The last objection of Mr. Tappan he did not touch.

Mr. Phelps desired to be excused from serving on the committee, and assigned his reasons:

1. Wm. Lloyd Garrison had said in conversation that he was opposed to this form of female action.

2. This majority has been obtained by females voting in their own case, and by a packed delegation.

3. It is a violation of Scripture propriety, for females thus to take part in the business of the Society.

A new Society has been formed, and a new paper commenced, entitled "The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter." The Constitution of the new Society contains the following Article:

#### ARTICLE VIII.

The meetings of the Society, for the transaction of business, shall consist of its officers, and such other men as may be sent as delegates. Each State or Territory Society, auxiliary to this, shall be entitled to send two delegates, and every local Association, (consisting of not less than fifty members) whether auxiliary to the State or Territory Societies, or to this Society, shall be entitled to one delegate for every fifty members.

#### ART. IX.—General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

THIS ecclesiastical body held its annual meeting on the 21st of May, 1840. We insert below, for future reference, such matters as appear to possess general interest.

No. 2. A memorial from the Presbytery of Miami, praying the Assembly to take some action in relation to the office of deacon, which has sunk extensively into disuse, in the Presbyterian Church.

This subject awakened an animated discussion, some contending that as the subject was before the last Assembly, and they had referred the memorialists to the Constitution, nothing more was necessary. Others contended that in the present state of the church that officer was wholly unnecessary. On the contrary it was urged that the Constitution declares that Deacons as well as Bishops and Ruling Elders are the "ordinary and *perpetual* officers in the church;" that notwithstanding the civil institutions make provision for the management of the temporalities of congregations, and the support of the poor in general, the duty still rests on the church to take care of her own poor, especially her poor widows and orphans, for whose particular guardianship the office was originally instituted: and that to pronounce the office "*unnecessary*" is equally contrary to the constitution of the church and the word of God.

Saturday morning, May 23d, 9 o'clock.—The unfinished business of yesterday was resumed, and after a long discussion, and the proposal of several amendments, the previous question was called for and decided in the negative, and the discussion proceeded, for which, the order of the day was postponed.

The original motion having been amended, was at length adopted with great unanimity in the following form, namely:

Resolved, That it be enjoined upon all the Presbyteries under the care of the General Assembly, to take such order on this subject, as shall secure the appointment of Deacons in all the churches, with the exception of those in which it is impracticable from the paucity of male members.

The report of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton was read; from which it appeared that the number of students at the close of the year was ninety-one; since added, forty-nine; highest number in the year, one hundred and fifteen; present number, one hundred and ten; certificates of having completed the whole course have been given to nineteen.

#### ART. X.—*New School Assembly.*

##### OVERTURE ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

The committee on bills and overtures reported Overture No. 2, namely: Communications from presbyteries to the number of twelve, *on slavery*, and the committee recommend the following preamble and resolution: Whereas the last Assembly received several memorials on slavery which were read, and the matter of them considered at much length, and whereas, after full discussion, the Assembly with great unanimity referred the whole subject of the memorials to the lower judicatories, leaving it to them to take such order thereon as in their judgment will be most judicious and adapted to remove the evil, Resolved, that this Assembly regard the disposal which the last Assembly made of this subject as wise, and that all farther action on the subject by the General Assembly is at present inexpedient.

The report was accepted, and the overture laid on the table.

Overture No. 2, on the subject of slavery, was called up, and Rev. Mr. Leech of Virginia gave notice that he should move the following as a substitute for the preamble and resolution reported by the committee, viz:

Whereas slavery as it exists in the United States, is a subject over which the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has no control or power to legislate, and which was after a thorough discussion by the last Assembly referred to and declared to belong to the inferior judicatories of the church whose local and relative business it is to inspect the moral and religious character and conduct of their own members; therefore, Resolved, That henceforth all memorials and petitions on the subject be considered as inappropriate to the functions and relations of the General Assembly.

The following resolution was then moved and adopted:

Resolved, That the farther consideration of this subject be postponed until Tuesday morning next.

This motion was reconsidered, and Dr. Cox opposed fixing a time for the

discussion of the subject. It would create unnecessary excitement and call together a multitude to hear the debate.

Rev. Mr. Leech of Virginia said, that in offering the substitute which he had proposed, he had no design to go into the discussion of the subject of slavery. In his own state and in his own synod he had freely expressed his views on the subject; but this was not the body to *legislate*. Let those who believed that the General Assembly was a legislative body, go and cast in their lot with those who hold that doctrine. But he held and so did his brethren at the South, that this was a subject over which this body had no control, and there was no alternative left but for the Assembly to put an end to the discussion of the subject of slavery here. It was the only way by which the South can be prevented from a separate organization. They are about to take this step, and he wished the Assembly would act immediately on the matter and dispose of it, that he might write to his friends from Virginia to Florida, that they need not hesitate to send Commissioners to the Assembly, as this subject was now put at rest. He entreated his brethren, as they valued the union of the church, to desist from distracting it with this subject. The abolition movements had put back the cause of religion at the South, twenty years.

Mr. Leech was reminded that he was wandering from the question, which was simply on postponement, and he desisted. The motion was then put on postponement, and lost. Assembly adjourned till Monday morning at 9 o'clock.

*Monday morning, May 25, 9 o'clock.*—Overture No. 2, on the subject of slavery, was on motion taken up. The Moderator in a few exceedingly appropriate remarks admonished the members that they were about to consider a very exciting subject; that they should be cautious in the matter and manner of their observations; bear and forbear with one another, and keep their hearts continually in prayer for the Holy Spirit to guide them to a wise disposal of the subject.

The reading of the memorials was called for, and upon the reading being objected to, considerable discussion was elicited, which was finally arrested by a decision of the house to hear them. Papers were accordingly read from various presbyteries and synods, and after reading,

Mr. Leech again offered the substitute proposed by him on Saturday.

The question was then taken to postpone the resolution of the committee for the purpose of taking up the substitute of Mr. Leech, and was decided in the negative.

The committee on the narrative of the state of religion made a report, which was accepted. On the motion for its adoption,

Mr. GRIDLEY, of the Presbytery of Oswego, wished to inquire why, in the narrative which had mentioned the progress of intemperance, Sabbath-breaking, &c., no notice was taken of the subject of slavery.

Mr. KIRK, the writer of the narrative, replied that he had prepared it on his own responsibility, and that it had been approved by the Committee.

The report was laid on the table.

The subject of slavery being resumed, on motion of Dr. Cox the report of the Committee on bills and overtures which was now before the house, was postponed for the purpose of taking up a substitute which he had prepared. While this substitute was under consideration, on motion of Mr. KIRK the whole subject was indefinitely postponed.

*Wednesday morning, 9 o'clock.*—Rev. Mr. GRIDLEY, of the Presbytery of Oswego, wished to have his dissent entered on the records, from the decision of the Assembly indefinitely postponing the subject of slavery.

Dr. Cox moved that the resolution for indefinite postponement be re-considered. After considerable discussion the motion was carried *unanimously*, and the subject postponed until to-morrow.

The consideration of the subject of slavery being resumed,

Dr. HAY of Geneva moved the following preamble and resolution:

Whereas slavery, as it exists in these United States, is interwoven with the civil polity of those portions of the union where it is found, and on this account renders all ecclesiastical action in relation to slavery by the General Assembly extremely difficult and of doubtful utility; therefore Resolved, that it is inexpedient to take any action in relation to this subject.

Dr. Cox moved to amend by striking out all after the word Resolved, and insert "that any action different from the act of the Assembly of last year be declined by this Assembly."



The amendment was adopted, and the resolution as amended was discussed at great length.

Rev. Mr. SHEDD, of the Presbytery of Marion, moved its postponement, to take up a substitute re-affirming the declaration of the Assembly of 1818, on the subject of slavery, which motion was lost. The yeas and nays on this motion were demanded and refused.

The question now recurring on the motion of Dr. HAY, it was farther discussed by the mover, and Messrs. Beecher, Parker, Gridley and others.

Rev. Mr. Wells, of the Presbytery of Oneida, moved an amendment, inserting the clause that "slavery is in itself a violation of the rights of man, and of the law of God."

The discussion being again resumed, it was farther continued by the mover of the amendment, and Messrs. West and Miter.

Dr. HILL desired to say in a word, that if any brethren were disposed to vote for the motion of Dr. Hay, with the expectation of satisfying the South, they would vote under a misapprehension, as it would not accomplish that object.

Rev. Mr. LEECH confirmed the statement of Dr. Hill, and said that he had introduced a few days since, a resolution embracing the *very least* that would satisfy the South; and if by adopting some resolutions to satisfy the North and West they could conciliate their feelings, he begged the Assembly to adopt such resolutions, and not attempt to please the South unless by taking the ground he had proposed.

Upon this announcement from the South, Dr. Cox moved the indefinite postponement of the whole subject. The yeas and nays on this motion were demanded and refused by the house.

And on the motion to postpone being put, it was decided in the affirmative.

Rev. Mr. Gridley gave notice for himself and others that they should enter a dissent against this decision.

#### *Constitution of the Church.*

The Committee on the "Polity of the Church," reported in part that 53 Presbyteries had voted in favour of so altering the constitution as to make the Synods the ultimate courts of appeal; and 44 had voted in favour of triennial Assemblies. The first proposed alteration was therefore adopted, but the second was still in doubt, as the roll of presbyteries had not yet been adjusted so as to determine the exact number belonging to the Assembly. The committee had leave to sit again.

1. That the overtures sent down to the Presbyteries by the Assembly of 1839, have been affirmed in their responses, all three of them; there being 59 responses in favour of the first overture; 57 for the second, and for the third 44. The number of our presbyteries last year was 85, of which consequently the lowest majority is 43; and this number the committee have therefore assumed as their criterion of the majority, according to the words of the Constitution: see Form of Government, chap. xii. sect. 6.

Thus, this self-styled General Assembly are henceforth to meet *triennially*; other changes were adopted modifying essentially the constitution of the Presbyterian church; "Synods in their own bodies have *final* appellate jurisdiction in the church."

It will also be seen that the chains of the poor slave have been riveted still closer by this ecclesiastical body. This comes with a bad grace from those who two years since affected to condemn the old school Assembly for the sin of slavery. The latter body is indeed guilty of this sin in all its enormity; but their accusers in this instance are no better. It is some consolation to turn from a scene so revolting to humanity and contemplate the action of the Associate Synod on this subject at its recent meeting. The Pastoral Letter addressed to the people within the bounds of the Carolinas, was ordered to be transmitted, if we remember rightly, without a dissenting voice. It is a plain statement of present duty, in difficult circumstances; and more to be regarded than all the sayings and doings of those voluntary societies, which have been founded by the coadjutors of Abby Kelly.

Is it not repugnant to common sense, that voluntary societies generally have their origin in such corrupt ecclesiastical establishments? that such are the elements in which they "live and move?" Are their loud cries in behalf of the oppressed to be regarded, while they continue from year to year in church fellowship with the oppressor? Let these professed friends of the down-trodden African come out and be separate from men-stealers, and then an intelligent community may be induced to believe more in their sincerity. But till they do this, we cannot unite with them in any of their schemes. With these views we rejoice at the course pursued by the Associate Synod; she has purged her own communion. Let others go and do likewise, and our country may yet be delivered from threatened judgments.

---

#### ART. XI.—*General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church.*

This ancient and respectable ecclesiastical body commenced its annual meeting in the city of New York, on Wednesday, the 3d of June, 1840. We extract the following items of business.

*Vacant Churches, and introduction of Ministry from other denominations.* The Committee on Synodical Minutes reported that the Classis of Long Island had presented a reference to the General Synod, requesting some more strict regulations to be adopted relative to vacant Churches, and the introduction of ministers from other denominations; and particularly foreigners, into the Church. The Classis of Paramus also complained of the number of ministers received from the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, to the exclusion of the candidates from our own Seminary. This subject created very considerable debate. A motion was made, at first, to refer it to the Committee on the state of religion. But a great portion of the Synod were desirous to obtain a special committee. After a somewhat protracted discussion, which involved some points of order, the subject was finally referred to a special committee, consisting of the Rev. James Romeyn, Isaac P. Labagh, and John C. Cruickshank, and the Elders Wilhelmus Schuneman, and Isaac Cortelyou.

It may not be improper to state that this subject recently called forth an excited and not very courteous discussion between Professor McClelland of New Brunswick, and Dr. Brownlee of New York, which was checked by a refusal of the Christian Intelligencer to continue the insertion of their papers.

The Order of the Day for this afternoon, was the appeal taken by the Classis of Orange for the decision of the Particular Synod of Albany, reversing their proceedings in the case of the Rev. Samuel Van Vechten. This case was accordingly taken up. The Chair announced that the Synod was about to proceed to the consideration of judicial business, and enjoined upon the members to regard their character as judges in the highest court of Jesus Christ on earth, known to the Reformed Dutch Church.

We insert the above merely to express our approbation of the usage here recorded. It should never be omitted. We have often admired the dignity, gravity, and good order which usually distinguish the proceedings of this body. Ecclesiastical courts should be more grave than the civil, while the reverse is often lamentably true. The decisions of such courts depend as much, perhaps, upon their manner of proceeding as upon their justice. If attended with levity, haste, or disorder, they lack that moral grandeur which in reality constitutes their binding obligation, and secures the confidence and obedience of the community.

**Widow's Fund.**—The Standing Committee on this subject now brought in their report. This excited considerable interest in the Synod. Several amendments were proposed and adopted, and after a full discussion the report was finally adopted, and is as follows:

The committee to whom was referred so much of the report of the Board of Directors of the Incorporation as relates to the fund for the relief of disabled ministers, and the widows and children of deceased ministers, submit the following report:

The importance of making some provision for disabled ministers, or in case of their death for their widows and children, was a subject which occupied the attention of the General Synod years ago. Several attempts were made to provide some source of income for them when their former regular means of support failed; but either for the want of a well digested plan or indifference and lukewarmness to the subject itself, the measure was relinquished, and for many years nothing more was heard of the matter than the annual announcement of the Lemma "Widow's fund," accompanied with the declaration nothing occurred. The year 1836 formed a new era in the history of this fund, the General Synod then appointed a committee, to digest some system on which the said fund might be permanently established and safely administered, and which would recommend itself to the confidence of pastors and churches of our denomination. The report of said committee, drawn up with much care, was submitted to the Synod of 1837, and after a full discussion and most careful examination of its principles and details, was sent down to all the Classes, that a fuller expression of the view of the whole church both as to the expediency of providing some mode of relief, and basis on which that relief should rest might be obtained. The action of the various Classes, as appears from the Minutes of 1838, was of such a character as to induce the Synod of that year to believe that the plan submitted had met with their decided approbation and would be generally popular; on which ground they unhesitatingly adopted it as the mode best calculated to attain the object, and recommended it to all the pastors and churches.

The present amount of this fund, which is chiefly invested in safe security, is about \$5000, of this amount about \$1,500 have been received from subscribers, the remainder from donations and collections in the churches. While in some parts of the church both pastors and people have manifested a deep interest and a commendable liberality in this matter, in other parts it seems to have been entirely neglected.

It is presumed that few if any cases exist at present in which the widows or children of deceased ministers are in a suffering state, and perhaps none may occur until after the capital sum of the fund shall have reached the amount specified to render it available to the subscribers. Your committee deem it of great importance that this object should be obtained as soon as possible, and therefore would propose to Synod the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*,—That it be earnestly recommended to the ministry of our churches to inquire whether they are not called upon by considerations of interest to themselves as well as of duty to their brethren and to their families to obtain an interest in this fund by the payment of the annual subscription.

2. *Resolved*,—That this Synod appoint one minister from each Classis to be nominated by the delegates from said Classis, whose duty it shall be to present this subject to all the churches within their respective bounds, and collect contributions, and report to this Synod at its next stated meeting.

3. *Resolved*, That this plan of relief be recommended to all our Consistories and people as entitled to their confidence and liberal aid, and deserving of a place among the various other benevolent institutions of our day.

All which is respectfully submitted,

J. P. LABAGH, Chairman.

The committee to whom was referred the resolutions of the Classes of Paramus and Long Island, respecting the introduction of Foreign Ministers into the Reformed Dutch Church, respectfully report, that they recommend that the following resolutions should supersede all previous legislation, and be the sum of their enactments on the subject.

1. *Resolved*, That no licentiate or ordained minister from any other ecclesiastical body, shall be received into any Classis until they shall have been fully satisfied either by documentary evidence or examination of his competent literary qualifications; and by an examination, in all cases, in the presence of a

*deputatus*, they shall also become fully satisfied of his Theological attainments, his piety, soundness in the faith, and ability to teach, and shall have received his entire assent to the standards of our Church as to doctrine and discipline.

2. *Resolved*, That if any candidate or minister applying for admission into any Classis, shall, in the judgment of Classis, have sought and obtained licensure or ordination from any ecclesiastical organization for the sake of an easier admission into our Church, than upon the same terms enjoined upon our own students at New Brunswick, it shall be considered a disqualification—to be removed only by a dispensation from the General Synod.

3. *Resolved*, That no licentiate shall be received as a candidate under the care of Classis, or be privileged to minister in or receive a call from our Churches; unless he shall have spent the same amount of time in actual attendance upon theological instructions that is required from our own students; and any deficiency in this respect shall be made up by study at our own Seminary.

4. *Resolved*, That it be enjoined upon the Standing Committee on Doctrine, in the several classes, when a vacancy occurs, to send to such vacant Church immediately a list of the licentiates of our own Seminary; and that they use their endeavours to procure for them an early hearing; and that it be recommended to the Consistory of our vacant Churches, in all cases, promptly to endeavour to obtain their services.

5. *Resolved*, That whenever a church becomes vacant, it shall be the duty of the Classis to exercise guardianship over it; and when requested by the Consistory to supply it as far as practicable by their personal services,—thus preventing the disorganizing influences of casual and indiscriminate ministrations, and that they maintain such a supervision over it, and minister such aid as is necessary to carry out the above resolutions; and such as a destitute Church is entitled to claim from its very relations.

6. *Resolved*, That no foreign minister be received on mere private letters of introduction or recommendations, but that in all cases, full ecclesiastical certificates shall be required.

7. *Resolved*, That no foreign minister shall be received by any Classis until he shall have undergone a probation of one year under the care of a Classis, and shall then present the same testimonials, and undergo the examination required by the first of these resolutions.

8. *Resolved*, That these resolutions be inserted in some conspicuous place in the minute books of the respective classes.

Respectfully submitted,  
JAMES ROMEYN, *Chairman*.

A letter from the Rev. John T. Presley, D. D., and the Rev. William Wilson, acting in behalf of a convention of Reformed Churches, together with a copy of the minutes of that body, have been placed in the hands of your committee. From these documents it appears that the convention in question, is composed of delegates from the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, the Associate Reformed Synod of New York, and the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; that the object of it is to “devise measures for the promotion of the unity of the Church of God upon scriptural principles,” and that this Synod is affectionately invited to take part by delegation, in its deliberations.

By a reference to the minutes of 1838, it will be seen that this subject was at that time under consideration in Synod, and that it was deemed expedient to decline the invitation then received, to mingle in the deliberations of this convention. The ground of this determination on the part of Synod at that time, appears to have been that they were not in possession of that information on the subject which was requisite to intelligent action.

Your committee are of opinion that the same difficulty still exists. The precise object contemplated, cannot be ascertained from the documents before us, neither does there appear to be any radical principles assumed affording a well ascertained and common basis for ulterior action. Until these points are definitely and authoritatively settled by the judicatories composing the convention, there is, in the judgment of your committee, but a faint prospect of any beneficial results flowing from its deliberations.

Your committee would, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That while this Synod fully appreciate the kindness and respect evinced toward them on the part of the convention of Reformed Churches, by

their affectionate invitation to this body to unite in their deliberations they do not feel prepared, with their present views on the subject, to accord to the wishes of their brethren.

**Colonization.**—The following preamble and resolution, on the subject of efforts for colonizing the free people of colour, were proposed and adopted by an almost unanimous vote of the Synod:

Whereas this Synod, in the expression of our sympathies for the suffering Africans, have uniformly signified our approbation of the object and plan of operation of the American Colonization Society, devoutly desiring its prosperity, and commending its claims to the serious consideration and charitable efforts of the churches in our communion: and whereas, in addition to the prosperity with which God, in his holy and gracious providence, has crowned the efforts of that Society, there appear at this time increased encouragements and calls for labour in this cause: Therefore,

**Resolved,** That the subject be, and is hereby earnestly recommended to our churches, for their special attention and efforts; that our ministers be requested to solicit their congregations to contribute in aid of the American Colonization Society, on Sabbath, the 5th of July next, the day succeeding the Anniversary of our National Independence, and to promote this benevolent enterprise according to their ability, in such other ways as opportunity may offer.

## XII.—*Horrors of the Slave Trade.*

When will the horrors of this traffic be fully disclosed! When will the wrath of heaven cease to slumber, or the energies of earth be roused, to put an end to it for ever! The Cape of Good Hope Shipping List, received by the last arrival, contains the following dreadful account of the suffocation of *seven hundred* human beings, fastened in the hold of a slave ship, that they might be kept quiet during a gale!—*N. Y. Obs.*

"The last accounts from the Mozambique, state that two slavers, one a ship and the other a brig, were wrecked in Mozambique harbour during a hurricane from the south-east, but the crews of both, and 200 slaves on board the brig, were saved. The ship had arrived the preceding day, and had not taken in any slaves. It was reported of the brig, which was commanded by a Spaniard, that she originally had on board nine hundred slaves, but during a hurricane (in the prosecution of her voyage) the hatches were battened down, and on opening them after the hurricane had subsided, it was discovered that 300 of the slaves had died from suffocation and want of food. The gale re-commenced, the hatches were battened down a second time, the consequence of which was an additional 300 slaves perished from the same causes, and 100 of the remaining 300 slaves died on the passage to Mozambique harbor, whither she repaired for the purpose of getting a farther supply."

**SCRIPTURAL PREACHING.**—From an article in the London Eclectic Review, respecting publications on preaching, we extract the following thoughts, to which we invite particular attention. The writer says:

"Whatever may be the merits of the more recent of these publications—and that they have merit, we are abundantly willing to admit—there is one error pervading all of them; an error, we believe, of the most fatal consequence—and one which must be opposed and successfully exposed, if we ever expect to see the preaching of the gospel of Christ possess that high character of instrumentality for which it was intended in the designs of its Great Author: and that error is the general, and, in many cases, the entire omission of serious exhortation to young ministers, on the indispensable necessity of acquiring the genuine meaning of that book which they profess to explain. We are deeply and painfully convinced that ignorance of the mind of God in the Scriptures, is the sin of a great majority of Christians; that our congregations are distressingly uninformed of the meaning of that language which God has addressed to their understandings—and that there are popular and eloquent discourses spoken in our places of worship on the Sabbath-day, and which receive the plaudits of admiring crowds, which contain no attempt to explain the portion of truth on

which they are professedly grounded—and which, while they abound in meretricious eloquence, and in all the figures of artificial oratory, leave the hearers deplorably deficient in clear and enlightened views of that which is the alone work for which the ministry was originally appointed—the testimony of truth. We speak it in sorrow, and with a distinct conviction how disagreeable such an avowal must be to many whom we love; but we give it as our solemn and heart-felt conviction—*the word of God is but rarely explained in the pulpit, and hence it is but little understood by our people.* We have listened to much admired pieces of hortatory eloquence in the pulpits of the metropolis, to addresses in which the most jejune views of the word of God have been brought forth; and because they were brought forth in a cloud of sesquipedalian words and lofty imagery, the penury, or occasionally even the distortion of sense in the exegesis has been forgotten amidst the admiration which has been lavished on the medium of its conveyance.”

---

**MATTER AND MANNER IN PREACHING.**—Charnock thus distinguishes between the truth and the style in which it is set forth—a distinction which the ministers of Christ should never forget:

“No man is renewed by phrases and fancies, those are only as the oil to make the nails of the sanctuary drive in the easier. Words then must be to make things intelligible; illustrations to make things delightfully intelligible, but the seminal virtue lies not in the husk and skin, but in the kernel, the rest dies, but the substance of the seed lives, and brings forth fruit; separate, therefore, between the husk and the seed. The word does not work as it is elegant, but as it is divine, as it is a word of truth. Illustrations are but the ornaments of the temple, the glory of it is in the ark and mercy seat. It is not the engraving upon the sword which cuts, but the edge; not the key, as it is gilt, opens, but as fitted to the wards. Your *“faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,”* 1 Cor. ii. 5: it is the juice of the meat, and not the garnishings of the dish, that nourishes. Was it the word as a pleasant song, or as a divine seed that changed the souls of old, made martyrs smile in the midst of flames? It was the knowledge of the excellency of the promise and not worldly eloquence made them with so much courage slight gibbets, stakes, and executioners; they had learned the truth as it is in Jesus.”

---

**TO CORRESPONDENTS.**—It is necessary to caution some of our contributors against a careless manner of writing. Articles are occasionally forwarded for insertion so illegibly written, and even in some instances so ungrammatical and badly spelled, that it is nearly impossible to print them with any tolerable degree of accuracy, without the thankless drudgery of re-writing. It is hoped this hint will relieve the compositor from much needless embarrassment and loss of time, by a remedy of the evil. Many persons think it unfair to be excluded from our pages, whose productions are totally unfit for public inspection in the form in which they reach us. These remarks are not intended to apply to occasional oversights; consequently it is not anticipated that writers of general accuracy will apply them personally.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

AUGUST, 1840.

---

ART. I.—*Notes of a Sermon transcribed at the request of some who heard it preached.*

PART I.

“Honour the Lord, with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase: So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.”—Prov. iii. 9, 10.

THE Lord or Jehovah is “honoured” when his statutes and ordinances are observed in a *right manner* and from *right motives*. Indeed all true religion may be said to consist in obedience to God. Thus Solomon summed it up after all he had seen, and all he had said or written—“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter—fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole of man.” (Eccl. xii. 13.) The one having a respect to the *motive*, the other to the *rule* of our obedience. “The commandment of God” is the rule of all right obedience, and “the fear of God” the motive. That obedience which is honouring to God, is also always profitable to those who yield it. For God has said, “Them that honour me, I will honour.” (1 Sam. ii. 30.) God has required no service of his people, but what he will abundantly and liberally recompense, “either in the life that now is, or that which is to come.” “God said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain.” (Isa. xlv. 19.) All requisitions of obedience are accompanied with promises of corresponding blessings. This principle is clearly recognised in our text. We are farther taught in these words, that there is a use of our worldly substance which is peculiarly honouring to God. It is doubtless honouring to God, though more indirectly, when we apply our worldly substance to its proper natural use, as when we use it for the comfort of our bodies, either in the way of nourishment or clothing. Because this is manifestly according to the mind of God. And it is equally manifest that we *dishonour* God, when we abuse our worldly substance by spending it in the gratification of sinful lusts or appetites—because this is contrary to his will. But the “honouring of God with our substance and the first fruits of our increase,” spoken of in our text, is direct, when our substance is appropriated and applied according to some special command of God; as, when the people under the Old Testament dispensation paid their prescribed “tithes and offerings.”

I. The first doctrine which we propose from our text is,—“That God requires a portion of the worldly substance of his professing people to be appropriated to religious uses, and for the support of

religious ordinances," and God is *honoured* when this requisition is obeyed in a right manner, and from proper motives.

This requisition is not confined to either dispensation of the church's existence. Tithes were paid, at least, by Abraham and Jacob, and probably by others, before the giving of either the ceremonial or judicial laws, (Gen. xiv. 30; xxviii. 22;) which shows its morality and obligation, independent of the positive enactments of the ceremonial law. The truth of our proposition will appear, when we consider,

1. The offerings appointed in the laws of Moses. Of these there were three stated kinds, which formed the principal support of those who ministered in religious things, and furnished a large proportion of the materials necessary to the external worship in the tabernacle or temple service. These were—

1. The first fruits of the produce, both of the ground and of the animals.

Under this law, even the first born of the sons of the members of the Old Testament church were devoted in the same way, and must be redeemed with some substitute suitable to be offered in sacrifice. "Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors, [wine and oil:] the first born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me. Likewise shalt thou do with thine oxen and with thy sheep: seven days it shall be with his dam; on the eighth day thou shalt give it me." (Exod. xxii. 29, 30.) In our text it is said, "the first fruits of *all* thine increase." In the revival of religion which took place in the days of Nehemiah, this ordinance of the offering the first fruits is very particularly set forth. Speaking of the measures that had been taken, to have this part of the service regularly attended to, he says, "And to bring the first fruits of our ground, and the first fruits of all fruit of all trees, year by year, unto the house of the LORD: also the first born of our sons, and of our cattle, as it is written in the law, and the firstlings of our herds, and of our flocks, to bring to the house of our God, unto the priests that minister in the house of our God, and that we should bring the first fruits of our dough, and our offerings, and the fruit of all manner of trees, of wine, and of oil, unto the priests, to the chambers of the house of our God, &c." (Neh. x. 35—37.)

That these offerings of the first fruits belonged to the perquisites of the priest's office and Levitical service, appears from several references to the institution. "And this shall be the priest's due from the people, from them that offer a sacrifice, whether it be ox or sheep; and they shall give unto the priest the shoulder, and the two cheeks, and the maw. The first fruit also of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the first of the fleece of thy sheep, shalt thou give him. For the LORD thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes, to stand to minister in the name of the LORD, him and his sons for ever." (Deut. xviii. 3—5.) The same allowance was also made to the Levite, from any place in Israel, that came "with all the desire of his mind unto the place which the LORD should choose;" and this he was to have "beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony," (v. 6—8;) for he might also have a patrimony.

Again; it is expressly said to Aaron and his sons, "And this is thine: the heave-offering of their gift, with all the wave-offerings of



the children of Israel: I have given them unto thee, and to thy sons and to thy daughters with thee, [for the support of their families,] by a statute for ever. . . . . All the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, the first fruits of them which they shall offer unto the LORD, them have I given thee. And whatsoever is first ripe in the land, which they shall bring unto the LORD, shall be thine; every one that is clean in thy house shall eat of it. Every thing devoted in Israel shall be thine. Every thing that openeth the matrix in all flesh, . . . . . whether it be of men or beasts, shall be thine: nevertheless, the first born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem." (Num. xviii. 11—15.)

The religious exercises which were appointed to accompany the offering of the first fruits, and which must have proved interesting and solemn, we have recorded, Deut. xxvi. 2—11.

2. Tithes formed another principal item, required under the Old Testament dispensation for the support of religion. The tithes consisted of the tenth part of all the produce of the ground, but was chiefly collected of the corn, wine, and oil, the three staple productions of the land of Israel. There appears to have been three kinds of tithes, or tithes for three different purposes.

1st. For the Levites for their maintenance, and that of their families. "Behold, I have given the children of Levi, all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service, which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation. . . . . But the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as a heave-offering unto the LORD, I have given unto the Levites to inherit." (Num. xviii. 21—24.) This tithe appears to have been required, year by year, or annually, as we would say. As mention is made of the tithe being paid "every third year," which is called "the year of tithing," (Deut. xiv. 28, and xxvi. 12; also Amos iv. 4,)—some have supposed that there were no tithes collected only every third year; but it is expressly said, Deut. xiv. 22, "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth *year by year*;" and in the next verse it is said to be the "tithe of the corn, the wine, and the oil;" and from passages already quoted, it appears that these were the things which were especially appropriated for the priests and the tabernacle service.

2nd. There was a tithe for the poor and the stranger. This tithe appears to have been required every third year. Deut. xiv. 28, 29, and xxvi. 12. This was not to be brought to the place where the LORD should choose to put his name, but "to be laid up and eaten within their gates," as is evident from the passages referred to, and of this, "the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow" were to partake.

3d. There was also a *tithe* which must not be eaten within the "gates," or private dwellings of the Israelites; but must be eaten in the place where the LORD should choose, this was to be eaten by the whole household, son, daughter, man-servant, and maid-servant, and the Levite that might belong to the household. (Deut. xii. 17, 18.)

All these are, besides a tithe of the tithes, paid to the priests by the Levites, (Neh. x. 38,) and used for the heave-offering. (Num. xviii. 26.) And all were contributed, according to the Divine appointment, by the people, and were stated, besides the numerous free

will or voluntary offerings which were continually presenting. These were all required by God, and the people were enjoined to be punctual in paying, in order, as it is often expressed, "That the Lord might bless them," and "That they might learn to fear the Lord their God always." (Deut. xiv. 22—29.)

3. The third source from which provision was made for the stated support of religious ordinances appointed under the Old Testament dispensation, was, what may be called the *poll* tax, of half a shekel, equal to about twenty-seven cents. (Exod. xxx. 11—16.) This was paid by every male Israelite, twenty years old and upwards, and was not varied on account of the circumstances of the people; the rich might not pay more, nor the poor less.

Besides these stated appropriations for the support of the religious institutions of the Jews, there was a large amount contributed in the way of "voluntary offerings," for the giving and disposing of which, appropriate directions were given in the law.

These observations show, that so far as it regards the Old Testament dispensation, the truth of our proposition is abundantly clear. And it also appears from the passages of Scripture quoted, that the ordinary objects for which these contributions were required, were,—the maintenance of those who served at the altar—for relieving the wants of the poor—and for furnishing the materials necessary for the external worship of God, under that dispensation.

To complete the proof of our proposition, it is necessary to show;

2. That the design of these requisitions is carried out under the New Testament dispensation.

Before referring to passages of the New Testament directly confirmatory of our proposition, I would invite attention to the following considerations:—

1. We nowhere find, in the New Testament, a revocation by Christ or his apostles, of the Old Testament regulations and usages, for the support of religion and religious institutions. The inference, then, is, if they are not revoked, or in some authoritative way repealed, they are still in force, at least so far as is necessary for the support of, and in accordance with the spirit of the New Testament institutions. But our Lord did not appear even to disapprove of the conduct of the pharisees in paying tithes of the produce of their gardens. He censured and reproved them for their hypocrisy, in being so scrupulously exact in those articles of which the tithe had not formerly been exacted, and neglecting the weightier matters of the law. "Wo unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." (Matt. xxiii. 23.)

2. The same objects, or at least two of the ordinary objects, for which the contributions under the Old Testament were required, still exist,—namely, the maintenance of those, whose time is required in attending upon the public services of religion—and the relieving of the wants of the poor. The other object, namely, victims for the stated and daily sacrifices, &c., does not exist under the New Testament dispensation. But houses and other accommodations for the public worship of God, are necessary now; so that although there may be some change in the nature of the objects, requiring provision, under the present dispensation, yet neither their number nor necessity are removed.

3. Whenever there was a genuine revival of true religion under the Old Testament dispensation, a conscientious regard was paid to the requisitions of the law in providing for religious uses, and an increased spirit of liberality manifested by the people. As was the case in the days of Jehoiada, the high priest and regent, during the minority of King Joash, (2 Chron. xxiv.) and in the days of King Josiah, (2 Chron. xxx. iv.) also in the time of Nehemiah.—And why may not a similar spirit be expected, whenever there is a true revival under the New Testament dispensation? No good reason, it is believed, can be given why it should not.

But the following passages seem clearly to show that the design of the Old Testament institutions for the support of religion is fully carried out under the new. When Christ sent forth the twelve Apostles to visit, and to preach the gospel throughout the cities of Israel, he said to them, "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves, for the workman is worthy of his meat." (Matt. x. 9, 10.) With this also accords the language of the Apostle Paul, "Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? And they who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel, should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.) The Apostle, for special reasons in his case, did not avail himself of that to which he had a right, according to this principle; yet he would not suffer his practice in this particular to be afterwards pleaded as a precedent; but he expressly asserts his right, though he did not choose to claim it, on that occasion, (v. 12.)

Again; "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." (Gal. vi. 6.) These passages together with another which might have been sooner referred to, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," (Luke x. 7,) are sufficient to show that it is the mind of God, that his professing people should contribute, out of their worldly substance, whatever is necessary to support, in a becoming manner, the public institutions of religion.

That the necessities of the poor are to be relieved, and that it is a Christian duty to contribute of our worldly substance for this purpose, is abundantly plain, from the whole tenor of Scripture. There are, however, several passages, worthy of particular notice, in connexion with this part of our subject. "He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given, will he pay him again." (Prov. xix. 17.) Here the duty is enjoined, and the promise annexed to it, in a place and manner which is not peculiar to either dispensation. But we have several passages in the New Testament, strongly inculcating the same duty, where it may have respect to the necessities of the saints, in things either temporal or spiritual. Paul thus writes to the Corinthians: "Now, concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) From other passages evidently referring to this same collection, it appears that it was for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and may have been designed to aid them, either as to their temporal wants, or to provide for their spiritual privileges.

In his second epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle again alludes to the subject, (chap. ix. 1—5,) and having commended their readiness and liberality in their former contribution, made another call upon them for a similar purpose. And added (v. 6, 7,) the following consideration as an inducement to liberality, “But this I say, He which soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.” (See also to the same purpose, chap. viii. 11—15.) The contributions here spoken of were evidently voluntary, like the free will offerings, hence the Apostle does not undertake to prescribe what each one, or any one should give. He, however, lays down this rule as to the sum to be given, “Let each one give as the Lord hath prospered him,” and as to the manner or spirit with which it is to be given,—“According as he purposeth in his heart, so let each one give; not grudgingly, or of necessity.

---

ART. II. *Address on Foreign Missions before the Associate Society of Inquiry. By the President of the Society. Canonsburg, March 24th, 1840.*

[Concluded from page 68.]

Viewing matters as they now are in the church, could not something be done immediately for the destitute? Could not some one of the thirty-four settled pastors, who have charge of one congregation only, be so disposed of, as to be released without serious injury done to the people, and set him apart to a foreign field? What joy would such a movement impart to the friends of God and man? to see an inroad begun to be made upon those parts of Satan's empire, which have been for ages held under his absolute control. And if a change could be effected in one instance, certainly in one or two more. Then we might behold the star of our hopes, the lethargic spell broken, the frigid apathy, which has congealed the souls of Seceders would *begin* to relent, and a free circulation of Christian philanthropy commenced through all parts of the body. This, in our humble opinion, might be effected without any perceptible derangement of the present state of things or loss to the church at home.

But the objection that we have not men, and therefore cannot enter upon the work of foreign missions *now*, appears to be sophistical in the extreme. How do we *know* we have not men? Have any efforts been made to obtain them? Suppose our country were invaded by a foreign foe, rapine and murder spreading on every hand, and to the suggestion, that we should rise in defence of our country, it were objected, that no soldiers are in the field, no army is martialled, no arms, no ammunition, no loaded cannon, lying in front of the enemy,—would the objection be worthy of a second thought, or could any thing appear more ridiculous? Only let the word of the commander go forth speedily, and let men know the danger of the country, hosts of volunteers will instantly throng the field. Precisely parallel is the case of the church; her chartered possession embraces the *whole world*, not a single point is unoccupied by the arch enemy of man. Let the church know the desolate

condition of the Lord's heritage; let all determinately begin to do what they can, and, as in every other undertaking, *demand*—and the *supply* will be found to correspond. Do we anticipate a period when hundreds and thousands of men will be found prepared for enlightening the heathen, without starting the idea that the heathen stand in *need* of light, or, that illumination is the work of the church, when men will spring up as by enchantment, to a work to which they have not been previously called? Vain delusion! let the church lay to heart the important work, of extending the gospel throughout the world; let the great idea "*all the world*" be carefully instilled in every mind. It is *necessary* that a motive of such magnitude, should always be in the mind, in order to procure the required action; and the most earnest, and indefatigable exertions, will be found necessary to correspond to the idea of Christianizing *all the world*. Let ministers and people stir up each other; let them ponder and gaze upon the moral waste, yet extending itself over more than two-thirds of the globe. Let them bear in mind the worth of the soul, constitutionally destined, to eternal bliss or eternal wo, and that the blood of every soul, to which it is *possible* for us to extend the knowledge of the Saviour, will be required at our hand. Let these things be regarded according to their incalculable importance, and the most formidable barrier to the spread of the gospel is at once removed. This is the way *God gives the word*, and great *then* is the company of them who publish it. We certainly deceive ourselves, if we expect any miraculous call to the work; if we wait for God's goings in the mulberry trees, for the levelling of mountains, or any supernatural intimation of the time when we must begin. We have no ground to believe that God will give the word in any extraordinary manner. He has already given it. From the day of Pentecost until the present day, there has not been a moment when the command to *evangelize the world* was not obligatory on the church; nor will there ever be such a moment, until the isles of the ocean, and every corner of the habitable world shall see the "salvation of our God." The whole is to be done through this mean instrumentality; and if that be not exercised in active and implicit obedience to the commands of God, a change must be effected in his moral government. With the faithful exercise of means, the blessing flows: this is the concurrent testimony of scripture: "Why criest thou unto me? bid the children of Israel that they *go forward*," saith God to Moses. "Why do ye sit still? Assemble yourselves, and let us go into the defenced cities," saith Jeremiah to the lamenting Jews. "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, and prove me now therewith," saith Malachi to the church, blighted and withered for want of reviving showers from heaven." All so many infallible witnesses, testifying to this important truth, *that nothing is impossible to those who go on courageously to the performance of duty, in the name and in the strength of the Lord God.*" The mountains shall be brought low, the valleys exalted, the Euphrates dried up, and the way of the kings of the east prepared in the *same* way, by the *same* instrumentality. If proper means are used, there will be no lack of supply: let the youth of our congregations be made to understand the *orders* of the Captain of our salvation; let them see that his heritage, according to stipulation, is in the hand of the enemy. Open to them the extensive field of action; impress upon them the

duty of *implicit* obedience to their general's high command, and volunteers will be plentifully found. We feel constrained to remark, also, in connexion with this subject, that in our humble opinion the *mode* of preparing young men for the ministry, and for missionary operation, might be greatly improved. Let it not be anticipated, however, that we would favour a superficial course of preparation. No; but to remedy that evil, at present too prevalent everywhere. We think it not necessary that pious young men in devoting themselves to the ministry, should study three years, to become heathens, and then four more, to become Christian again, as a *sine qua non* of ministerial preparation. That the Apostles were well acquainted with scripture is evident from all their writings; but whether or not they had read Horace, and the canonized course of heathen authors, is not so clearly revealed.

But it is doubtless the duty of the church to see that men are prepared for the ministry, and to take measures which will effectually secure that end. As a general rule, it will be found that the most profitable men in the church are such as are raised in the poorer class of professors. Not many noble, or rich young men are called to this work, and the poor by reason of poverty are frequently kept back. To remedy this evil, is certainly the most imperative duty of the church: but more of this again.

We come now to look at the *means*, by which, we say, the church is *able to begin* to send the gospel abroad. If ever there was a time in Christendom, when the want of means could have been plausibly pleaded as a reason for restraining the gospel from the heathen, that time was the time of the Apostles;—few in number, and many of them, like their master, *destitute* of worldly goods. We are aware, however, that this fact has been abused, much to the dishonour of Christianity, being taken to prove that ministers should always preach without support from the people. This would still be true, under the same circumstances; namely, before the people among whom they labour, come to *know the worth* of the gospel. But when they come to know this, the difference between spiritual things and things that perish with the using, they will embrace as an *ordinance* of God, the *privilege* of supporting those who serve at the altar.

In entering upon this point, we are aware of encountering opposition. Here lies the *besetting* sin of the age. Mammon has taken such root in the church, that we almost despair of ever seeing its removal. It has not only taken deep root, but has grown to a most formidable size; like the tree which Nebuchadnezzar saw in his vision, its height reaches to heaven, and the branches thereof to the ends of the earth. Mammon has always been the sin of the world, of such as have their part only in the present life: but it has become most emphatically the sin of the church. And if the charge may be brought against any branch of the church in particular, that branch is our own. We do not bring this charge reproachfully against our own people: no! but we regard it as a *painful truth*, which behooves to be told, in order that it may be remedied. A truth, too, which is easily accounted for. Numerous benevolent associations have sprung up in other branches of the church around us, which either in their nature, design, or some other circumstance necessarily connected with them, we consider unwarrantable: against these, our preachers

have borne a faithful testimony; but in shunning one extreme, we have run into another. While we testify against various forms of expressing benevolence, we have not presented an object calculated to call forth the exercise of benevolence at all. Consequently, every argument against any of these institutions, was construed into an argument in favour of the pocket, and embraced with eagerness. And while we have done what we ought to have done in relation to error, we have left *undone* some weighty matters of the law: mercy, and the manifestation of the love of God to the souls of the heathen. How shockingly insensible must that individual be, who could stand by his neighbour falling headlong from a precipice, where he must be dashed to pieces, without stretching out a hand to save him! How much more if he should fail to warn hundreds and thousands, rushing impetuously to the same verge of unavoidable death. But this ruin is only temporal. If we were to witness such a scene as the destruction of Sodom, and see the wrath of Heaven visibly bursting forth upon a few thousands, their shrieks, their groans, their inexpressible agony, and the thought that the smoke of their torments was beginning to ascend for ever and ever would produce an impression which we could never erase from our minds; and if they were not entirely beyond the reach of our beneficence, no sacrifice would be too great to alleviate their torments. How then shall we account for that cold-hearted indifference, with which we regard the claims of the heathen world? whose number confounds our perception, and whose plagues, many and wonderful, are as certain as those of Sodom and the cities of the plain, long since engulfed in fire. Let none who profess love to God, turn a deaf ear to their cries while they are yet in the place of hope. Let every minister of the gospel martial in view of his congregation the hosts of Christless men, six hundred millions of our brothers and sisters, forming in solid phalanx a body a mile in breadth, and more than a hundred in length. Let these myriads of immortal beings pass in review before them, with the arch deceiver at their head, mustering, and marching them down to the gulf of eternal perdition. Such representations would have their effect. They would banish selfishness from the church. They will open new fountains in the frozen breast. They will touch a cord, which, if it does not vibrate through every bosom in the church, and move the hearts of the people as the trees are moved before the wind, it will at least discover the hypocritical pretensions of those who are *not* affected; who pretend to love God whom they have not seen, and remain insensible to any such emotion, toward their brother whom they have seen. But charity compels us to suppose such cases rare, at least until a trial is made.

It is said we have no *means!* and how do we know? Have we measured the extent, or fathomed the depth of our means? Until this is done, and it can be proved to a demonstration that we can do nothing, it is at least an arrogant assumption.

We are not able to form any correct estimate of the amount of wealth possessed by members of our church; but certain we are, that if the amount which God claims for religious purposes were duly contributed, we could do much. To the question how much Christians are bound to give for the support and extension of the gospel, we will not attempt to return a positive answer. The apostle Paul says, "As God has prospered us," but as this is indefinite, to some

degree, we may derive an answer from another part of revelation, which will be better understood. *Moral* duties, we know, do not change with dispensations. Whatever was a moral duty for a Jew, is the moral duty of a Christian. Now, it was the duty of the church to support those who served at the altar. And the apostle, to show that this is still a moral duty, quotes that law, 1 Cor. ix. 9—14, as an ordinance of God, "That they who preach the gospel, should live of the gospel." The same law, however, obliged the Jews to pay a *tenth*, annually. And it would be a mangling of Scripture to say that one part of a law was moral, and of perpetual obligation, and *another* part, referring to the same subject, was positive, and only intended for temporary use. Now to be sure it is to be given willingly, that is, not by assessment or regular taxation; but that would be a lame argument to prove that it should not be given at all.

But let us take another view of our ability. The whole number of members in our communion is supposed to be about eighteen thousand. Now suppose every member should pay, *annually, one dollar*, and we are unwilling to harbour the thought that they will come even so far short of their duty, (as many would, no doubt, give a hundred.) But suppose each one to pay so much, then we have *an annuity of eighteen thousand dollars* for missionary operation. Are we not able to do something? That sum would support thirty missionaries in a foreign field until they could make arrangements for supporting themselves; or, appropriating it differently,—it would support fifteen foreign missionaries, and educate ninety young men for the ministry, annually. Every excuse of inability, will, upon close inspection, be found fallacious. Nothing is wanting but *a heart in the work*. But will not this calculation be realized? There are none too poor to contribute what we have assumed in this calculation; and can it be possible that any, who have themselves been "bought with a price," will esteem this too great a sacrifice to the honour of him who redeemed them, too great an expression of gratitude for their redemption. To this argument the apostle appeals, in reasoning with the Corinthians: "Ye *know* the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ." He appeals to their experience. The argument is of no force to any others but those who *know* his grace. "That, though he was *rich*, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich." In this we are called to study his example and to imitate him. He emptied himself of heavenly glory, lived on earth the life of an outcast, and died as a malefactor; and all that we might be made *rich*. Is it then a great return that he demands, a tenth, a hundredth, of the poor a mite: a dollar, annually. Look only at the truth as it is. We have passed from death unto life, we have escaped the vengeance of eternal fire, we have come into an inheritance which no tongue can describe. Now what is the worth of that change? Can we, for a moment, compare it with any sacrifice of a costly kind? with any amount of exertion, whether physical or moral? If it exceeds, thus, all comparison, then apply the golden rule. Suppose the messenger who brought the joyful sound, or those who sent him had been as indifferent and lukewarm as yourselves, what would have been your condition? And yet you refuse to do to others as they *have* done to you; others, whose decree of eternal death is sealed, if you do not send them the gospel! But if you still refuse our argument, speaking on earth, we have a higher authority



which you will not *dare* to refuse, we have the voice of him that speaketh from heaven. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

This is one of those commands which involve relative duties. It enjoins on one hand the duty to preach, on the other to hear: more, when it enjoins the duty of preaching, it enjoins the duty of sending men ready qualified to preach. So that the duty of qualifying, and sending forth missionaries, devolves upon the church by no forced argument, but by necessary implication in the command itself.

Many appear, from their practice, as if they had yet to learn that God had constituted them *stewards* of all that they possess. That all their intellectual powers, their time, and their substance, are so many talents, all written in God's book of remembrance, and a strict account of the manner in which they have been applied must shortly be rendered. There is not an individual of the eighteen thousand of our fellow professors but what has, at least, one talent. Many have their hundreds and thousands; but who, with a firm conviction that he must shortly answer to God for all that he has received, would venture to hide one talent in a napkin? That this is the tenure, by which all hold their worldly estates, is no abstract theory. The principle must be recognised by all who participate in baptism, the Lord's Supper, or formal covenant obligations. The language of such, and of all these, is a hearty surrender of *ourselves* to God, and if a surrender of *ourselves*, much more of all our appurtenances. How then account for that strange contradiction in the character of professors, which is practically portrayed before us daily? All the withs and cords, with which Samson was bound, form no comparison to the obligations to which the followers of Christ submit; but the moment he turns to the world, all his obligations fall from him "as a thread of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire." "Son of man, see the abominations that they do here." After obligating himself by every thing in religion that *can* bind to honour the Lord with his substance, his eye is dazzled with the glare of the unrighteous mammon; he turns his back upon the tempter, and actually worships this sun towards the east. How can we expect the pleasure of the Lord to prosper among us, when having made a voluntary surrender of *all*, we are found before God to "keep back *part*," ay the whole, of the price back from the especial object for which it is intrusted, the extension of his kingdom in the world? "Will a man rob God?" *Can* he do it? Him who is self-existent, and absolutely independent of all his creatures! *Dare* he do it? Him who upholds him in all things, made him a steward, at any moment liable to be brought to give an account of his stewardship! "Yet ye have robbed me in *tithes* and in *offerings*."

We have seen that the contribution of a dollar from each professor in our communion would raise eighteen thousand annually, for missionary purposes, and taking it for granted, that they can, it no longer remains strictly *optional*. God peremptorily claims it as his right, and to withhold it is robbery: not of man, though it robs man of the gospel, and the heathen of their souls: but it is robbery of God himself, it robs him, as far as our instrumentality extends, of that revenue of glory which would accrue to him in time and eternity, from the conversion of the nations. We have seen that the amount which might be contributed, would support in a foreign field fifteen labour-

ers; and bring an accession to the ministry, of ninety every year. This idea might startle some of our people; especially such as are afraid of the church being overstocked with ministers, from our present ratio of increase. But, such men have never opened their eyes upon the world; they take for granted, that the first inquiry with young men devoting themselves to the ministry, is, *where shall I find a place?* Who will accept of my services in the ministry? Instead of inquiring, as every conscientious student will, where can I do most for the honour of my Master.

There is no fear of being overstocked with faithful servants of the cross of Christ. Look at 7,000,000 aborigines in our western forests, allowing 500 members to be committed to the charge of any minister, 12,000 are called for their supply. Five and a half million blacks in our Southern states, (at present slaves to their masters, as far as legal enactment can extend, slaves to Satan also,) will require, at the same rate, 11,000 preachers for their redemption!—the opening of this field for missionary labour, we trust is drawing nigh.

Is there not then a call for ministers? If that demand is not sufficient, look to the *world* calling for 12,000,000, at the same rate. Now if our hearts are not sealed to sympathy, and unaffected with the love of God, we cannot turn a deaf ear to this call.

Many, we are aware, will not find it *convenient* to contribute to such a cause. But mark ye, these very persons will find it *convenient* to spend more in one year, in luxuries, and superfluities, than they would be required at this rate, to sacrifice during their whole life. In times of slumbering in Zion, such as the present, many make a profession of religion for the sake of convenience. Put on the yoke of Christ for an ornament to the neck, rather than an implement in which to become co-workers with God.

The idea "that a profession of Christianity is much easier now than in the days of the apostles," though not written on our banners, appears to be more firmly impressed upon the minds of the multitude, than many things that are. The idea, in other words, is, that we can come to Christ without denying ourselves, and follow him without bearing a cross. This is a most fatal mistake, the standard of discipleship lowered! Christ divide his kingdom with Satan! Vain presumption! The matter may be tested by a single application. Go through our congregations, and ask the *sacrifice of superfluities* for the spread of the gospel; blot from your list every one who is unwilling to yield the claims of appetite for the claims of Christ; and something will be developed in *modern* Christianity *utterly irreconcilable* with the Spirit of Christ.

The slaves of folly, the devotees of sinful pleasure, should put professing Christians to shame. In gambling, in horse races, and in theatres, no expense is spared, and how is this? Is the object of their devotion more *worthy* than ours? Are the pleasures of sin more exquisite than the shedding abroad "of that love which passeth knowledge?" Even the heathen spend more upon their wooden gods, and lavish more upon their idol temples, than is spent in many parts of Christendom in the service of the living God. But in these offerings to vanity, we are deeply implicated. What a revenue would accrue to the Lord's treasury, by curtailing luxuries, which prevail much to the injury of both the soul and body of professors! Take the money which is sinfully squandered for superfluities in dress, and

devote it to such purposes, as our consciences before God would dictate; take the time which is alike sinfully squandered in preparing it, and devote that to the contemplation of Christ's kingdom within and without, in our hearts, in the world; take also the haughtiness which is connected with the former, and exchange it for the humility which would be the natural result of the latter; what a different aspect would be assumed by the church, both at home and abroad! Let vanity be ashamed of its curls, and foppery of its costly superfluities, the proceeds given to the support of the gospel in heathen lands, and the humble souls by which they are devoted, bowed at a throne of grace in fervent prayer for the success of the gospel, then, "Our God shall bless us, and all ends of the earth shall fear him." But we come to our fourth argument. *It is expedient.* The welfare of the church at home requires it.

The truth is, *duty and expediency* are one. None but an infidel will attempt to separate them. Whatever "the Lord our God requires of us," will be found in the end most expedient for us to have done; and having already seen that the positive command of Christ has made the diffusion of the gospel to *every creature a duty*, the dispute about entering upon the work *now*, should be for ever terminated. But as some, indeed many in the church, appear to be influenced by considerations of policy alone, it becomes necessary to meet them upon their own ground.

That *benevolence* is the most prominent pattern of Christianity, as portrayed in the gospel; that it was most characteristic of our Saviour himself, and that we are commanded to imitate his example in doing good, is beyond a doubt; but if benevolence is a personal duty, it is also a social duty. If it is the duty of an individual, it is the duty of the church.

The only difference is, that the one acts promptly, as moved by occasion; the other must act by system, by plan and compact. Now, if the son who promised to work in his father's vineyard, and went not, subjected himself to censure,—if the unprofitable servant who hid his lord's money was *cast out*,—if that which justly belongs to the poor, cankers in the coffers of covetousness, and the rust thereof eats as fire in the flesh of the fraudulent dealer, and if all this is true of the *unrighteous mammon*, what will be the doom of those, who keep back the *true riches* from the wretched, the miserable, poor languishing heathen?

The danger of monopolizing the truth, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the light of life and immortality which is committed to the church, for the express purpose of dispelling moral darkness from the world, is *peculiarly* great.

The hands of the Christian are not made for *grasping* and *hoarding*, but for *channels*, through which the bounties of Providence should freely flow to all that are in want. Neither are their hearts to be callous and iron-bound with *selfishness*, but consecrated channels for the love of God, producing works of mercy, and labours of love in all the members of Christ's mystical body. And the Holy Spirit, which is at once a Spirit of illumination and sanctification, if not improved for the purposes for which he is promised, we hear a voice from Heaven, solemnly testifying that he will "turn to be our enemy, and fight against us."

We have also the uniform history of the church, corroborating the

same doctrine: that just in proportion as she failed to discharge her function, as "the light of the world," she has lost her life, her purity, her peace, and become a *scourge*, to herself. As the primitive church began to contract the sphere of her exertions, for sending the gospel *abroad*, the star of her glory began to decline, and soon left her benighted—chilled with superstitious forms, and burdensome rites of human institution.

When the light of primitive Christianity again broke forth upon the world, with the reformation from popery, the bottles of heaven were opened, the light, the irresistible power of true and undefiled religion, like the approach of an army with banners, struck terror to the heart of all opposition. Had the church here only prosecuted the work of reformation with the zeal and determination with which she had begun; if, in obedience of the high command of her Lord and the impulse of the Spirit, she had laid siege to the strong holds of sin in heathen lands, the banner of the cross might now have been waving in triumph over the last relics of Paganism, shouts of victory pealing from the utmost corners of the earth. But how painful the contrast! Instead of carrying on the war so successfully begun, after a few skirmishes she sat down ingloriously to enjoy "the trophies her valor had won." No sooner, however, had she relinquished the thought of carrying the war into the enemies' camp, than the sun which had stood still on Gibeon began to sink behind the lowering frowns of Jehovah, and storms of wrathful contention. The heavens became as brass, and the earth as iron,—no dew descended. The very waters of the sanctuary became stagnant, and *bred and sent forth* a teeming progeny of errorists and schismatics, by whom she is distracted and paralyzed to this day.

Amid the wreck of reformation principle and decayed love of the truth, God has graciously enabled us to support a standard for the testimony of Jesus; and the question now is, shall we rush headlong into the quicksands upon which they have been wrecked? shall we now, with folded arms and calm content suffer ourselves to be driven upon the same rock upon which the church has been repeatedly driven before our eyes? *Of this there is danger.* That man must be indeed a superficial observer of the present state of the Secession church, who does not see our atmosphere growing dark with elements of destruction. Ordinances have become inefficacious. Deadness and formality pervade alike their administration and observance. The spirit of discord and contention mingles itself with all her ecclesiastical procedure, from the lowest to the highest court. And why all this? Why, the church has forgotten her "chief end:" she has *slept*, and the enemy has sowed tares. Now in this state of things the only conceivable way of redeeming Israel from trouble, is to raise her misdirected energies, and concentrate them upon their appropriate object. There is no want of real opposition already existing, that we should be creating more; let us then direct our eyes to the captive in the dungeon, and set our hearts on the redemption of those who are appointed to death, ready to sacrifice our ease, our fortunes, and all our interests in this world, to the despoiling the God of this world; then petty feuds and animosities will be lost and forgotten in earnest opposition to the common foe. Our country's history affords an illustration of this idea. When all the resources of the nation were called into requisition and directed against the usurpers of our rights, the hearts of the people were united as one man. But now when

nothing of a common interest is at stake, the spirit of party and faction threatens the destruction of the commonwealth. Such, also, is the state of the church, as though she had finished her conquest and set down to divide the spoil. We know of nothing calculated to bring back the purity, the spirituality, the life, the love, and in one word, the *blessedness* of primitive Christianity, but the spirit and practice of that age, resolute and determinate *aggressive warfare* against "the powers of darkness."—We say, therefore, Missions to the Heathen are *expedient*.

But here the advocate of home missions meets us and demands the attention of the church to be directed to that subject. The subject is important, it is freely conceded. A soul converted to God is as valuable in one part of the world as in another, yet the comparative value of souls is not the question.—But be it observed this *home* idea is what has cursed the missionary movements of the church in every age. "Charity begins at home," is the motto of *selfishness*; the banner under which it rallies continually: would that it were blotted from Christendom. Our charity is for the *world*, and let the world both see and feel our charity. The church proposes to herself to plant the standard of the cross in some province, tribe, or city; and, when that is done, relaxes her energies, and lays aside the prosecution of the work. This has been her uniform practice. Whereas, the motto which Christ put in the mouths of the apostles,—*"all the world," "every creature,"*—should have been the exclusive motto of the church till, *"all the world," "every creature,"* had seen *"the salvation of our God."* It requires, we say, *all the world* to be continually before the mind; nothing less will *balance* the corresponding action which is required of the church.

If we wish *home* missions to prosper, the number of evangelical preachers and professors increased, it is *experience* (not *theory*) has shown that no means is so effectual as to hold up to professors at home, *"the whole world lying in wickedness,"* and launch into the work determined to scale the highest rampart of the *adversary* in heathen lands.

Again; it is a notorious fact, that such is the *penuriousness* of professors in our church that, with few exceptions, those who minister in holy things do not receive a competent support. And why so? We have before seen that occasions do not occur for our pastors to discuss and enforce the *duty of benevolence*. For this deficiency the subject of Foreign Missions would afford an effectual remedy, as we are taught, 1 John iii. 17, that it is certain evidence of a soul being bound in the prison of death, that he refuses to part with this world's goods as a means of salvation to others. While, on the other hand, all who are *"born again,"* will be constrained to generous sacrifice, as an expression of gratitude to him who has bought them with a price.

By this means the church at home may be redeemed from an insatiable spirit of avarice much to the mutual comfort of both ministers and people. In so doing we will realize the fact, that *the more Religion is exported, the more will be left at home*. The more we exert ourselves for the salvation of others, the more will we have peace one with another, and joy in the Holy Ghost; and the more liberally and heartily we honour the Lord with our substance, the more will our *"barns be filled with plenty, and our presses burst out with new wine,"*

ART. III.—*Forgiveness of Injuries.*

Recompense to no man evil for evil. Rom. xii. 17.

THE adaptation of Christian principles to produce love and goodwill among men, proves their divine origin, and their superiority to the maxims of natural men, which are generally of a retributive and vengeful character. Instead of forgiving a trivial offence, it is resented with the most revengeful feeling; hence, so many law suits, duels, murders, and wars; feelings that cannot be allayed but by the immolation of the offending victim. Attention to the precept under consideration, would prevent thousands of evils disgraceful to individuals, and disastrous to the community. Forgiveness always implies offence, without which there could be no such duty as forgiveness. A debt could not be cancelled, if not contracted: so an offence could not be forgiven, if no injury be done. An offence may be much aggravated by the disparity of parties, time, place, and other circumstances; still the command is imperious. "Render to no man evil for evil:" that is, forgive; and the more aggravated the offence, the more estimable the act of forgiveness. "It is the glory of a man to pass over a transgression." What is it to forgive?—it is just to treat the offender as if he had given no offence. That this is a matter of difficulty, appears from the consideration, that when Christ enjoined upon the apostles the duty of forgiving offences even to seven times a day, they pray, "Lord, increase our faith:" for they were convinced that, unless they were strong in faith, they could not discharge aright a duty of so much difficulty. They had still something of a revengeful disposition, which appeared when they would invoke fire to descend and destroy the Samaritans. So difficult, indeed, is the duty, that to be qualified for its right observance, nothing short of the humbling and sanctifying grace of the gospel is requisite. I say the *right observance*, for often when conciliation is professed, a secret grudge is still retained. History also affords some solitary instances of forgiveness, not based on a gospel principle. With the duty we have to do, as an act of obedience to a divine command. I shall mention some considerations in way of argument to enforce the duty.

1. Personal retribution is expressly forbidden, even by God himself; it is not, therefore, left to our own discretion to forgive, or not as our inclination dictates. Lev. xix. 18: "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the Lord." Mat. v. 38, 39: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil." The 44th verse is an inhibition still more explicit, not only not to recompense evil, but to "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven." Paul, in 1 Cor. vi. 7, severely reprehends the Corinthians for engaging in vexatious law suits, either to avenge a trivial offence, or to recover a paltry debt. "There is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? Nay, ye do wrong, and DEFRAUD, and that your brethren." 1 Thess. v. 15: "See that none render evil for evil to any man," 1 Pet. iii. 9: "Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing;

but contrariwise, blessing," &c. These passages are sufficient authority for avoiding an evil so unprofitable, and so much at variance with the spirit of the gospel.

2. God claims retribution as his prerogative. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." Those who avenge themselves by rendering evil for evil, assume a work which God claims as his own. Impelled by an irrepressible impulse of passion, they do themselves what God would do in the exercise of his sovereignty, wisdom, and providence. "Say not thou, I will recompense evil; but wait on the Lord, and he shall save thee," Prov. xx. 22. There are offences that cannot be forgiven without the violation of express precept, such as idolatry, blasphemy, Sabbath profanation, murders, &c. Such crimes, we are called upon neither to forgive nor avenge. Punishment of such crimes belongs to the civil magistrate, who is the "minister of God to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." The crimes that we are to forgive, are of a personal nature, committed against ourselves, and in which others are not concerned. The *lex talionis*, as eye for eye, hand for hand, wound for wound, &c., belongs to the magistrate's office; so that in such wrongs, persons can neither avenge themselves nor be their own judges.

3. We ourselves need forgiveness; but, unless we forgive, we have no reason to expect to be forgiven. Christ insists much on the duty of forgiving offences, and even our forgiving others as a condition of our obtaining the like mercy. "Forgive, if ye have aught against any, that your Father may forgive your trespasses: but if ye forgive not, neither will your Father, who is in heaven, forgive your trespasses." Is it possible that a person, possessed of grace, can read this passage, involving such awful consequences, and yet indulge in vengeful feelings? feelings, that as certainly exclude from the realms of bliss, as crimes of the highest enormity. How can any, indulging vengeful feelings, pray, "Forgive us our debts, AS WE FORGIVE OUR DEBTORS?" Since they do not forgive: they virtually pray that God would not forgive them. See Matt. xviii. 15—35.

4. It is the way to conciliate enemies and gain their friendship, which is rarely done by repulsive and revengeful treatment. It is said of soft words, that they break the bone. It is said also of a gift, "whithersoever it turneth, it prospereth:" so verse 21: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink: for, in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head." This is a quotation from Prov. xxv. 22, where it is added, "And the Lord shall reward thee." The good effects of relieving the wants of enemies, is here represented by the action of melting metal in the crucible, by putting fire above and under. The hard metal is hereby reduced to a liquid state, and then it can be cast into any form. In like manner, by acts of kindness, as giving food to the hungry, and drink to the thirsty, or any other act that may alleviate indigence, or relieve from distress, inimical dispositions are dissipated, and those of a friendly nature are exercised.

5. The duty of forgiving offences is sanctioned and enforced by the highest example, even by that of God himself. Micah vii. 18: "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy." We should think of the ten thousand talents that we owe, a debt, for which we

can make no compensation; and which must either be pardoned, or we must perish eternally. The Apostle says, "forgiving one another, as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Christ also in his expiring moments exercised a forgiving disposition when he prayed for his enemies; "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." These instances of a divine example are intended as patterns for our imitation. Those who do not imitate this example in forgiving those who have offended them, cannot be ranked among those, who have learned of Christ, nor be viewed as his genuine disciples.

6. It is a distinguishing character of the righteous, who, in imitation of their Lord and Master, and in obedience to his authority freely from their heart forgive those who have trespassed against them. This was signally exemplified in the case of Joseph, who freely forgave his brethren: Gen. l. 17. His generosity in forgiving them was no less signal, than their unfeeling baseness in selling their own brother. Stephen also in his last moments prayed for his murderers: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Philemon also freely forgave Onesimus, at Paul's entreaty. Is it then a character of the righteous that they forgive offences? If we would be esteemed as such, we must imitate their example. The instances of David imprecating curses upon his enemies will perhaps be adduced as an exception. These are not to be regarded as instances of resentful feeling, but as prophetic denunciations against the enemies of God and his church. This appears evidently to be the case in the hundred and ninth Psalm, where Judas and the Jewish enemies of Christ are clearly brought to view. Such instances of imprecation might, with perfect accordance to the Hebrew language, be rendered in the future, instead of the imperative. Instead then of imprecation, they would appear purely as matters of prediction, which is the very thing intended. This mode of rendering would have obviated many heavy charges against the inspired Psalms. It ought at any rate to satisfy us that David was one of the holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. See Acts, i. 16. Modern Psalm makers, who object to David's Psalms, cannot say as that ancient monarch, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me." This ought to quash every objection.

7. Revenge, which is the reverse of forgiveness, is the attribute of a malignant mind, a disposition to retaliate in every offence; as this is a characteristic of the wicked and ungodly, no argument from the worth of character can be adduced in its support. What is the cause of so much fighting, murder, duelling, war, &c.? nothing but revenge, stimulated by pride. As humility is the principle whence forgiveness proceeds, so pride is the cause of revenge, with all its direful consequences. Its language is, As he has done to me, so will I do to him; which is expressly forbidden: Prov. xxiv. 29. "Say not I will do so to him as he hath done to me, I will render to the man according to his works." I shall make the remarks of Dr. Lawson supersede any observations of mine on this verse; which are virtually the same with the words of Paul, under consideration. "Recompense to no man evil for evil," says the Dr. To speak in this manner, would be the same thing as if you said, "Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will repay it." I will step into the throne of God, and hurl the thunder-bolts of vengeance upon mine adversary.



"What would become of us, if God should render to us according to our evil works? We need great mercy at the hand of God, and shall we render nothing but rigid justice to our fellow men, in direct opposition to the royal law of love? When our neighbours do us an injury, shall we borrow weapons from hell to retaliate? When we revenge injuries at our own discretion, we may do hurt to our enemies, but we do much greater hurt to ourselves; for the punishment of malice and revenge, to which we expose ourselves, is far worse than any vengeance which our feeble arm can inflict. Let us, therefore, show ourselves the disciples of Christ by loving our enemies, and recompensing evil with good. Thus we shall heap coals of fire upon the head of our enemies to melt them; but, by following an opposite course, we heap them on our own to destruction." *Lectures on Pride, Vol. II. p. 220.*

The abusive treatment that we often meet with, our corrupt nature is ever prone to resent; but as men of reason, of religion, and profession, we ought not to be guided by the dictates of pride and revenge, but by divine authority prohibiting resentment, and by the example of the worthy, especially that of Christ, who in this, as in all other respects, is our great pattern of imitation. Obedience in this, as well as in all other traits of Christian character, will be a test by which the genuine disciple is distinguished from the nominal professor, as well as the man of the world.

ALIQUIS.

---

#### ART. IV.—*Quero's Queries.*

Mr. Editor:—It is not my design to meddle with the discussion between R. and Quero, by going over the ground, that has been so often and thoroughly surveyed by others, on the subject of Occasional hearing. But I have a few remarks to offer on another subject, suggested by the Queries, and in my way to these, shall only touch in a sentence or two, on the queries themselves.

The first query seems to carry something of an air of defiance, when it is asked, *Where* the doctrine of the sinfulness of occasional hearing is taught in the standards of the church? I would simply point him to the Testimony, page 211; where we confess that "it is the sin of multitudes in this land, that they have hearkened to such—," namely to irregular and unsound preachers. Again: "We confess that the evil being common, though on this account, it ought to have been so much the more lamented, yet it has seemed light to us; and we have not expressed a due sense of the injury done by it to the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." Page 223. "We engage in the strength of the Lord,—to beware of every thing that has a tendency to break this desirable harmony, and profitable communion among the members of Christ's mystical body; and for this end, we shall endeavour to mark them that cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which we have received, and avoid them." Several other passages and texts of scripture might be added. It is farther asked, whether this doctrine be *the door*, and *the term* of communion, in the Associate Church. We might reply, that it is not the only *term*, but certainly belongs to the terms of communion, as might very readily be gathered from the above quotations;

and the Book of Discipline, page 8, directs sessions in the admission of members, to ascertain their "resolution through grace, to guard against wavering and unsteadfastness in the profession they now make." Page 40, we have an entire section, condemning the practice in question, declaring it to be censurable, showing it to be contrary to the word of God, the Westminster Confession of Faith, our own Testimony, and the express acts of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, and the Associate Synod of Edinburgh. I do not bring forward these passages with the idea that Quero himself needs information on the subject; he has perhaps before this day lifted up his hand to the solemn engagements above quoted from the Testimony: I do it for the sake of many readers, who might be misled by his queries, to suppose that there is no authority for the rule now followed.

It is again asked, whether it be not a doctrine, professed by some in the church, and denied by others? We must acknowledge that this is the case, for while the church generally professes it as a reasonable and scriptural point in our public standards, it is evident that Quero is at least one who is opposed to it, and desirous to excite others also to oppose it. This I consider manifest, from his strong insinuations, that it is not to be found in our public standards, &c., but, especially from the prominence which he gives to the opinion of some eminent man in the church, who favoured the doctrine, that "it is a disputed subject, only a bone of contention." (By the way, it was a pity that the eminent man could find nothing better in which to show his wisdom, than favouring a bone of contention in the church.) The manner in which Quero sets forth the opinion, seems plainly to say, and *I think so too*. He is also well aware that it is much easier to give a downward motion to any body, than to send it upward; that if eminent men will only dash out reproachful terms against any of our peculiarities, that are thought to be strict, it will have more influence towards laxity in that point, than can be counteracted by many efforts for steadfastness. Quero says, "few have been able to find the subject even mentioned in any of the Articles of our public profession." It is a fact that there are a few who have not been able to find it, and when we consider the plainness of scripture, and of our standards, as well as the many unanswerable essays that have been written upon it, we cannot avoid the opinion, as to some of them, that the true reason is an unwillingness to find it; it is, therefore, a hopeless task to point it out to their conviction. I suppose it is with reference to these, that it is farther inquired,—Whether those who disagree on this subject, can hold communion together? The answer is very easy. It cannot consist with honesty for persons holding themselves unteachable, or prejudiced against any part of our witnessing profession, to remain in our communion pretending an adherence to Secession principles. A verbal opposition to errors of doctrine and worship, is perfectly neutralized by a practical countenancing of them. The following remark of Dr. Owen on the subject is simple and sufficient as a volume. How many professors have I known, says he, that would plead for their liberty as they called it! They could hear any thing, all things!—*let no man pretend to fear sin, that doth not fear temptation to it, they are too nearly allied to be separated*. It is farther asserted in the queries, that in some places the subject cannot be so much as mentioned, without

serious consequences to the peace and prosperity of the church. This is either a lively figure or a most extraordinary fact. Let us consider it; there are some congregations in the Associate church, where it would produce disturbance, merely to mention, that it is a duty, to "cease to hear the instruction that causeth to err." I think this paraphrase will not be deemed unjust to the original, yet it seems hardly credible: it would show these people to be unreasonable and irritable beyond all parallel; they are in many respects beyond the southern slave-holders on the subject of abolition: if they think the doctrine is mere bigotry, they show that they are excessively bigoted against it. And we are naturally led to inquire, how they have arrived at such a pitch of opposition? It is never the case that a people get into such a heat on the first mention of any subject, and very rare that speaking the truth in the spirit of meekness and love, will have such an effect, however frequently it may be repeated. Quero ought, therefore, to have stated briefly by what process these people had been brought into such an inflammatory condition; whether their sessions had endeavoured faithfully to follow the rule of Discipline, in admitting them to membership, or whether they were as violent as the rest? Whether their ministers had been accustomed to *mention* it, in the way of preaching from such texts as we have above noticed? or, whether they taught them that it was *a disputed subject, only a bone of contention*? Some eminent men have a very ingenious method of discovering the people's opposition to certain points, and also of predicting the serious consequences that will result from the insisting on them? They first find that they themselves are bitterly opposed to them, and willing to do part of the mischief, then in their intercourse with others they naturally express their own sentiments, and breathe their own spirit, which being more or less imbibed by the hearers, is soon echoed from the people, and they at once perceive the prevailing opinion. Upon this they are ready, with becoming zeal, to bring the subject before the church, and advise some meliorating expedient, to allay the fever and avert the threatened ruin; wisely passing all questions on the rise of the evil, and dwelling only on the means of its removal. I am of opinion this has been done oftener than once in the Associate Synod. Now if Quero had informed us on these points, with respect to the people referred to, we would much more easily have understood the subject and what remedy it requires.

But I have far transcended the limits I had intended in this branch of the subject. My main design was to state, that I consider the queries only one small item of an extensive system of hostility to the principles of the Associate church. I am aware this will appear to many intolerably harsh, and I may be wrong, but think I can satisfy any candid mind that I am not unreasonable. I do not pronounce on the designs, but the conduct of men, and the meaning naturally suggested by it to the rational observer. Those who are acquainted with proceedings in the Associate Synod, must have noticed, that for a number of years in succession, some point in the principles or practices of the church has been attacked in a hostile manner, by one or other whom Quero may probably think eminent in the church: the opposition as yet has been made only upon what may be termed the outworks of the cause, and so, less likely to excite alarm for the general safety than if it were otherwise, yet as sure

in the end to produce general ruin. First, the rule for the publication of the purpose of marriage, was violently assailed, (I do not at all here speak of the merits of that question,) and eminent men were not sparing of their censure upon it, till they got it so far crippled, as to be in effect destroyed; next, some strokes were made at the principles and practice of the church, on societyism; presently there rises also a great trouble about occasional hearing, it cannot be proved to be sinful, and what is very remarkable, though that doctrine has been professed by the Associate church for nearly a hundred years, it cannot now be found in any article of her public standards; in short, it has become intolerable, and in some places must not even be mentioned. What then is to be done? Why certainly, if Synod regard the peace and prosperity of the church, they must repeal the order for avoiding those who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned. The manner in which the warfare is carried on, also deserves notice: first, the violation of a plain rule is countenanced by those whose duty it is to maintain it, and then they insist on its abolition, because of the difficulty of observing it, and for the sake of uniformity. Again; those who had inflamed the minds of the people, were the most earnest in urging the excitement as an argument against the rule. An established order was brought into dispute, with protests and appeals and an endless noise of words and publications, till the object was effected. The measures adopted in this trouble on occasional hearing, have been very distinct. It was reported to Synod by a Presbytery, that the subject was still a matter of contention among them, and Synod was urged to adopt some measure promotive of uniformity on the subject. It is perfectly manifest, however, that if the Presbytery themselves had been *unanimous* in faithfully adhering to the doctrine and order of the church, it could have made no such contention as to need the enactment of any new rule by Synod; it is also manifest, that the existing scriptural order is more promotive of scriptural uniformity, than any new measure could be, and no new rule would be any more acceptable to the contentious, unless it were a compliance with their own humour. But the suggestion was well calculated to reduce the doctrine to the level of "a disputed subject," as the eminent man called it. (I by no means impute such a design to the *Presbytery*.) At the same time a memorial was presented by some members of the same Presbytery, in behalf of a candidate for license; a very worthy young man in all respects, but he had *doubts* on the subject of occasional hearing; and it was inquired, whether it be consistent with our principles, to license one having such *doubts*. This reminded me very much, of the expedient adopted for settling the contention that rose at Antioch: Paul and Barnabas went to Synod, taking Titus with them, who being an uncircumcised Greek, would on his return be a practical proof of Synod's judgment, and a precedent of great weight throughout the churches. There was this difference, however, that the question presented to the Associate Synod, was by no means so open and simple in its terms; it had more resemblance to that proposed on another occasion; "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?" It was so stated, that Synod could not turn to the right hand or to the left, without committing themselves. If they said, *it is consistent* to license one *who doubts*, it was enough, not only as a condescension to the doubts of an individual, but as a

positive encouragement to the practice generally, and to a certainty would have been so used in some sections of the church. If they said, *it is not consistent*, it had the appearance of great rigour. What! must not even *doubt* on such a point! that is intolerable strictness, people will never submit to it, something farther must be done for peace and uniformity. At another meeting of Synod, in considering the overture of a new Book of Discipline, the same discourse was preached again, and as nothing was effected at that time, it is now substantially repeated in the queries; which serve to keep the matter alive, and also throw much new light on it, before the people; as that it cannot be proved that the practice is sinful, that the subject is not mentioned in our standards, that in the judgment of *eminent men*, *it is only a bone of contention*, and tends to destroy the peace of the church: and, perhaps, at next meeting of Synod some measures may be effected that will finally batter down the troublesome doctrine. Then, if this were disposed of, we might proceed to something of more importance; as the doctrine and practice of public religious covenanting, undoubtedly a disputed subject; or that of close communion; then the exclusive use of the scripture Psalms; then the maintaining of a judicial Testimony, and then any other subject you please. All these matters have, we doubt not, been considered by *eminent men as only a bone of contention*, and possibly some one might be found among ourselves having *doubts*, or it would be very easy to throw out a few queries, that might excite doubts, and draw on debate on almost any topic; and let it only be reduced to a disputed subject, it is not difficult to foretell the issue. While a matter is kept for years undecided by Synod, the previous order is considered of authority till a farther decision be made; and while the opposers of it verbally acknowledge this, they have various ways of undermining its force, by countenancing multiplied violations of it in the mean time, and thus extending the opposition: also, in their social intercourse sneering and ridiculing it, till at length people will not bear to hear it *even mentioned*. This assertion is fully established by Quero himself, it is plainly the spirit of his remarks and queries throughout, but it is demonstrated by his account of his eminent man: he says "he was considered in favour of the doctrine" of *the sinfulness of the practice* in question, yet he called it "a disputed subject, only a bone of contention." (Wherein did his eminence consist?) We cannot suppose that both these ways of speaking were used at the same time, or in the same circumstances; the most natural interpretation is that his public formal professions warranted the belief that he was in favour of the doctrine, while in the greater liberty of private intercourse he said it was only a bone of contention.

In conclusion, I do not charge Quero with a *designed* co-operation in such a plan of hostilities as I have described, or being a *designed* enemy to the Secession cause; it is more than I am warranted to say, that any man has a premeditated purpose to break down the church. But I am sure, that the various movements noticed above, would, to an impartial observer, have very much the appearance of it, and justify the view I have taken. It is also certain, that they tend strongly that way: one step is strictly connected with the next till the whole issue in the ruin of the Secession cause. It is also certain, that though Quero delivers himself at this time, in queries, which is the most

inoffensive form of discourse, he does as positively contribute to the injurious result, as if it had been his intention.

Therefore, if men are really friends, they ought to take good heed that they may not do the work of enemies, or give friends cause to suspect them for enemies. The Apostle Peter was an eminent saint, and no enemy to our Lord Jesus Christ, when he took him and began to rebuke him for speaking of his approaching sufferings; but he was then zealously doing the work of the greatest enemy; and many *eminent men*, still, fall into the same mistake. And, on the other hand, if men are really enemies in heart to any part of our covenanted profession, it would be infinitely more honest and honourable, plainly to declare that they cannot believe such things, nor continue in communion where they are; and go where they would be better suited, than under the profession of conscientious attachment to remain in any church, only to be a brier under her wing. Finally, all the sincere friends of our covenanted profession, have special reason at this time, to watch and pray that they be not beguiled by little and little out of the sacred trust committed to them.

Some years ago, when some faithful brethren expressed their apprehensions that the alterations then warmly contended for, though in themselves unimportant, were the first steps in the way of change, and the entrance on a downward course without limit, I thought them over sensitive, but observation has brought me fully into the same views; yet I hope, by a blessing on a prompt use of the scriptural means, their forebodings may never be verified.

RESPONDO.

---

ART. V.—*Salvation, addressed chiefly to the Young.* No. II.

2. We observe secondly, then, that the way of salvation, taught in the Bible, shows us that to satisfy justice, magnify the law, and save our souls, the *death of Immanuel, God with us, was necessary*. It was an infinite God we had offended by our sin, an infinite and Almighty Surety must make satisfaction for that sin. Thus the Bible uniformly speaks of the blood of Jesus as possessing infinite value, because it is the blood of the human nature, inseparably and eternally united with the divine. Though the divine nature can neither suffer nor die, yet, that divine nature indissolubly united to the human in the person of the Son of God, gave to the sufferings of that human nature a divine dignity, an infinite efficacy. Thus, the sacrifice of Jesus saves the soul, because, in that sacrifice, the life of a God-man is given. Jesus “a child is born, to us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.” “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” “The Word was made flesh.” “Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” “The blood of Jesus Christ, his son, cleanseth us from all sin.”

These, and similar passages, prove that, because the Son of God, the Mighty God, the Eternal Son, equal with the Father and God

over all, was given to the death for us; the curse, we must have borne for ever, is removed from our souls. If we had suffered for our own guilt, though we had endured for ten thousand ages the vengeance of eternal fire, we could not have atoned for a single sin. There is no merit in our suffering; we would only have increased our guilt. But the eternal power and Godhead of Jesus, gave to his sufferings through a short life, and to his sacrifice in death, a worth sufficient to save from eternal perdition all his redeemed: a value equivalent to the eternal endurance of the curse, by all those millions in hell, yea, sufficient, had God so willed it, for the rescue of ten thousand worlds. No other could have saved us. The blood of no other victim could have quenched the flames of wrath, and reconciled us to the Holy One. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Sin is not such a trifling evil as this, that a man might insult God, trample on his laws, and then escape punishment by pouring out the blood of his beast as an expiation. *The highest angel* could not have become our surety. The penalty was death, and an angel cannot die. Our debt, too, was infinite; the highest angel is a finite being, and has no power, no worth to repair, or render satisfaction for, an infinite evil. Angels felt and saw that the sufferings sin deserved, and the law demanded, no finite being could bear. Their services too, they well knew, were necessary to clear and justify themselves. With what holy rapture, with what adoring triumph, must they have contemplated Christ appearing in our nature, "to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." What a mystery of mercy, that He who is the First and the Last,—that He, who spake all worlds into existence, and without whom nothing was made that is made, should, for us, become "an infant of days," and appear as a helpless babe in the manger. What a mystery of mercy, that He, who has the keys of hell and of death, and to whose call the lightnings answer, should, for us, become "a servant of rulers;" that He, who, as the Lord of all, could say, "every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills," should, for us, be exposed to hunger and thirst; and, on the earth his hands had formed, be forced to say, "—the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." What a mystery of mercy, that He, who is the essentially Blessed, the Holy One, and the Just, whose goodness encircles his angels with glory, and fills all heaven with happiness, should, for us, become a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: that He, who from eternity was with God, and was God; that He, who had all the strength of the Godhead to sustain him, should, for us, in the deep and dreadful anguish of his soul, sink to the ground in Gethsemane, his spirit crushed by the wrath we should have borne, and his garments rolled in blood. See Him in the heat of the contest, when suffering for you. See Him suspended between his heaven and his earth, the sword of justice in the hand of a sin avenging God entering his heart: hear the loud and bitter cry forced from the human soul of the Saviour,—God the Redeemer groaning in anguish,—God manifest in the flesh, complaining, and crying out on the cross: and can we but confess, in holy astonishment and awe, "Great is the mystery of godliness." No wonder that the rocks were rent asunder, the graves opened, the dead raised, the sun darkened, and the earth shaken to its centre. The Creator of heaven and earth is dying upon it: the Lord of life is

coming to the house of death. My young friends, what should be your feelings as you follow the Saviour in the history of his sufferings from Gethsemane to Calvary, and see him in the midst of shame and agony, purchasing for you, pardon, and peace, and heaven? May the language of believing Thomas be yours, "My Lord, and my God." He was wounded for me. He shed his blood for me. He took the cup of wrath, to give me the cup of blessing. He chose the cross to give me a crown; death, to give me life; the grave, to give me glory. And shall I not live to him? "While I live will I praise the Lord; I will sing praises unto my God while I have a being."

3. It was necessary, in order to secure our salvation, that satisfaction should be rendered, and the penalty paid, by one who was truly man, as well as truly God. It was necessary, we have seen, that he should be the Almighty, that infinite value might attach to his sufferings, and infinite power enable the human nature to endure the wrath we had incurred. It was necessary, too, that he should be man, that in the nature which had sinned, he might suffer for his people the death their sin deserved. Against man, the law denounced punishment; and by man, must that punishment be borne. To atone for the guilt of men, the Son of man must suffer unto death: the Son of man must be lifted up, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Though he was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God, yet it was necessary that he should take on him the form of a servant, in order to become obedient for us unto death, even the death of the cross. Though he knew no sin, he was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, *that in the flesh*, God might condemn sin, by making him a sin offering. How boundless this condescension and love! The God of glory assuming the form of the man of sorrows,—the Lord of life becoming man, that as man He might, for our redemption, become the prey of death. Can we think of this amazing love unmoved? He was sinless. You were the guilty ones for whom the Saviour was smitten. For you, he was delivered into the hands of wicked men. For you, he was through life the victim of sorrow. For you, the wrath of God fell upon his soul. For you, the sword of justice struck him to the heart, and the "pains of hell took hold upon him." His body on the cross did indeed suffer, but to bear that would be easy. The curse of the law you had broken is on his soul. The wrath you deserved is drinking up his spirit. His soul is heavy unto death. His heart is broken. He is covered with wrath. He is dead; and O why? well might angels ask in amazement, "What evil hath he done?" Never did a sinful word, a sinful action, or a sinful thought defile the holy Lamb of God. Why then was his soul smitten and made a curse? Surely he hath borne *our* griefs, and carried *our* sorrows. For *our* sins he suffered. To free us from death, he was seized and cut off out of the land of the living.

4. Hence, we observe fourthly, that our redemption was effected, and the sacrifice of the Redeemer accepted, because it contained not only the life of a man, but also of a perfectly righteous man. He was the Holy One of God. He did all things well. He was without sin. Had he not been sinless, he could not have been our Saviour. Had he been chargeable with a breach of the law, either from original or actual sin, the law would have demanded his life for his



own sin, and his soul could never have been accepted as an offering for the sins of others. "Such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." Let us rejoice that the law had no claims upon him. All that he did and suffered was in his people's room. He was as holy when suffering in Gethsemane and on Calvary, as when he reigned from eternity on the throne of heaven; but, for *us*, he was cut off out of the land of the living; for our sins imputed to him, and charged upon him, he was made our sin-offering, though he himself "had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."

5. But again, the way of salvation teaches us that our redemption is accomplished, and justice satisfied; because the life of Jesus was *freely given*, and the penalty due to our sins willingly borne. The sacrifices formerly offered were defective in this respect. The life of the victim could not be said to be freely given. Justice has a right to demand the body of the debtor, and cast into prison till the debt is paid; but justice has no right to seize on another person, and compel him to go to prison in the debtor's room. Justice has a right to demand blood for blood, and execute on the murderer the sentence of a violated law; but justice has no right to seize on an innocent man, and drag him to death instead of the murderer. And thus, if Christ had not been willing to become our surety, we had never been saved. But O how willing was he to become a sacrifice for us! With what delight does he say, when about to come from his throne to die, "Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Throughout the whole course of his sufferings, he was a voluntary victim. He *gave* his back to the smiters in Pilate's hall: he *gave* himself on the cross, a ransom for our souls. True, he was amazed and very heavy, when the anguish we deserved dried up his strength; when the waves and billows of divine wrath began to roll over his soul. And did he, amid all these sufferings, ever regret that he had interposed between us and the storm of wrath? did he ever wish he had left us to drink our own cup of wo, or shrink from his deadly sufferings, or give up his life at last, with reluctance? O, no. In full view of those "sorrows of death," which were soon to encompass him about, and "the pains of hell," that were about to lay hold upon him, he went up to Jerusalem to suffer, saying, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened, till it be accomplished!" Amid all the sorrows of his humble life, amid the fiercest assaults of the powers of darkness, when sinking in the deep and dark waters of divine vengeance, when all his earthly friends had forsaken him and fled, when the sword of wrath was entering his soul, the stricken, broken-hearted, dying victim never complained, never wished that he had left us to bear our own griefs—that he had remained in his own glorious heaven, where, amid his adoring angels, he had been enthroned in bliss from eternity. Besides, a word from his lips would have scattered the legions of hell, and chained them in the abyss. A single word would have crushed the soldiers who crucified him, and the Jews who reviled him. He *could* have come down from the cross, and, dropping the veil which shrouded the glory of his Deity, have appeared to his wicked persecutors surrounded with a splendour that would have withered their souls, and proclaimed to a misjudging world, that they were indeed crucifying their King.

Yes, it was not the pains of crucifixion that caused his death. It was not the scourge, the nails, and the spear. It was not because his life-blood, streaming from his wounds, weakened his strength, that he died. No; looking forward to the hour of his suffering, he says, "*I lay down my life* for the sheep:—I lay down my life, that I might take it again:—No man taketh it from me, but *I lay it down of myself*. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again." (John x. 15, 17, 18.) Even when this Lamb of God was bleeding, he was triumphing over principalities and powers: even when wounded and dying, he was, as a conqueror, taking the prey from the mighty, and securing the salvation of his redeemed. The moment before he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost, he had, we repeat, power, if he had chosen, to drive back the king of terrors, to dash in pieces the enemy, and from the cross of shame, ascend, as the God of glory, to his throne again.\* But no, he came to die. He came to have the vials of wrath poured out upon his soul, as the sinner's surety, and purchased salvation for his people with his blood. It was not the Roman guard, it was not the bitter and malignant Jews, that bound him to the cross; but the bonds of a love—a boundless love, which not all the waters of vengeance could quench, no floods could drown. Well did he know the suffering he willingly assumed, when from eternity he engaged to come from heaven to seek and save that which was lost. From his birth to his death, he well knew all that was before him. His omniscient eye beheld all the malice of his enemies, the desertion of his friends, the agonies that, for our guilt, in the garden would fall upon him, the bloody scene in Pilate's hall, the crown of thorns, the cross, the grave. Yet he willingly went forward to be "wounded for our transgressions," to be "bruised for our iniquities. He was led as a lamb to the slaughter." His firmness did not fail, his love did not wax cold, when, in the extremity of his anguish, he pleaded in the garden, "if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." It was not the death of the cross he here pleads might pass from him, but that ineffable and mysterious wo, which then fell upon his soul. And he was heard; he is always heard. His agony of soul passed away, and there appeared an angel from heaven, strengthening the human nature of this Creator of angels. In all his sufferings he was a willing victim. He died, it is true, a sacrifice to vengeance, inflicted by the hand of his own Father as the avenger of a violated law; but his love, his free, sovereign, incomprehensible love, led him to the cross, and bound him there to the altar of justice, where "through the Eternal Spirit, he thus *offered himself without spot unto God*." Well may we, with angels and the redeemed in heaven, sing and say, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.—The right hand of the Lord is exalted, the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly.—It is finished." The man of God's right hand has triumphed. The seed of the woman has bruised the serpent's head. "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." "O sing unto the Lord a new song, for he hath done marvellous things: his right hand, and his holy arm have gotten him the victory. Sing unto the Lord, bless his name, show forth his salvation from day to day."

\* He was, however, under covenant obligation to suffer.—Editor.

**ART. VI.—*Missions to the Jews a Grand Means of Evangelizing the World.***

As our Lord when sending forth the Apostles to preach the glad tidings of salvation to all nations, commanded them *to begin at Jerusalem*, so the following statement, made by a missionary of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to Palestine, shows that faithful efforts among the Jews open a wide door for spreading the truth throughout the darkened parts of the earth.—*Belfast Covenanter*.

I shall now state, very shortly perhaps, a single fact, because it is a most striking fact, and one which ought to encourage the Church to go forward in this good cause of carrying the Gospel to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The encouraging fact is simply this, that there is a peculiar access to the Jews; that in almost all the countries we visited, and in some more especially, the only people to whom a Christian missionary can go are the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It is a fact which struck us in every country where we sojourned, and especially on reviewing the course of our travels, and reflecting on all that came under our observation, it appears to us still more striking and still more encouraging. For example, we spent more than a week at Leghorn, in Tuscany. Leghorn is a free port, and Tuscany the freest of all the countries in Italy. Yet in that free port and state you cannot preach the Gospel to Roman Catholics. If you give a tract or a Bible to a Roman Catholic, he carries it to the priest, who carries it to the magistrate; you are immediately seized and imprisoned. It is impossible to carry the Gospel directly to the Roman Catholic population, because imprisonment will certainly follow. And yet, in the same place, you may go freely to the lost sheep of Israel. We went daily to the synagogue—through the streets—every where to preach the Gospel to the Jews. And why is it that to them we are allowed to preach without hinderance? No man careth for their souls; no man heeds though we carry to them the Bible and the message of life. Do you not see that thus the door is shut to the Gentiles, but open to the Jews? The same fact is true, though not in the same eminent degree, with regard to the Eastern countries. In Egypt and Palestine you dare not preach the Gospel to the deluded followers of Mahomet, on the penalty of instant banishment or death; at least if any follower of Mahomet came over to the Christian faith, and openly confessed the Lord Jesus in his mouth, I am convinced that he would be put to death. Yet in those countries you may preach freely the Gospel to the Jews. In every place—in the market-place, in the bazaars, in the synagogue—we went openly with the Hebrew Bible in our hand. No man hindered us; no man said, why do ye these things?—why do ye speak to these people? In Jerusalem we spoke freely to all the people we saw. We sat in the stone court of the house where we lived, the whole court full of Jews, to whom the Gospel was freely opened. And when we came to the ancient Sychar, now Nablous, we visited the bazaar, which is a place for shops, with a covered way; that makes it dark and cool. Before the doors there is a stone divan, on which the shop-keeper generally sits. There have we often sat with the Jewish shop-keeper, and freely opened the Gospel of our Lord. The Bible was constantly with us; and we

found that the door was perfectly open to preach the Gospel to the Jews in the Holy Land.

---

ART. VII.—*Slavery in the New School General Assembly.*

The "Anti-Slavery Reporter" thus concludes an article respecting the action of this ecclesiastical body on the subject of slavery.

Dr. Cox moved an indefinite postponement of the whole subject. The motion for indefinite postponement was put and carried!! Messrs. M. Buttolph, G. W. Clark, G. M. Gifford, C. Dubois, J. Shaw, J. J. Miter, J. Gridley, S. Wells, E. B. Chamberlain, and H. Shedd, wished to have their names entered on the minutes, as dissenting from the foregoing vote. The editor of the New York Evangelist, who was present, says, "Had the Assembly proceeded to discuss the whole subject with a mutual effort to frame some minute expressive of their mutual sentiments, on the moral character of slavery, and the duty of emancipation, a unanimous result might have been obtained." Why, it will be earnestly and extensively asked, was not such a result brought about? The following answer is probably the true one. The threats of the slave-holding members to secede alarmed the other members, who are unwilling to have the numbers of the New School Assembly diminished; considering union, and attendance approximating to that of the Old School Assembly, paramount to any action on the subject of slavery at the present time.

Will the people be satisfied with such inaction on the part of ministers of the gospel? One of them, Dr. Cox, in view of the recent proceedings in the New School Assembly, has published, on behalf of himself and others, that while the Old School Assembly dared not take up the subject of abolition at all," We, on the other hand, have discussed it like men, and like Christians; and we rise stronger and more intelligent from the subject!!" And, with reference to the adjournment of the New School Assembly till 1843, without farther action on the subject of slavery, Dr. Cox exultingly says, "our Vesuvius is safely capped for three years." We call upon wise, discriminating, fearless ministers of the gospel, and laymen, in this and foreign lands, seriously to consider these things.

---

ART. VIII.—*A Popular Preacher.—From the Ch. Mag.*

A few months ago a conversation, not very unlike the following, took place between two neighbors in one of our western villages. One of them, Mr. G——, is a mechanic, plain, upright and intelligent; the other, Mr. S——, is a merchant, who attends well to his business, and is becoming rich.

Mr. S——. Did you hear the sermon last evening?

Mr. G——. No. I was at home, catechising and instructing my children.

S. Well, now, if that don't beat all! At home instructing your children, when such a preacher is in the village. Why, you don't know what you lost.

G. I am willing to deny myself the pleasure of an evening service, in order to improve that time in teaching my family. But what have I lost?

S. Lost! Dear me, you have lost the best sermon preached in this town or any other for a twelvemonth.

G. I am sorry for that. It must have been an excellent one; for within that period I have heard a great many instructive, gospel discourses. My pastor gives us, every sabbath, a couple of good, sound discourses; opening to us the scriptures, and aiding us in applying the truth closely to our hearts. If I have lost so much by not attending your church to hear this stranger, perhaps you will help make up my loss by giving me some account of his sermon. What was his text?

S. Text! Why, it was—let me see—yes, it was in the second book of the prophet Deuteronomy—no, I mistake—it was somewhere in the *Old Testament*. Positively, I can't exactly remember, this moment, where it was. The truth is, I was so taken up thinking of the popular preacher—his appearance, as he arose in the pulpit—he looked as if he had just come out of a band-box—an eye as keen as a razor, and a voice like silver—that I really forgot to attend to the text.

G. That was truly unfortunate. Perhaps the silvery sounds of his voice brought up some pecuniary association not very favourable to the reception of divine truth. But, neighbour S., is that the right kind of popularity in a preacher which makes the hearers inattentive to the text? or is it right for us to suffer our admiration of a man's person, or his talents, or his manner, to make us inattentive to the word of God which he utters?

S. O, you know any body can take a text. The poorest preacher can take as good a one as the best. It's not the text that shows the man, but the manner in which he handles it.

G. But, neighbor S., I thought the business of the preacher of the gospel was not to show himself, but to exhibit Christ. You know Paul says, we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. But let the text pass. Will you have the goodness to inform me what he preached about—what was his subject?

S. Subject! preached about! Why, sir, he preached about every thing. He said—dear me—he said more than I could retail out to you in a month. After all he seemed to feel as a cotton bale just opened. He said more fine things—beautiful figures—elegant words—than I ever heard in the same space of time. He said he had not much time for preparation—was called upon unexpectedly to address this polite assembly.

G. You are quite certain, that was in the sermon.

S. Certain! Why, my dear sir, I heard it with my own ears. And you've no idea how he waved his hand, and smiled, and bowed to the congregation, when he said it. Why, dear me, *every* body was in raptures.

G. I'm not very fond of hearing a preacher make such apologies for himself, or pay such compliments to his auditors. But you seem to have been very much delighted.

S. Well, I was delighted, and entertained, and edified besides.

G. But, friend S., he must have had some particular subject under discussion. I must confess an increasing curiosity to know what it was.

S. Why, didn't I tell you the particular subject was in the text; and I've forgot that. But, dear me, there was enough besides.

Why, the sermon was full twenty minutes long; and every sentence was crowded with thought.

G. I suppose his thoughts were something like the small gems in a piece of mosaic work, packed in so close that no one could get any out. Perhaps, however, you can tell me some things he said.

S. Why, sir, he said so many things, that I can scarcely remember what they were. It constantly reminded me of my store. Any body, standing a few minutes in my door, would see that the shelves and tables are loaded with goods of every variety, and very cheap too; and yet he could hardly specify one in a thousand of the particular articles. Brother G., I've just received my fall supply:—Hope you will give us a call.

G. Perhaps I may. But that's quite another subject. No wonder you don't remember what was said, if you were all the while thinking of your new goods.

S. Not *all* the while. I gave particular attention to the footing up of his sermon. He talked about beautiful flowers, and morality, and said it was just as easy for us all to become good Christians, if we had only a mind to, as it was to come to church. And then he talked about the free winds sweeping over the mountains, and about vivid lightning, and metaphysics; and the showers of rain falling on the barren desert, and on the fruitful fields; and that, he said, proved the general atonement. And then he went off, like an eagle, to the clouds, and the stars, and talked about liberality, and aurora borealis, and charity, and the philosophy of the mind; and concluded by saying the whole subject, thus considered, proved that the new-light men were all exactly right, and the old-light men were all exactly wrong.

G. That was quite a sweeping declaration.

S. Sweeping! I guess it was. Why, he swept every thing before him, as clean as a broken merchant's shelves after a sheriff's sale.

G. And his hearers, doubtless, thought it all very conclusive.

S. Certainly! Why, sir, they could not think otherwise. There was no getting away from it. He carried the whole audience right along with him. He made it as plain as a ledger. I heard lawyer W. say, "the argument was unanswerable, and the orthodox would have to let the cause go by default." And Col. T—— declared, "it was a complete victory; that it spiked all the orthodox guns at a single blow." And Dr. L—— said "it was the most powerful dose he had ever seen given; that it would either kill or cure; and he didn't care a pill which." And I can assure you, sir, it was a most superior article. But I did not attend so much to what he said, as to his manner. He had a most elegant assortment of words, and they flowed out like liquor out of one of my casks—a *very free* delivery—and then his gestures—he measured them off like tape—the most graceful I ever saw. He pounded the cushion, slapped his hands, and smote his breast; and two or three times he made one eye a little bigger than the other, and looked as tender!! At one time he clasped his hands, and held them right over his head, standing on tip-toe, for more than two minutes, talking all the while like a book. The house was as still as death. Several times when he came to the pathetic parts, he laid one hand upon the bosom of his shirt, and the other, with a *beautiful* linen handkerchief in it, up to his eyes, and uttered an O—— a yard long. Why, sir, it went right to my heart. I was overpowered. It seemed

to me every body must be convinced. I'm certain if there were not converts made last night, it was not the preacher's fault.

G. Friend S., I have engagements requiring my presence elsewhere. But before we part, let me say your account of the meeting last evening, has not given me a very favourable opinion of this new preacher. The doctrines which you say he advanced are not found in the Bible. From your account of him, (and I speak only with reference to that,) he did not give a very favourable specimen of the charity of which he boasted. Nor did he, if your report be correct, show a proper regard for the best interests of his hearers, in seeking to entertain them with imaginative flights, and theatrical action, when he should have preached to them the gospel of Christ. I have no objection to ornament in a sermon, only let it be such as becomes the soberness, the dignity, and the sacredness of truth. I have no objection to gesture, but let it be such as the sentiment dictates, and as the speaker would make if Christ were with him in the pulpit. I have no possible objection to feeling, in speaker or hearers. I love to see it, deep and strong; only let it be that which is produced, not by an attitude, or a pathetic inflexion of the voice, or the relation of puerile anecdotes, but by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Christ did not send out his ministers to act a part, or tell dreams, or relate anecdotes, but to preach the gospel; and if they don't do that, they've an awful account to render. And let me observe, too, that we laymen are not admitted to the courts of God's house, for the purpose of admiring ministers, but to hear the word of God, to believe and do it. Better, far better, for us to listen to God's plain truth, even though it be told plainly and without any rhetorical flourish, than to profane the Lord's day and the Lord's ordinances, by being amused with the most finished elegance of unscriptural and frothy declamation.

M. N. M.

---

#### ART. IX.—*Socialism in England.*

FROM various public exposures of the character and pernicious tendency of this system of daring Atheism and immorality, it appears that Socialism has spread, and is spreading, to an alarming extent throughout England, and in some parts of Scotland. The Bishop of Exeter, in his speech in the House of Lords, on moving an address to the Queen on this subject, stated that not fewer than 350 places (chiefly cities, towns, or villages) in the United Kingdom are fixed upon, where there are either associations of Socialists, or which are visited by Socialist missionaries—that there are *sixty or seventy* of these missionaries, or lecturers, regularly employed, with salaries of *eighty or ninety pounds* a year, who travel about, blaspheme the existence and perfections of Deity, openly impugn all the great doctrines of Revelation, and teach the most abominable principles in relation to marriage and private property, denouncing both as utterly opposed to the design of nature, and attributing to them almost all the evils that desolate society; and that there is a convention held yearly for directing the affairs of the Socialist institutions, which is attended by numerous delegates from various parts of the kingdom. The Bishop likewise stated that there was reason to fear that persons of property and influence were lending aid to the progress of Socialism. Very

lately the Socialists had erected a *Hall of Science*, as they call it, in one of the public squares in Birmingham, at an expense of £5,000, where on the Sabbath, the Deity is openly reviled, and the most poisonous doctrines are inculcated. The same party had purchased a farm of 500 acres near Southampton, for the purpose of forming an establishment, and have even offered to buy an estate which had been proposed for sale, at the amount of £22,000. Several persons in public situations under the government were connected with the Socialists, some of them being even active office-bearers of their associations. The ministers of the crown have manifested the most criminal ignorance and indifference in reference to the progress of this hateful and demoralizing system; though, in consequence of the Bishop of Exeter's exposure, and the sensation of horror which it has excited throughout the nation, orders have been of late sent from the Home Secretary to the lord lieutenants and magistrates of the counties to watch the operations of the Socialists, and to take measures against them in case they should be found chargeable with breaches of the peace. This order falls far short of what Christian rulers ought to do for the suppression of gross blasphemy and immorality; and at a time when the most pernicious principles are spreading, Christians of every name should cry mightily to God, that he would arrest the progress of evil, and avert the fearful judgments that impend over the nation.

#### ART. X.—*National Education in Ireland.*

The principle on which, it will be seen by the following extracts from a late number of the *Belfast Covenanter*, the British Government proceed in reference to Education in Ireland, is the same which has prevailed in this country to such an alarming extent, namely, *that all kinds of religion are entitled to equal favour* in the community. Satan never invented, men never proclaimed a more diabolical doctrine; as it is the rankest, the foulest species of infidelity, so it is the most destructive in its operation. It holds its principal seat in the bosom of the visible church, and becomes a convenient stepping-stone to ecclesiastical preferment, political power, wealth, and worldly honours. It is the invention of a highway to heaven without truth, faithfulness, or self-denial—an invention by which lordly priests and political demagogues riot on the temporal interests of mankind at the expense of their souls. And from present indications this very principle will probably overthrow the Secession church in the United States. It has already brought it very low. "Lord, wilt thou not revive us?"

The Board, as it was originally constituted, and as we believe, it still exists, was composed of the *Roman Catholic and the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, a Presbyterian clergyman and a Socinian and an Episcopal layman, with a liberal nobleman at their head*. It is easy from the materials to judge of the character of the extracts, and of the other moral and religious works, that would receive the sanction of the Commissioners, and would be admissible to the schools. In the Second Report of the Commissioners, it is stated that "religion is constantly impressed upon the minds of the



children *through works* calculated to promote good principles, and fill the heart with a love of religion, but *which are so compiled* as not to clash with the doctrines of any particular class of Christians." However liberal and charitable this comprehensive plan may appear to persons of loose or superficial views, it is evident that it just amounts to a virtual exclusion from the books used in the schools of every thing that is distinctive in Christianity. On the system that nothing must be introduced that will "clash with the doctrines of any particular class of Christians," how many of the great articles of Revelation, that concern the person and work of the Saviour, and the way of a sinner's salvation through him, will be retained? Nothing, even from the Scriptures, that would condemn creature-worship, or any of the other numerous errors of Popery—that would clearly declare the Saviour's divinity, or exhibit any other doctrine in which persons of such heterogeneous and conflicting views as the Commissioners could not concur, may hope to find admission to the seminaries honoured with Government patronage; and it is needless to state how many of the precious articles of Divine truth, with which the sinner's safety and the church's hopes are connected, would, in consequence, fall under the ban of an unhallowed exclusion.

Wherever the word of God comes, it is a rule and a law universally binding: it carries its own obligation along with it, and as the light shining from heaven, it evidences its own purity and power. Nations and their rulers, favoured with Divine Revelation, are under paramount obligation to receive and submit to its requirements, to make it the basis of their legislation, and labour that its authority be universally recognised. These are duties which Christian nations cannot neglect, without incurring the guilt of rebellion against the moral Governor of the universe, and subjecting themselves to his fearful displeasure. When Protestant truth has been professed by the nation and its rulers, as in these lands, there is plainly a super-added obligation, never to compromise, but always to carry out the great Protestant principle, that an unmutated, uncorrupted Bible is the right of every inhabitant of the land; and that as every individual ought to use and apply it, so facilities should be furnished by rulers that all should know it, and walk in submission to its holy requirements. The system of education which they should sanction should be based on the Divine word; and it is plain that they can never, without high criminality, sanction what it condemns, or employ the national resources, placed at their disposal, in promoting error, or in removing out of view the standard of truth by which error is detected and condemned. Proceeding on these principles, which we think follow indubitably from the premises that have been stated, we cannot but regard the British Government deeply criminal in introducing the new National system of Education into Ireland; and this system we hesitate not to say, should never be regarded otherwise than with marked disapprobation by those who value sound principle. Disguise or conceal it as its friends may, the new system was adopted by British statesmen succumbing to the intrigues of Popish priests and demagogues, and depriving the Roman Catholic population of what, if left to themselves, they would, in general, have readily received—a sound scriptural education.\* And

\* The fact that the Roman Catholic people in general would have willingly re-

notably has the system since its establishment subserved the designs of Popery. The vast majority of the schools that are receiving an endowment from the Commissioners, were admitted into connexion with the system on the recommendation of Popish Priests; the great mass of the teachers are Papists; and though the Scripture Extracts are received in the Roman Catholic schools of the Board, there is evidence that in many cases they are utterly neglected, while the works that directly inculcate Popery are daily used, and the Bible is wholly unknown in them. Well might the Romish prelates in the "Christian Directory," some time since, call upon the faithful to rejoice in the success of the National System, for greatly has it served their purposes; and though some fiery zealots of Rome, such as Dr. Machale, may oppose it for not daring to be exclusively Popish, the majority of the Romish Dignitaries and leaders, more thoroughly versed in the lore of Ignatius Loyala, can play a deeper game, and consistently give the National system their strenuous support, knowing that it is mightily promoting the interests of the Man of Sin.

In fact, the legislative doctrine of the new National System of Irish Education, even when the concession is made that, in some instances, Protestant formularies may be used in the schools, is just that truth and error are on a level, and that one is as equally entitled to the support and countenance of the State as the other. What the Rev. Hugh M'Neile eloquently charges upon the new National System of Education for England, may with equal justice be adduced against that which has been saddled on this country:—

"The plea of liberty of conscience is convenient to deceive, but the root of the system, like that of its predecessors, lies much deeper. It springs from the insatiable and indefatigable ambition of Rome, yielding to her purpose the genuine liberality and unsuspecting honesty of English statesmen. Lord Stanley was in no sense or degree the accomplice, but in every sense the dupe of the Most Rev. Doctor Murray, the agent for the supreme Pontiff."

"The direct tendency of the system is to reduce to a dead level in the minds of the people scriptural instruction in religion, and Popish instruction in superstition, and Socinian instruction in infidelity—to exhibit as equally under the patronage of the Government, and equally entitled to the support of the nation, the truth that there are only two Christian sacraments, and the falsehood that there are seven; the truth that there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, and the falsehood of the mediation of the Virgin Mary, the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints; the truth that if a man could do all whatsoever is commanded him, he would still have no merit before God, but be an unprofitable servant, and the falsehood that man's good works are essentially meritorious, entitling him to grace and salvation; the truth that *to bow down to a graven image* is expressly forbidden by Almighty God, and the falsehood that it is lawful and right to bow down to graven images;

ceived the boon of a Scriptural Education, if offered them by a paternal government, is proved by the circumstance that previously to the withdrawal of the Government grant from the Kildare-Place Society, 132,000 children throughout Ireland were attending the schools of that Society, of which more than 90,000 were Roman Catholics, and this notwithstanding all the denunciations of the Romish Priesthood against it—and also that large numbers of Roman Catholic children attend the Sabbath Schools of the London Hibernian, and the Baptist Societies, which are exclusively Scriptural.

the truth that Jesus Christ is both God and man, and the falsehood that he is man only.

ART. XI.—*A Sermon of the Rev. Thomas Hamilton, preached September, 1813.*

“And thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things.” Psalm xlv. 4.

By the right hand of Christ, we understand his power and strength. In this sense the right hand of Christ is often celebrated in scripture, “Thy right hand, O Lord, is become glorious in power,” &c. Exod. xv. 6. “Thou savest by thy right hand, them that put their trust in thee,” Psalm xvi. 7. “Thy right hand shall find out them that hate thee,” &c. Ps. xxi. 8. “The right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly.” Ps. xlv. 3, and cxviii. 15. This power of the Messiah is demonstrated in war against the enemies of his cause and kingdom. Ps. xlviii. 10, 11, and xcvi. 1. By the “terrible things” are meant those operations of the right hand of Christ which are adapted to fill his enemies with terror, and his friends with reverence, and all with wonder, on account of their greatness. They include the work of mercy and judgment which he executes in behalf of his people, and against his enemies: there is a reference to the terrible things God wrought in the redemption of Israel from Egypt, in their guidance to Canaan, through the Red Sea, the wilderness and Jordan, and their settlement in that goodly land, &c. Deut. x. 21, 2 Sam. vii. 23, and Ps. cvi. 22. To these things there is an allusion in the following places, where the subjection of the nations to Christ is predicted. Ps. xviii. 30, to 46, and xlv. 3—6, and lxviii. 13—18. The operations of his right hand are intended in Ps. cxlv. 6, “Men shall speak of the might of thy terrible acts,” and Ps. lxiv. 3, “When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for,” &c. The epithet “terrible,” is applied to these events, to denote, 1st. That they transcend all human efforts, and can only be ascribed to a divine power, Isa. xl. 12, and xli. 4. 2nd. They are calculated to inspire holy veneration and awe in the subjects of his kingdom, Ps. lxxxix. 3d. And fear and dismay in the minds of his enemies, Ps. xlviii. and xcvi.

His right hand is said to teach him terrible things, or to show or demonstrate terrible things to him. Here are two figures used. His power is metaphorically represented by his right hand; this, again, is personified or represented as doing a personal act; that is, he would perform these things by the power of his arm. He would experience or realize these events, as effected by his own power. Similar to John v. 20, he will show him greater things than these, that ye may marvel; where, by the greater works which excite marvel, the terrible things here mentioned are included; and to Ps. lx. 3, “Thou hast showed thy people hard things;” that is, thou hast caused them to experience hard things. The phrase which exhibits the right hand of Christ as a teacher of terrible things, intimates,

1st. That he would perform the terrible things by an act of his own power, without any human aid; “his right hand, and his holy arm have gotten him the victory.” Isa. lix. 16: “And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor; therefore, his arm brought salvation to him, and his righteousness it sustained him,” and lxiii. 5. In other places where the subjection of the

nations to Christ is spoken of, he is accompanied by instruments, but here he alone is brought into view, to intimate that while he employs instruments, their success depends on his power and prowess.

2d. That by these works the Divine purposes would be displayed; the truth of the types, and prophecies would be demonstrated, and thus the church of Christ would see these mysteries in the light of their own accomplishment, and on this account her Head is represented as instructed.

3d. The high complacency Christ takes in the success of his kingdom, as promoted by these terrible things in righteousness. Instruction, as to great and important matters is a source of much pleasure. The interest Christ takes in the subjection of the nations as his inheritance, agreeably to his compact with the Father, appears from Ps. xvi. 6, "The lines have fallen unto me in pleasant places," &c.

The performance of these terrible things is connected with the success of the gospel of Christ: his claim is coupled with the preceding one, "*and thy right hand.*" The doctrine set forth is, that terrible things are executed by the right hand of Christ, riding in his majesty prosperously, and for the sake of truth, meekness and righteousness. We may consider,

1. The "terrible things" here mentioned. These may be considered in regard to the world, and the church which is in the world; the enemies of Christ, and his friends, or true subjects.

1. He performs awful things, as to the world, or the nations. "Come see the works of God; he is terrible in his doing toward the children of men." These terrible things include the judgments he inflicts on them for their idolatry, and wickedness, and particularly for the persecution of his church; consisting in the wars, the famine, the pestilence, and other calamities with which he scourges the world. The shaking of the nations, Hag. xi. 7, "I will shake all nations." Heb. xii. 16. "The revolutions and overturnings which take place in nations and empires, Ezek. xxi. 27, "I will overturn," &c. These are terrible events, represented by the demolition of Nebuchadnezzar's huge image, composed of heterogeneous materials, Dan. ii., by the sacrifice, prevalence, and destruction of four beasts, vii. and these are terrible things in the seven vials, which are mentioned by John, in Revelation, and which have been, and still are pouring out on the nations which have opposed the progress of Christ in the chariot of his gospel.

2. In the visible church;—she has occasion to sing both of mercy and judgment. God hath visited his church, with

1st. Terrible rebukes and chastisements. He thus punished the Jewish church, "Thou hast showed thy people hard things, thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment." "By terrible things in righteousness wilt thou answer us, O God of our salvation;" and also the New Testament church, what manifold, and awful rebukes has God given her since her establishment. The persecutions which have in different ages wasted her, are terrible things in righteousness allotted to her for her correction. By these he purges away her dross.

2nd. He sometimes visits his church with *desolating* judgments. In this manner he healed the Jewish church, Isa. vi. 11, Hos. i. 6, and vi. 1, 2, &c.: wrath has come down on the Jews to the uttermost, and many particular and local branches of the church have been cut off, and thrown away for their unfruitfulness; witness the seven

churches of Asia: many a candlestick has been removed out of its place. We should improve these awful dispensations. God says, "Go ye now to my place which was in Shiloh, where I set my name first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel."

3rd. His interpositions in her behalf, are included in these terrible things, which mean those dispensations which are calculated to excite holy veneration, and are awful on account of the manifestations of the Divine power, majesty and goodness. Many of these gracious manifestations of God to his people of old inspired them with fear. Jacob said, of Bethel, "how dreadful is this place!" The deliverances wrought for them inspired them with fear, whilst they excited their joy and gratitude. The children of Israel, when they saw that great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians at the Red Sea, they feared the Lord and believed him, Ex. xiv. 31. It is predicted that in the latter days, upon their conversion, they will fear the Lord, and his goodness, Hos. iii. 5. The extraordinary events of the Millenium, attended by the great enlargement of the church, will produce holy fear: "Then shalt thou see, and flow together, and thy heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee." Isa. lx. 5.

3. "Terrible things" towards his enemies and the enemies of his church.

1st. He *restrains* them, while he makes the wrath of man to praise him. He restrains the remainder of his wrath. This restraint is so strong, as to be compared to the control God exercises over the ocean, "which stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves and the tumult of the people." This may be reckoned among the marvellous and awful operations of Christ's right hand. He often employs fear in imposing this restraint upon them. "They fear where no fear is: when no man pursueth, the wicked flee;" and in considering this work, the people of God are filled with awe and veneration.

2d. He makes their wrath, so far as it is not restrained, to *praise* him. He defeats their malicious designs, when they are most sanguine and confident of success, and often he so orders it that their malicious efforts rebound on their head. They fall into the pit they digged for others. Thus the Lord gets himself honour upon them.

3d. He smites them with the terrors of the Lord, he sets them round about with terrors. He causes his arrows to penetrate their conscience. They are filled with the anguish of terror and remorse. They have a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries, Heb. x. 27. There are many instances of this.

4th. He cuts them off by the stroke of *death*, and often in a very terrible manner. Christ's right hand performs terrible things in the death of the wicked. "The wicked are driven away in their wickedness." The death of every sinner is a terrible event to him. It puts an end to all his sinful and sensual enjoyments. It destroys their bodies and reduces them to dust under the curse of God, and summons their souls before his bar. The death of some has been attended with extraordinary terror, the fire of almighty wrath being kindled in their consciences. The right hand of Christ lay heavily upon them. Witness the death of many infidels and apostate Christians and other wicked men, &c. They died full of the fury of the Lord. Hell was

moved to meet them at their coming, and entered into them as the prelude of their entering into hell.

5th. The right hand of Christ executes terrible things on sinners in the *day of judgment*. "Then his hand will find out all his enemies, his right hand will find out all those that hate him," he will make them as a fiery oven in the time of his anger. The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath and the fire shall devour them." Then he will come in flaming fire, 2 Thess. i. 8.

4. Dispensations towards his people, in these instances:

1st. In a law work the hand of Christ lies heavy upon them; "the law worketh wrath." The terrors of the Lord set themselves in array against them, as in the instance of Saul.

2d. After their conversion the Lord frequently shows them hard things, and answers them "by terrible things in righteousness." 1. *Terrible afflictions*, in regard to their number and duration. They are brought into deep waters, where the floods pass over them. "Deep calls unto deep at the noise of his water spouts." 2. *Terrible temptations*: Satan is permitted to buffet them and annoy them with his fiery darts. They are harassed with sinful and blasphemous thoughts or injections. 3. *Terrible deserts*: "thou didst hide thy face, and I was troubled." They walk in darkness, and have no light, as in the instance of Heman, Psa. lxxxviii. and others. We may consider,—

II. The right hand of Christ, which executes these things. Some of its distinguishing attributes may be mentioned:

1. It is strong and powerful. It framed and sustains the universe: the resplendent and mighty orbs of light which adorn the heavens were created by his mighty hand, upon which they are dependent in all their revolutions. It is the right hand of Christ which supports the church and every believer: "ye are kept by the mighty power of God," &c. It restrains and subdues all his enemies.

2. It is *high*; "high is his right hand." It is infinitely high in power and sovereignty; there is nothing above or beyond its reach. Its control is in heaven above, as well as on earth beneath: we are called to praise him in the firmament of his power. There is no escaping from the scope of its operation, Amos ix. 2, 3.

3. It is *valiant*; "the right hand of the Lord is exalted, the right hand of the Lord doth valiantly." The most potent and numerous foes, who have dared to resist it have sunk beneath its stroke, Exod. xv., "Thy right hand hath dashed in pieces the enemy." Isa. li. 9, "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord," &c.

4. It is a *righteous* arm, Ps. xlviii. 10, "thy right hand is full of righteousness." It is *holy*, Ps. xcvi. 1, "his right hand, and his holy arm, have gotten him the victory." All the ways and works of Christ are righteous and holy.

5. It is *glorious*, Isa. lxiii. 12, "that led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, to make himself an everlasting name. It is glorious in power, glorious in holiness, "who is like unto thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?"

6. It is the right hand of *mercy*, Zech. xiii. 7, "Smite the Shepherd, and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones." "All his saints are in his hand. "He holds the seven stars in his right hand." It is called therefore a good hand, Neh. ii. 8, and Ezra vii. 9. His power is exerted to carry into effect the dictates of his love and goodness. Consider,—

III. The influence which these awful operations of his right hand

would have on the cause of Christ. This is conspicuous in the following instances:

1. By his right hand some are reduced to the obedience of faith, and become the true subjects of his kingdom.

2. They who continue to resist are destroyed; they are made his footstool.

3. Others beholding and dreading the terrible things of his right hand, *dissemble* their enmity, and feign submission, Ps. lxxvi. 3, "Say unto God, How terrible art thou in thy works! through the greatness of thy power shall thine enemies submit themselves unto thee." Ps. xviii. 44, "as soon as they hear of me, they shall obey me: the strangers shall submit themselves unto the Lord." Ps. lxxxi. 14, 15.

4. The fame of Christ, spread abroad by the terrible things wrought by his right hand, would induce strangers to come and submit to him, Zech. viii. 20—23.

#### INFERENCES.

1. The Lord is greatly to be feared. His power, holiness, justice and truth should fill us with holy dread. While he gives the most inviting and encouraging displays of his grace, he shows the most awful exhibitions of his justice and majesty and wrath against his enemies. He is not only terrible in his doings to the children of men, but awful to his own. He has set up monuments in his church, of his displeasure at hypocrisy and impiety. The fire of his jealousy burns ardently in his own house, witness the death of Nadab and Abihu; of Ananias and Sapphira: his own dear children do not escape terrible things in righteousness as a chastisement for their sins; as we see in the case of Eli, David, Uzzah, the Corinthians, &c.

2. We see the cause of the success of the Gospel and the preservation of the church. Both are owing to the right hand of Christ, his word, his saints, and his ministers are all in his hand.

3. They are very safe and happy who enjoy the protection of his right hand; he thus *defends* them against all their enemies human or diabolical, *upholds* them under all their afflictions. He keeps them from sinking in the deep waters, as he took hold of Peter when he began to sink. He keeps them from sinking under their burdens, by lightening these, and strengthening them. He comforts them in distress, "his left hand is under their head, his right hand doth embrace them." He leads them in the way they should go, pointing out the path, and guiding them in it, he keeps them from falling: "Thou hast holden me by my right hand;" "hold up my goings;" "when I said, My foot slippeth, thy mercy, O Lord, held me up." "He not only performs these kind offices in *life*, but they are under the guardianship of his arm in death and judgment, &c.

4. How dreadful and dangerous the condition of those who are his enemies and exposed to the stroke of his arm! they have no defence against their foes, they have no support under their burdens, they have no comfort in their afflictions, they have no shield or consolation against the sting and under the pangs of *death*, no advocate at the bar of *judgment*, not only so, the hand, the right hand of Christ is on them in all these scenes. "The wrath of God abideth on them." O what terrible things does it execute in their consciences and on their persons! It is a fearful thing to fall into

the hands of the living God!—in *life*, in *death*, at the *judgment-bar*, in *hell*.

5. Let sinners, especially sinners in Zion, be afraid: consider your danger, it is great and immediate. Consider the *hand* of Christ: it is strong, it is valiant, it is high, it is lifted up: nothing prevents its descent upon you but the long-suffering, and the patience of God. Can you be easy in such danger? Your condemnation will be just. The right hand of Christ is full of righteousness, and will be rendered glorious in your destruction. The sword which he wields is bright, and has never been stained with a drop of blood unrighteously shed. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne." Your own conscience therefore will pronounce your sentence holy, and these terrible things righteous. Whilst the fire of divine wrath consumes you, this worm will gnaw you like an insatiable vulture.

But, consider, the right hand of Christ delights in deeds of mercy. Before he employs it in inflicting wrath, he extends it with the sceptre of peace and the offers of pardon. Nay, he holds it forth in the posture of expostulation, Rom. x. 21, and when he lifts it up, the stroke is often long suspended. He waits to be gracious, he hath no pleasure in the death of sinners. It hath been raised many years before the fatal stroke was given, and in many instances, though the hand of justice was lifted up, the hand of mercy hath been turned upon them. Let sinners then submit, before it be too late, to him who in majesty rides forth prosperously because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness.

#### ART. XII.—*Associate Reformed Church in Boston.*

The following extracts from an article in the April number of the Christian Magazine, looks as though some in that church intend to resist the "innovations" which they have been so long making on the subject of Psalmody. Their sincerity will probably soon be tested.

The fact that an Associate Reformed Church existed in that city, at a period earlier than the adoption of the federal constitution of our country, naturally calls our attention to it, and some such inquiries as these arise. With such early advantages, does it still continue there? have many churches sprung from it, and are they "sound in the faith?" or have the labours of Annan, like footsteps on the seashore, been obliterated by the tide of time? or has "the innovation in the order of our church with respect to psalmody," about which Synod expressed their disapprobation, obtained the ascendancy, and if so, what have been the consequences? These are natural inquiries in the mind of every lover of our Zion, and the answers ought to be extensively known.

First, it is inquired, does an Associate Reformed congregation continue in Boston? No, reader, no. With one exception, this is the only denomination, which once had a society in that city, that is now extinct there. The answer to the other inquiries you shall have a little in detail, with some of the probable causes.

More than half a century has elapsed since the existence of an Associate Reformed church has been known in Boston, excepting by name, in the history of the city. The place of worship is still there, but the psalmody is changed from Rouse to Tate and Brady, and from their version, to something still more fashionable to keep pace with



the wise notions of a more enlightened age! It is occupied on sabbaths by gay and honourable-looking men, not a few of them "princes to look to, after the manner of the land of their nativity," and you need not be astonished that they "rejoice at the sound of the organ." An educated ministry occupy its desk, men of superior intellect, and in "philosophy commonly so called" profound, surpassed in erudition by few indeed on the American soil. But, reader, *tekel* is written on the pulpit, and *Ichabod* over its portals. That "name which is above every name" is not honoured there. Its occupants have a worship without a Saviour, and a religion without an atonement. "Him," whom all the "angels of God worship," they dishonour. He who is "Holy, holy, holy, JEHOVAH of hosts," John xii. 41, is there treated as a mere creature, and by them only so far respected, that his death is regarded as an example of heroism; while God, the eternal Spirit, is considered as only the power of the Father. Lest the devils should shame them into a belief of the divinity of Immanuel, they deny the existence of evil angels, doubt whether their own soul is a substance or principle separate from the body, and pretend that the scriptures do not teach the doctrine of eternal punishments to be inflicted. Such are some of the "doctrines of devils," now substituted by them for the doctrines of salvation by grace taught by Robert Annan. "Tell it not in Gath!" Such is the tendency of will worship, such the consequences when men do not obey what is said in Jer. vi. 16. The spirit of unhumiliated pride has doubtless wrought "this great wickedness." For fifty years the congregation had prospered under the Presbyterian form of church government, but the "thus saith the Lord," upon which it is built, grew irksome, and "go to, let us," became its substitute. For a longer period, it has declined under the form of government adopted at Shinar, and proposed at Kadesh, the genius of independency. As this form had been adopted previously to the period when the Rev. Mr. Annan laboured among them, it was doubtless this principle which involved him in trouble with them. Congregationalism for a season made the version of Tate and Brady, with them, more popular than that of Rouse, and a mere imitation at length more popular than any version, or "the words which man's wisdom teacheth," more acceptable than that which "the Holy Ghost teacheth." With the matter of praise, it has also changed the doctrines of the gospel to its pleasure, and yet boasts that its dogmas and practices are all *scriptural*.

In one of my visits to that city, I found the following facts, which I then transcribed, from the "Picture of Boston."

A Presbyterian church was founded in Boston by Mr. Morehead from Ireland, on the 31st of March, 1730. He continued in it till 1773. In 1783, the Rev. R. Annan became its pastor, and continued till 1786. On April 4, 1787, Jer. Belknap became their pastor. They adopted the Congregational form of government on August 6, 1780. Its ministers are decidedly Unitarian. It is called the Federal street church, because the Massachusetts convention assembled there when they decided on adopting the United States constitution." —(Ed. 1832, p. 14.) The exception which I have above made is founded on the following facts. "The second Presbyterian church in Piedmont street joined the Presbytery of Londonderry, Nov. 26, 1823. Their church was dedicated Jan. 31, 1828. In 1829 the Rev. Mr. Sabine, who had come from Newfoundland, joined the Episcopalians, and a majority of the church went with him. In consequence

of their breaking up, the building has become vacant, and is owned by eight individuals, who have it for sale or to let." (p. 165.) These facts "speak volumes." With other things, they show that even amidst the Job and Amasa charity of the 19th century, religious *forms* have a powerful influence on denominations, according as they are either of divine, or of human, or of fashionable origin. They show us that where there is so little difference kept up, except in name, as there must have been between the church which joined the Presbytery of Londonderry, in Nov. 1823, and the Independents, that even the name of Presbyterian could not long survive.

To dispense with a lawfully constituted Presbytery, with the appointed matter of divine praise, with a table at the Lord's supper, and to "invite all in good standing in their own church" to the promiscuous communion seat, are among the fashionable inroads on the *forms* of religion, which kill churches, and advance "another gospel. Let those who "are given to such change" inquire how far they will advance "pure and undefiled religion," by abandoning our present version of the psalms (excepting in a few obsolete words) for any other which they choose to name. In all probability, just as far as "true holiness" has been increased in Federal street church since 1786. Yours, &c. B.

CAVE OF THE WALDENSES.—The following description of one of the caverns into which the Waldenses fled for safety from their persecutors, may give some idea of the ingenuity which these afflicted people were compelled to exert for their own safety, as well as the natural asylums in many of the mountains which were afforded them by divine Providence. Near the lofty and projecting crag which soars above Mount Vaudelin, there was a natural cavern, which the inhabitants of the *commune* (department or district) of La Torre contrived to make a secret hiding-place. This cavern, in which three or four hundred might conceal themselves, was vaulted, and shaped not unlike an oven, with clefts in the rock, which served for windows, and even for loop-holes; and prepared with recesses which answered the purpose of watch-houses, from whence they might observe the motions of their assailants. There were also several chambers within this vast cave, accommodations for cooking meat, and a large fountain, well supplied with water. It was impossible to enter it except by one hole at the top, and those who were in the secret, could only let themselves down one at a time and by a very slow and gradual process with the assistance of steps or foot-holes cut in the rock. In fact, it was like descending into a mine, and one or two resolute men might easily defend the entrance against the assault of any force that could be brought against them.—*History of the Waldenses.*

A GUILTY CONSCIENCE.—Had you all once felt the smart of a galled conscience, you would need no other argument to persuade you to avoid it; for that doubtless is the greatest torment and misery that mankind is capable of, as the wise man observes, saying, *The spirit of a man will sustain his infirmity, but a wounded spirit who can bear?* No man, certainly, except Almighty God support him under it, either in judgment to punish him, or else in mercy to bring him to repentance by it. Ask but such a one who labours under it, what it is to have a wounded and offended conscience, and he will

tell you, that *no sorrow is like unto his sorrow, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted him in the day of his anger; the arrows of the Almighty are within him, the poison whereof drinketh up his spirits, the terrors of God set themselves in array against him.* O the wormwood and the gall, the anguish and bitterness of the soul!—How doth he fret, and fume, and vex, and tear, and torment himself at the remembrance of his sin and folly! Every thing is uneasy and troublesome to him, yea, he is a burden to himself, he cannot endure himself, but wishes he had never been, or could cease to be: his mind is distracted, his thoughts confounded, his whole soul is overspread with darkness and horror, and tossed to and fro, like a troubled sea, when it cannot rest, *whose waves cast up mire and dirt.* Thus is the poor man always upon the rack, distorted, tormented, terrified, and hurried about by his own outraged conscience, as if all the fiends of hell were let loose upon him. What would he now give, or rather what would he not give for a good conscience? If all the crowns and sceptres upon earth were his, he would willingly part with them all upon these terms, and reckon it the best purchase he ever made.—*Bishop Beveridge.*

---

DUTY TO GOD SUPREME.—But in the whole, the duty of zeal requires that we neglect an ordinary visit rather than an ordinary prayer, and a great profit rather than omit a required duty. No excuse can make lawful, a sin; and he that goes about to distinguish between his duty and his profit, and if he cannot reconcile them, will yet tie them together like a hyena and a dog, this man pretends to religion, but secures the world, and is indifferent and lukewarm towards that, so that he may be warm and safe in the possession of this.—*Bp. Taylor.*

---

### Constantinople.

Mr. Goodell, under date of February 8th, writes as follows:—"There is at present some stir among the Jews of this capital. The chief rabbies had led them to expect that, according to their books, the Messiah must absolutely appear some time during the present year.

But several months of *their* year have already gone, and still there are no signs of his coming. A learned rabbi, who assisted Mr. Schauffer in his translation of the Scriptures, occasionally visits me, and almost the *first*—sometimes the *very first* question I always ask him, as he enters the door is, 'Has he come?'—'Not yet, has always been his reply till his last visit a few days ago, when, laying his hand to his heart, he said in a low and solemn tone, 'If you ask me, *I say he has come*; and if you show me a safe place, I will bring you ten thousand Jews to-morrow who will make the same confession.' I replied, 'The apostles and prophets had no safe place shown them to confess truth in, but they made the confession in the very face of stripes, imprisonment and death. If you believe the promise made to the fathers has been fulfilled, and the Messiah has come, then receive him with all the honour of which he is worthy; submit to him, acknowledge him, follow him, and let the consequences be what they may. Act like Abraham, like Moses, like the prophets, like all the holy and good of your nation, though, like some of them, you be sawn asunder, though you be slain with the sword.' But, alas! they know too little of Christ, and feel too little interest in the subject, to venture all consequences for his sake."—*Missionary Herald for July.*

**PAPAL BULLS AND INDULGENCES.**—We give the following extracts translated from a Maltese paper, from a bull circulated at Malta, during the present year. It is entitled “Bloadella S. S. Crociata concessa dalla Santita del N. S. P. Gregoria XVI., per Pleno mille ottocento trantotta.”

After having conceded to the purchasers of this indulgence the permission, “with the consent of their spiritual bodily physician,” to eat meat on Lent or on fast-days, and to “make free use of eggs and butter,” it goes on to say:

“Moreover, his holiness concedes to all the aforesaid persons the power of choosing for confessor any priest, secular or regular, out of those approved by the ordinary, which confessor may absolve the said persons one time during life and another time at the point of death, from all sin and censure, having first imposed a salutary penance corresponding to the fault, and in case it may be necessary that some satisfaction should follow the fault, they may do it either by their own persons, or by their heirs, or by others. The said confessor shall also be able to commute any vow whatever, even when made with an oath, causing the penitent to give whatever alms he pleases for the benefit of the santissima crociata.”

The form of absolution is as follows:—“By the authority of Almighty God, and of the Apostle Peter and St. Paul, and of our Lord Gregory the Sixteenth, specially conceded to thee, and committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, misdeeds, and excesses, which thou hast now confessed, and also those which thou wouldst have confessed, had they occurred to thy recollection; and I also concede to thee plenary indulgence and ample remission of all thy sins which now or at any time thou mayest have confessed, forgotten or been ignorant of;—and from the pain thou wouldst have been obliged to suffer in purgatory!”

---

### *Presbytery of Caledonia.*

The last stated meeting of this judicatory was held in Buffalo, on the last Wednesday of January. Owing to the extreme severity of the weather, the meeting was small. The pastoral relation between the Rev. Mr. McKinney and the Associate Reformed church in Buffalo was dissolved. The Rev. Mr. Williamson was received as a member of Presbytery, on testimonials from the Associate church, and was appointed to labour in Buffalo for several months.

We copy the above merely to inquire respectfully of the editor of the *Christian Magazine* who the Mr. Williamson here referred to may be? What were the nature of his testimonials from the Associate church? What Associate church is intended? That in the United States?—for we know of no other. We ask these questions because there has been no minister by the name of Williamson in the Associate church in this country, at least within the last fifteen years. Plain people will think there is something here needing explanation, especially in this day of imposture and unfounded pretensions.

---

**THE INFIDEL IN THE APPREHENSION OF DEATH.**—Percy Bysshe Shelley, who gloried in his infidelity, and whose unquestionably fine

talents were fearfully desecrated, was apparently a person of the most heroic character, and not likely to feel any serious alarm in the hour of danger. When sailing in Lord Byron's yacht, a storm arose which threatened the destruction of the vessel. Shelley was immediately alarmed—nothing could render him tranquil; he called out in agony for mercy from the very Being on whose laws he had not only himself trampled, but whose sovereignty over the hearts of others he had sought to overthrow, and whose name he had never mentioned without the most profane ridicule: His terrors are described as having been fearfully awful. He is not the only infidel, however, whose last hours have been embittered at the near prospect of death. In the season of health and supposed security, the blasphemer may deride the idea of a God of judgment and eternity; his feelings will be far different when God causes his waves to go over him, and judgment and eternity are at the very door.

---

ANECDOTE.—An excellent clergyman, possessing much knowledge of human nature, instructed his large family of daughters in the ordinary practice of music. They were all observed to be exceedingly amiable and happy. A friend inquired if there was any secret in his mode of education. He replied, "when any thing disturbs their tempers, I say to them *sing*: and if I hear them speaking against any person, I call them to sing to me, and they sing away all cause of discontent, and every disposition to scandal." Such a use of this accomplishment might serve to fit a family for the company of angels. Young voices around the domestic altar, breathing sacred music, at the hour of morning and evening devotion, are a sweet and touching accomplishment.—*L. H. Sigourney.*

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The Address on Foreign Missions concluded in the present number, calls for a passing remark.—It has beauties and defects. The young author promises fair for the future, and a word of criticism may prove beneficial to him. It is too long; much of its verbiage is either redundant or weakens the force of his thoughts; it aims too much at the orator; and some of its statements and conclusions are greatly exaggerated. For instance, however plain the calculation, page 106, may appear on paper, or however beautiful in theory, it will be found by actual experience to exceed the reality a hundred-fold. Time, however, will correct these sanguine conceptions of youth. A little more experience, a little hard and ill-requited service in the church, and a few rebuffs from the enemy will banish these "vain imaginations," like shapeless and unmeaning visions of the night. But, on the other hand, the address contains much to commend. We regard a large portion of its reasoning as sound and unanswerable, and hope that it may obtain an extensive reading, and through the divine blessing prove the means of rousing the slumbering energies of the church.

---

"JUVENIS OBSERVATOR" probably in the next number.

**TO PATRONS.**—It is hoped that the following remarks will not be regarded in an offensive light, and that they will be so noted as to prevent the necessity of again adverting to a topic, as unpleasant to us as it must be to the reader.

When the Monitor came back into the hands of the present editor, the book accounts exhibited an out-standing debt of about twenty-six hundred dollars, seventeen hundred of which was supposed to be good; for this latter amount the present editor became responsible. As the subscription list continued nearly the same, with the exception of discontinuances within the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, it was anticipated that it must yield a surplus of receipts above expenditures. Partly at the suggestion of some long-tried and faithful friends of the work a proposition was made, last year, to pay a small sum for original articles, with a promise to increase the amount so far as the patronage would warrant. This was done with the two-fold object of assisting some of our brethren in the ministry, known to be well-qualified for contributing to our pages, but who, nevertheless, receive a small compensation for ministerial labour, and of elevating the character of the work.

But this plan is likely to fail for want of means to carry it out. Of the large amount due, less than one-half has been received; and we have commenced the present volume by erasing *fifty* names from the subscription list, owing an aggregate amount of SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS! To some of these names, ten volumes have been sent and not a penny returned. Against this we remonstrate for the following reasons:—

1. It is not strictly honest.
2. It defeats the benevolent design of those who do pay.
3. It inflicts a positive injury on the church.
4. It is evading the payment, at least in some instances, of a just demand, because the creditor, owing to the scattered and distant residences of his debtors, is unable to exact payment.

We know that it is unpleasant for our brethren in the ministry, who act as agents, to ask people for such demands; but would it not be well for them, in cases where they know a debt to be of long standing, to put it into the hands of some other person for collection?

To those, whose names have been struck from the list, we have only to say, that we shall be happy to restore them on the payment of their present dues. But we cannot do the real *supporters* of the work, nor ourselves, the great injustice of sending it to them any longer without pay.

With this brief explanation and statement of facts, we leave the matter with those whom it most concerns.

---

**ERRATUM.**—Page 28, June No.—Balance in favour of Synod's Fund; for \$357.78 read \$314.67

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1840.

---

ART. I.—*Notes of a Sermon, transcribed at the request of some who heard it preached.*

PART II.

“Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase: So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.”—Prov. iii. 9, 10.

II. A second doctrine taught in our text is, “That God will, in a special manner, bless those who ‘honour’ him with their worldly substance.”

We have already noticed the general principle which runs through the whole of divine revelation: “That there is no duty required in the word of God, without a promise corresponding to it.” We may now add, that this promise always contains the offer of such a blessing, either temporal or spiritual, to those of whom the duty is required, as will make it their *interest* to perform the duty. This principle will appear more clearly, in the illustration of our present proposition.

1. To such as honour God with their worldly substance, by appropriating it according to his appointment, God will honour or bless, by bestowing upon them a larger amount of worldly things, if this will be most for the glory of God or their good. Our text contains a positive promise to this effect: “So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.” Assuring them, that their “substance” should not only not be diminished, but that it should be greatly increased. “There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat: and he that watereth shall be watered also himself.” (Prov. xi. 24, 25.)

The prophet Haggai, after calling the attention of the people to what God had done, in disappointing the expectations of the husbandman and the labourer, fixes the very day, and calls on the people to mark it, when he would begin to bless them as to the produce of their ground. (Haggai, i. 15—19.)

But in the book of the prophet Malachi, we have a passage which is very particular. After God had, by the mouth of the prophet, sharply reproved the people for their neglect of his ordinances, for their actually *robbing* God, in withholding the “tithes and offerings,” which they should have brought to his altar, he says, “Bring

VOL. XVII.—13

ye all the tithes into the store-house, 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 enough to receive it. And I will rebuke the devourer [the locust, as is supposed] 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." (Mal. iii. 10, 11.)

The persons addressed in this passage are, "the whole nation" of God's professed people. And it is worthy of notice, that the passage has a special reference to New Testament times. This is manifest from the beginning of the chapter, which contains one of the most particular prophecies recorded in the Old Testament, concerning the coming of the Messiah; and the connexion of the whole chapter is so close and necessary that it cannot be separated. So that we have here another proof, that it is according to the mind of God, that his people should honour him with their substance in New Testament times, as well as under the former dispensation.

2. When God does not bestow an enlarged portion of temporal prosperity, he certainly will increase the spiritual blessings of such as "honour him with their substance, and the first fruits of their increase."

The Apostle Paul, in commending the liberality of the Corinthians, assures them that God is able to make all grace abound towards them; and holds out a very distinct promise, that he will do so besides, at all times, affording them "a sufficiency of all things:" "God is able to make all grace abound towards you; that ye, always having a sufficiency in all things, may abound unto every good work: as it is written, He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor; his righteousness remaineth for ever. Now, he that ministereth seed to the sower, both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, *and increase the fruits of your righteousness.*" (2 Cor. ix. 8—10.) That spiritual blessings are chiefly intended here, is evident from the language used, "every good work," "righteousness that remaineth for ever," "the fruits of" your "righteousness;" that is, Christ's righteousness imputed to them. And v. 12, "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, *but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God.*" Such spiritual blessings are infinitely better than all earthly good things; and where God bestows spiritual blessings, we may rest assured that he will not withhold any other good thing. (Rom. viii. 32.)

3. The truth of this doctrine also appears from the reproofs and threatenings in the word of God, to such as refuse or neglect to contribute "according as God hath prospered them," when called in providence to do it. "There is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty." (Prov. xi. 24.) God may, indeed, sometimes permit worldly men, and even hypocritical professors to prosper in worldly things, as a judgment upon them; (Ps. lxxiii. 3.) but in general, when his professing people do not honour him with their substance, by supporting, in a becoming manner, the institutions of religion, he either blasts their prosperity in worldly things, or "sends leanness to their souls" by withholding his blessing on their spiritual privileges. Haggai i. 5—11, "Now, therefore, thus saith



the LORD of hosts; Consider your ways. Ye have sown much—and bring in little; ye eat—but ye have not enough; ye drink—but ye are not filled with drink; ye clothe you—but ye are not warm; and he that earneth wages—earneth wages to put it into a bag with holes. Thus saith the LORD of hosts; Consider your ways. Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, saith the LORD. Ye looked for much—and, lo! it came to little; and when ye brought it home—I did blow upon it. Why? saith the LORD of hosts. Because of mine house that is waste, and ye run every man unto his own house. Therefore, the heaven over you is stayed from dew, and the earth is stayed from her fruit. And I called for a drought upon the land, and upon the mountains, and upon the corn, and upon the new wine, and upon the oil, and upon that which the ground bringeth forth, and upon men, and upon cattle, and upon all the labour of the hands.” (See also Neh. xiii. 10—12.)

Lastly. Consider the reasonableness of this doctrine. “The earth is the LORD’s, with the fulness thereof.” (Ps. xxiv. 1.) “The silver and the gold are his.” (Hag. ii. 8.) Jehovah can then withhold or give, as seemeth good in his sight. And shall he not then have a regard to his honour and glory in bestowing even these things? Consider the effects of one or two seasonable showers of rain on the productions of a single season. It may make, and often does make a difference of one hundred dollars in the value of the produce of even a small farm. Consider, again, how much, may be cut off, by one night’s frost, or by the numerous “devourers” which God, in his providence, may permit to prey upon the various labours of the husbandman; also the reverses in trade and business. Yet all these are under the immediate control of God’s providence.

On the other hand, consider, how God, in all ages, has honoured those that honour him. Laban, the Syrian, enjoyed a blessing upon his substance, for Jacob’s sake—and Jacob’s substance became great while with him. Jacob had vowed to give the tenth of all that the LORD should give him, to the LORD again. (Gen. xxviii. 22.) Potiphar, the Egyptian, could not but perceive that the blessing of the LORD was with Joseph, and “made all that he did to prosper.” (Gen. xxxix. 3.)

Another remarkable instance of God’s faithfulness to those who honour him, is also worthy of remembrance; in connexion with this subject, we have recorded, 2 Chron. xxv. 5—9, and xxvii. 5, 6, compared. It is in the case of Amaziah, King of Judah. In this instance, Amaziah was not, indeed, called to give money for religious uses; but he was called to do what is, perhaps, not less contrary to the disposition of a worldly-minded man, he was called to sacrifice a large amount of money, one hundred talents of silver, (equal to \$164,240) in the way of obedience to God. He relinquished it, however, and depended on God to make it up to him, in his own way, according to the word of the prophet. His grand-son, Jotham, the first of his family, who was worthy, received just three times that amount in money, besides thirty thousand measures (*Corim*, equal to 240,000 bushels) of wheat, and an equal quantity of barley. See also Joel ii. 21—27. When God promises to “restore to his people the years that the locust had eaten, the canker worm, and the caterpillar, and the palmer worm, his great army, which he had

sent among them; and that they should eat in plenty and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord their God."

A few remarks by way of conclusion.

1. From this subject we may see that God is *dishonoured* by those who do not contribute "according as God has prospered them," for all proper objects connected with the support and maintenance of the religious institutions of God's appointment. If, under the New Testament dispensation, God has not prescribed any definite sum or portion of our worldly substance to be appropriated to religious uses, yet this does not diminish from the obligation which should bind the conscience of every professed follower of Jesus Christ, to give according to his ability, in the sight of God. Ananias and Sapphira "lied unto God," when they kept back part of the price of their land, and professed to give it all. God takes notice of what each one gives for religious uses, and knows what each one is able to give. Some, we fear, have a long score to settle with God, in this matter.

2. God is honoured, only when we give to a proper object, and in a right manner. People may give liberally, and large sums, and at the same time be greatly dishonouring God; as, when they give for the support of institutions not authorized by God, or for the propagation of doctrines contrary to the rule of faith revealed in the word of God. Thus, those who contribute to the support of any of the institutions of Antichrist, or for the diffusion of antichristian principles, are not honouring God with their substance. All support, then, to popish schools and seminaries, contributions for erecting popish chapels, cathedrals, &c., is directly opposed to the spirit of our text. And what else can we say concerning contributions for the erection of seminaries and houses for public worship, where it is the avowed design to teach and propagate doctrines whose tendency is to lead away from a believing trust in the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ as the only ground of the sinner's justification before God! Do not such doctrines tend, as far as they can, to detract from the honour, which God has put upon his Son, as the only and alone Saviour of sinners? Or when it is the known design to introduce modes of worship unauthorized by the word of God. Is not this to dishonour Christ by stripping him of his kingly office?

What, then, it may be inquired, are the proper objects to which we may contribute of our worldly substance consistently with the "honour" of God? It is answered we may do it for the support of any institution authorized in the word of God, such as the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ—sending or carrying the gospel with all its ordinances, teaching and sealing, to the utmost ends of the earth—for the erection of places of worship, where the design is to conduct the worship of God, according to the rules of his word—the qualifying of suitable persons to carry the gospel to the destitute—for the relief of the poor and needy—whether it respects their bodily or spiritual wants, &c.

Again; persons give in a right manner, when they do it, not from mercenary or ostentatious ends, but out of a spirit of obedience to God, and from sincere love to the souls of men.

Lastly. We may hence learn, that none need fear that they will be made the poorer by the service of God. That part of our worldly "substance" that is laid out in "honour" of God, is the surest and

safest, and I may add, the most productive property we can have. There is no stock can stand on a *par* with that which is invested in God's bank. There is no pay master so certain and so liberal as God. Let all, then, be persuaded to "honour the LORD with their substance, and with the first fruits of all their increase: so shall their barns be filled with plenty, and their presses shall burst out with new wine." *Amen.*

---

## ART. II.—*Thoughts on Occasional Hearing.* No. I.

MR. EDITOR,—In your September Number, you express a willingness to insert articles written in proper temper in defence of occasional hearing. This is as it should be; for it is well known that there are not a few in our own communion, and more out of it who are not satisfied with the views which the Associate church maintain on that subject. If the objections, which they entertain, are well supported by sound arguments, these arguments ought to be allowed their proper weight; if not, they ought to be refuted and the objections set aside; for how "can two walk together except they be agreed?" I acknowledge, that I have had and do still have scruples in admitting that occasional hearing, in the sense which we generally understand it, is, in its nature, sinful. I wish it, however, to be distinctly understood, that I approve not the course of those, who, while they acknowledge obedience to our church courts, manifest so little regard to the obligations which they have voluntarily taken on themselves, as openly and avowedly to treat them as a dead letter. I wish it, too, to be understood that for those who do regard this practice as sinful, I entertain the most unfeigned respect; and that if there be those who treat them with contumely, and point at them the "*finger of scorn*," I desire to have no part or lot with them. I need not conceal the fact that the subject presents itself to my mind as one that is by no means clear of difficulties, and that I rather write, at this time, to invite others who are more competent to do justice to the views of those situated as I am, than to enter into a laboured argument on this much controverted point.

Before entering on the argument, I wish to premise some things. A moment's reflection will satisfy any one that the burden of proof rests on those who maintain the affirmative side of this proposition. This is obvious, not only from the difficulty in general of proving a negative, but the warrant for hearing the word preached, being conceded on all hands, it is plain that if it is sinful under particular circumstances, these circumstances must have a positive character, and ought to be distinctly pointed out. It is not only true that they ought to be thus clearly pointed out, but they must possess such weight, that they cannot leave on the mind of a reasonable person a doubt, that they amount to a prohibition of hearing the gospel preached by any minister, except those of the denomination to which they respectively belong. In our communion, occasional hearing is a subject of church censure. Now it is plain, that in reference to the performance of duty ourselves, we ought to interpret the divine law rigidly, but when we are called upon to decide on the conduct of others, we ought to interpret it as liberally as the nature of the case will admit. To lay the foundation of censure as broad as the foun-

dation of duty, would be a perfect absurdity. When we essay to perform duty ourselves, we weigh with care the various considerations involved in the transaction, and so very equally are the scales often balanced that the turning of a straw frequently decides our course of action in the most important concerns of life. On very different principles ought we to act when we judge the conduct of others. Before we condemn others, two points ought to be *incontestably* proved.

1st. That the person implicated was guilty, as charged.

2nd. That the law condemns the act of which that person has been proved guilty.

These principles are well understood in our criminal jurisprudence and universally practised on, but I am not sure that they are equally well respected by our church judicatures. It will be sufficient, then, if I examine the objections against occasional hearing, and show that they are not valid and conclusive.

It must be conceded that the bias of our day is to latitudinarianism. It is to be feared that many, in their indiscreet zeal for unity of action, have abandoned the claims, if not the standard of truth. It may be true that there is danger of running into the opposite extreme, and vainly attempting to sustain it by our traditions; but one thing is certain, and that is, that no consideration of policy or prudence can compensate the loss of the most unimportant truth, I say most *unimportant*, because truths, when compared with each other, have a relative importance; but, inasmuch as God is the revealer of truth, wo to that mortal who will rashly condemn, or set aside any part of it. It might not be amiss here to attempt the correction of what is, perhaps, a prevailing, but vague conception of the nature of revealed truth. The conception, I apprehend to be somewhat like this; that the Divine Being has revealed a particular number of truths, and that we are to witness for him in all their particularity. The fact is, the book of revelation is like the book of nature. Some things lie, as it were, near to us, and we can see them in all their beauty, strength, and utility; others, farther removed from us, we can see, but they are not seen very distinctly, nor can we so well determine either their nature or use; others, again, are so distant that we are in doubts what they are, and as to their use, we are left wholly in the field of conjecture. To continue the figure, persons of strong vision can see distinctly what those of weak eyes can hardly discover, but as the sight improves, the field of observation enlarges, and we are still uncertain about the nature, properties, and design of the most distant objects.

Absolute purity, or holding the truth practically in absolute perfection, belongs not to man or any associated body of men. When we speak of churches being pure we mean they are only relatively so, and when we declare our adhesion to a particular witnessing body or society of Christians, nothing more is to be inferred, than that we judge them the most faithful, which God, in his providence, has permitted us to associate ourselves with. It may, indeed, be a case of conscience with us, whether duty does bind us thus to connect ourselves with any society within our reach, on account of their unfaithfulness; but I think it would imply a strange misconception of duty were we to determine that it is more for the glory of God to stand back, because we judge that in some points all societies around us come short of perfection.

These things being premised, I shall briefly examine the arguments usually brought forward, to prove that occasional hearing is sinful. In doing so, I shall have reference principally to a sermon published by Dr. Anderson, and which may be seen in a volume lately brought before the public, entitled "Sketches and Sermons." I prefer a particular reference to the Doctor, because he is justly regarded as an author of great learning, judgment, and piety. It may seem great temerity in one, by no means versed in clerical lore to measure swords with an antagonist, universally allowed by all who know him to have few superiors in profound thought and close logical reasoning. But we are taught to call no man master on earth, and if I should succeed in showing that he fails in proving the point at which he aims, it will, at once, be acknowledged, it is because truth sustains me, and not that I am a champion fit to contend with such a giant.

The Doctor says, "In this question three things are supposed:—

1. "That the persons of whom we speak are, upon good grounds, persuaded that the church communion, from which they are in a state of separation, is so far chargeable, in her profession and obstinately continued practice, with the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge, as to render a state of separation from her warrantable, and, according to the circumstances of the case, necessary.

2. "That they are in full communion with a church in the state of separation, now supposed.

3. "That the two churches are in a state of opposition to one another, as to some articles of truth or duty held by the one, and rejected by the other."

It comports not with the brevity of my plan to follow the author through all his reasoning on this subject. Indeed, it is not necessary, as the intelligent reader will be at no loss to discover, that a few propositions embrace the material part of the argument. I shall, therefore, at this time, attend more particularly to three positions, and afterwards notice some others, and those Scriptures which are relied upon as sustaining the doctrine. The positions which appear the most important, are the following:—

1. The support or encouragement which occasional hearing gives to error.

2. The inconsistency which it involves as to testimony or witness-bearing.

3. Its implied admission that open communion is lawful.

Is it clear that when we attend on the administration of the ordinance of preaching, by a commissioned ambassador of the Head of the church, that we support or encourage the errors or other infirmities of such an earthen vessel? What is the tenor of such officer's commission? "Go ye and preach the gospel to every creature." What ought to be our exercises in reference to such ambassadors? Do we not wish them God speed? Do we not pray the Lord of the harvest to grant them much success in winning souls? Can we do this without praying the Lord to move sinners to attend their administrations? for how shall they hear without a preacher? Can we utter such petitions as these, without entreating others, as we have opportunity, to go and hear the word of life? Can we declare, in the same breath, that we believe it is an act of moral rectitude, and a highly incumbent duty in others to go and hear, while we declare

that we look upon it as an act of moral turpitude on our part to attend? We are certainly not required to perform inconsistent duties, but if there is any *consistency* in thus acting, I acknowledge that I cannot see it. The truth, I apprehend, is when we attend the word preached, we are not properly regarded as doing more than expressing an implied approbation or encouragement of preaching the gospel, and provided we hear only such as we judge in charity to be the commissioned ambassadors of the Most High, and hear in such a way as is consistent with a life of godliness, it is difficult to see wherein we commit sin.

There is another aspect in which this subject may be viewed, which, if possible, places the lawfulness of such hearing in a more conclusive point of light, and that is in reference to the duty of ministers of the gospel themselves. It will be granted, on all hands, that our relative duties are mutual and reciprocal; that is, where it is the duty of preachers to preach, it is the duty of people to hear. Suppose a member from one of those communions, from which we differ in sentiment, had gone to hear our author preach the everlasting gospel, and that previous to his going into the pulpit, he had met our hearer, and entered into conversation with him, on the subject of occasional hearing, what may we conjecture would have been the tenor of such conversation according to the principles here laid down? "Sir," he would have said to him, "the branches of the church to which we respectively belong, have separated on grounds, which we judge warrantable. I, of course, consider you to be chargeable with holding error in doctrine and practice, and though I do not judge you to be a swine or a dog, yet I must tell you that error in its nature is damnable—that there is in it a '*hellish energy*,' and that although through divine grace, it may not be permitted so to increase, as to drag you to the bottomless pit, it must necessarily enfeeble and weaken you in your Christian course.—Although I think I have evidence and arguments to offer you, which, if you would patiently hear and prayerfully weigh, would convince you of your mistake, and if accompanied with a blessing, would lead and guide you in the paths of the flock, yet I am constrained to tell you, I am sorry to see you here, and would advise you to retire as I consider occasional hearing a most wicked device of Satan, and can only regard your attendance on my preaching as a '*blasphemous*' waiting on the Lord. Verily," continues the Doctor, "I have an ardent desire for the salvation of your soul, and gladly would I deal effectually with the communion to which you belong, and bring it to a sense of its sin, in departing from a form of sound words, but here, in my congregational administrations, I can only speak to the flock committed to my care—*We have not a crumb for a stranger.*"

I leave it to the sober and candid inquirer to say, whether there is one idea here which is strained, and which is not in perfect accordance with the three propositions which I have cited from our author. But is such language, in any respect, the appropriate language of a minister of the gospel? Let me ask again, how does his commission read? "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Here we have no exceptions; no distinctions between saints and sinners; no reference to persons in this communion, or in that communion: no matter what the age, sex, or *condition*, all—all are to be invited to the gospel table, and fed with the bread of life.

The business of the preacher in the pulpit is not with communion, but directly with the souls of men. How absurd, then, to speak of dealing with societies in such ministrations! Have such separate communions souls to save? Who are the watchmen to warn? Will it be a valid excuse, at the day of final settlement, when souls are lost, for such watchmen to say, that they belonged not to their communion, and, therefore, they felt no responsibility in reference to them? Is such a course of conduct consistent with that of the Shepherd who leaves the ninety and nine sheep in the fold, and goes in search of the one which had strayed away into the wilderness, and was in danger of being devoured by bears, and wolves, and lions? What can be the condition of that sinner whom the bishop of souls is not bound to reclaim when wandering; not to correct when erring; not to strengthen when feeble; not to comfort when mourning? &c. If it is the duty of preachers thus to deal personally and individually with sinners of every grade and name, how can it be unlawful for sinners to come and be thus dealt with? Alas! is it not true that ministers and people, while they act thus, are worshipping at a shrine as cold and comfortless as that of Dagon?

But on no point, in this controversy, is there more stress laid than on the supposed inconsistency of occasional hearing and testimony bearing. Is there really any inconsistency betwixt them? There are several things respecting testimony bearing that ought to be noted, among which may be mentioned the following:—The qualifications of the parties. The occasion on which they are called. The authority demanding the evidence. The design or end to be accomplished, &c.

Now, is there any thing here noted, or any thing that could be noted, that has any relation to hearing the word preached? Who are the parties, and what is their character? What would any one expect to prove by them? Christ, through the instrumentality of preaching, is beseeching miserable rebels to be reconciled to God. When we go into an assembly of hearers, what do we see? We see men, but what is their character? They may be, personally, men of probity, who would depose to the truth, or they may be abandoned, perjured villains, who delight in falsehood, or they may be a mixture of both. Were we to attempt to distinguish one from another we might confound the most respectable with the most despicable. Saints and sinners may sit commingled in the mixed multitude, so that it is impossible, except for the omniscient eye, to distinguish them. Who ever thought that such a discordant concourse were uniting in giving testimony in favour of any peculiar tenets of faith, or modes of practice? Is the assembling of a congregation, to hear the word preached, an *occasion* where we are called upon to bear testimony in the aspect in which we are contemplating witness-bearing? If the parties are not such as we deem suitable for such a work, neither does the occasion call for it. The object is to hear, and not to testify; to convince and persuade sinners to become faithful witnesses for the truth, not to hear what they have to say in commendation of it. We ought never to presume a congregation of hearers to be saints. Whatever may be proper to be said to such assemblies, one thing is certain, they ought to be addressed as rebels, and the offers of pardon and peace proclaimed in their ears. The preacher may stand before them as a witness, in the character of an

accuser, testifying against them in the name of his Master, but how they can be considered as joining with him in any duty of a witnessing character, I see not. If the parties are exceptionable, and the occasion unsuitable, neither is there any organization appropriate for such business. Who has ordered an investigation? Who propounds interrogatories? To whom are they directed? What are the sanctions which could give weight and authority, if deponents could be had or known? If depositions could be taken, who is to make the record, or give it authority when made? Evidence obtained under all these, and many other essential disqualifications, could benefit no one, and, of course, the end to be accomplished is entirely distinct from that of witnessing for the truth. When we bear testimony, we do it judicially. Unexceptionable witnesses are called, the time, and place, and object is known; the organization is such that the evidence comes forth with the sanctions which give it authority. A witness certainly ought not to conduct himself in such a manner as to render his character for intelligence and veracity doubtful, much less ought he to directly contradict what he has solemnly averred to be true, but I cannot see how he can be justly chargeable with so doing when he only hears occasionally, what, under different circumstances, it is conceded, it would be lawful for him to hear statedly.

Those who argue that occasional hearing is sinful, triumphantly tell us, that if it is not, then occasional communion cannot be. My business is with occasional hearing, and not with occasional communion. It is enough for my purpose to prove that the arguments brought by way of proof, to show that such hearing is sinful, are not conclusive; and if others please to draw such inferences from the positions which I maintain, it is their business, and not mine. If I prove successful, no such inferential reasoning can by any possibility overthrow my argument. It is a matter worthy attention, to observe how two classes of theologians manage the controversy, about close and open communion. One party, tell us that it is self-evident that occasional hearing is lawful, and so obvious, that those who occasionally hear, may occasionally commune, that, therefore, open communion must unquestionably be proper and right. The other party just reverse the argument, and tell us that open communion is absolutely unscriptural, and so plain is it, that where we hear we may commune, that consequently occasional hearing must be entirely wrong. Thus by the same process of reasoning, they come to directly opposite conclusions. I find no fault with the premises assumed by either party, but I unequivocally dissent from their logic.

Is there, in fact, that intimate and indissoluble connexion existing between these two ordinances, which these contending parties so confidently assert, and on which they rest their reasoning. Now whatever may be common to the gospel, and sacramental tables, it is clear that they were prepared for different persons and intended to answer different ends. Is it reasonable or scriptural then to argue from the one to the other? Who is privileged to partake at the gospel table? Who is invited to a seat there? Any one—every one. The call is co-extensive with Adam's sinful family, nor are questions asked, or qualifications required, it being spread for the enemies as well as for the friends of the cross. Not such is the sacramental table. This is a feast for friends, and not for foes—“*Do this in re-*



*membrance of me."* Preaching is a gathering, a collecting ordinance. "Go out to the lanes and hedges, and compel them to come in." Communion is a separating, a sealing ordinance. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat."

But we are told that we have no warrant from scripture for receiving one ordinance from the hands of Christ's ministers and rejecting others. We have no express warrant, nor could we reasonably expect any, for the obvious reason that the church is uniformly represented as one in faith, and practice. It is the sin of the church and perhaps her misfortune too, that she is torn and rent, differing in every shade of colour. If it be necessary to maintain a separate organization in order to preserve the truth which God has revealed, that separation ought to be no greater than is requisite to accomplish the end at which we aim. Is it rational or scriptural that our separation from a branch of the church which we acknowledge to be evangelical, should be as entire as from one which we are constrained to condemn as most abominable, whether we regard the unsoundness of her faith or the profligacy of her practice? Let no one suppose that there is no danger of giving the divine law too rigid an interpretation in this respect; for every step which we take in separating ourselves from others which is not necessary for the accomplishment of some lawful purpose, involves us in the guilt of those who cause divisions. As matters now stand, other denominations and the world at large, contemplate us as much estranged from the most orthodox of other communions as we are from the Roman Catholics themselves.

As it is my purpose to address you again on this subject, I shall close this communication by pointing out to a Ruling Elder wherein I think, he failed in his argument. According to his own view, if I mistake not, the whole force of his reasoning rested on the proposition that ministers of other denominations stand in the same relation to us that our own do when suspended. Had he made his promise good in establishing this point, it would most certainly have been conclusive work. Is such the fact? I think not. In at least two most essential particulars they differ; one is *integrity*, the other *authority*. When one of our ministers is proved guilty of preaching unsound doctrine, has he not violated the solemn vows which he made at his ordination, and comes to us not only as one who is erroneous in sentiment, but as one who has committed a crime bordering on perjury itself. When suspended, he is, virtually, for the time being, no preacher at all. According to this author's reasoning, does not the case stand thus?—The ministers of other denominations are not only destitute of all proper authority to preach the gospel, but they are base dishonest men. This may by some be regarded as severe criticism, but I must think it just, and I am much mistaken if the most lenient person in any other communion will put a more favourable construction on it. Is it any wonder that Seceders have the "*finger of scorn*" pointed at them, if it be so that *we* estimate the most exalted characters in our country no higher than our own suspended ministers? I would beseech my brethren to be a little more tender in speaking of other denominations. If we regard them as brethren at all, let us treat them with respect. They are not only entitled to respect, but they are entitled to courtesy—that courtesy which is ever due to strangers.

I hope this author will take no offence at these remarks, as most assuredly none is intended. Indeed, I probably should not have noticed what seems to me an entire departure from correct rules of sound reasoning, had it not been for the impression which such sentiments are likely—nay will most certainly make on the minds of those whom we are bound to treat as friends.

PILGRIM.

---

ART. III.—*Salvation, addressed chiefly to the Young.* No. III.

6. THE way of salvation, by the death of the Saviour, shows us, that in this way, the violated law receives full satisfaction, and, that all the purposes intended by its threatenings are secured in the punishment of the sinner's Surety. If the threatened penalty of the law had not been executed, either on the sinner, or his Surety, there would have been an end to God's moral government, and a dishonour done to his attributes, which could never have been wiped away. But in the sacrifice of the Son of God, we behold a splendour thrown around the broken law, and the insulted attributes of Jehovah, greater than could have accrued from the eternal destruction of every son and daughter of Adam. The delivering up of a rebel race to the curse of the law they had broken, would indeed have honoured justice, and proved the immutable nature of God's government. But men are finite beings, and though their eternal punishment would have proved, that sorrow will always follow sin, and that the claims of justice, without full satisfaction, will never be remitted,—yet, how much more strongly is this awful truth exhibited, in the sufferings and death of the incarnate Son of God. The sword of justice drinking the life-blood, not of a finite being, but of God's co-equal, co-eternal Son; the violated law not sparing God's own Son, but inflicting stroke on stroke, till all the debt of his people was paid, and every one of their sins atoned for. See how justice is satisfied in the execution of its judgments, not on worthless, miserable sinners, but on their suffering Lord and King. See how the law is magnified and made honourable, by the Lord of the universe placing himself under it as man, and keeping its every requirement in our room.

7. Finally, here, the way of salvation, through the Saviour's death, teaches us, that God the Father, as the guardian of a violated law, *consenting* to transfer the punishment from the sinner to the Surety, sets the seal of perfection and acceptance on the Saviour's finished work. God was not bound to accept of a sacrifice in the room of the sinning soul. The Holy One, whom we had offended, was neither bound to provide a sin-offering, nor accept of one when provided. The sentence of the law we had broken, was, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." God might have refused to execute this sentence on any, but the offending. It was mere mercy that he accepted of a substitute. Even if the Son of God had descended from his throne, and died in our room, his sufferings and death, though of themselves infinitely valuable, would never have paid our debt, and saved our souls, if justice had not consented to his substitution in our room. Though the blood of Christ possessed a value, sufficient in itself to atone for and cleanse from all the sin that ever stained earth or hell,

yet, its application to the souls of any, and its acceptance for the salvation of any, depended on the consent of God the Father, thus to transfer the stroke of justice, and thus cause the innocent to die for the guilty. This, God in infinite mercy, as the guardian of justice, has done, setting forth, and ordaining his Son, to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, for his people's sins. Rom. iii. 25. Commissioned by God the Father, to act as our surety, and his servant, on our behalf, the Saviour has obeyed the law, discharged our debt, paid the price of our redemption, and procured our full acquittal from the arrest of justice. The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world; and when the covenant entered into from eternity, between the persons of the adorable Trinity was sealed with the Saviour's blood, the work of redemption was complete, and the salvation of his people sure. True, of ourselves, we no more deserve a place in heaven, than the fallen spirits. True, angels can look upon us when we enter heaven, as nothing but acquitted criminals, pardoned convicts: yet, they will rejoice to behold us adorned for Christ's sake, with a glory even brighter than their own. With angels, let us adore God for this incomprehensible mercy. Though no mere man has a right to part with his own life at pleasure, and no earthly tribunal a right to permit the innocent to suffer for the guilty; the Lord Jesus, as the God of life, had a right, both to lay down his life and to take it again: while the Father, as the offended Judge, had an undoubted right to decide, whether all the claims of the law, and all the ends of justice could be satisfied, by the substitution of the Mediator. Well may we adore the grace of God in consenting to admit of a Surety; the infinite wisdom of God, in providing by the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Immanuel, a Saviour, able to render an obedience which man only could render; and endure sufferings, which one united to the Godhead only could sustain. Let us rejoice too, that the life of Jesus is not lost. He, that for us was dead, is alive again, and lives for evermore; and hath the keys of hell and of death. Justice had a claim on him as our surety, and he must leave his throne for the cross, the glory of heaven, for the gloominess of the grave. He did thus humble himself; and justice, satisfied, calls on heaven as well as earth to rejoice; and commands angels to celebrate his praises, and welcome his return to his heavens again. "God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet.—Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in.—Sing praises to God, sing praises: sing praises to our King, sing praises." Ps. xlvii. 5, 6; xxiv. 7. Thus mercy and truth met together on the cross of Christ, and all the attributes of a holy God, glorified by his death, proclaim our *need of a Saviour*, and the only way of redemption for the lost soul, *through his precious blood*.

And now, reader, dost thou believe on the Son of God, and rely for your own salvation on his glorious atonement, his finished work? Do you ask what it is to believe, what is the nature of saving faith? There is a faith termed historical faith, which consists in the assent of the understanding to the truths taught in the Bible; while not accompanied by works, nor by any change of heart or life. There is also a temporary faith, in which the understanding not only assents to the truths of revelation, but the heart is somewhat affected, the natural feelings roused, and the life in some measure outwardly re-

formed, while the principle of loveliness was never implanted in the soul; genuine love to Christ and his precious truths, never rooted in the heart. Like the seed sown in the stony places, these truths, falling on the rock of the unrenewed heart, may be followed by some apparent love, while the heart remains unhumbled, and these fair appearances, in the time of trial and persecution, are soon swept away. Saving faith, on the contrary, is an abiding principle, a gracious quality implanted, and wrought in the heart by God, the Spirit, uniting us to Christ, and enabling us to receive and rest upon him alone for salvation. Faith believes what has formerly been shown. Jehovah's word proclaims that we are sinners by nature and by practice, exposed to the wrath and curse of God, and that our case, as to any help from men or angels, is hopeless. The believing soul credits and rejoices in the Divine declaration, "Thou hast destroyed thyself, but *in me* is thy help" found. Faith looks to Christ as the only Saviour; believes that he is able and willing to save the soul; that he is sincerely, and earnestly offered to sinners, without distinction, in the gospel, and to me in particular: that, from the gift of the Father, who appointed him our surety, and the offer of his righteousness to undone and guilty sinners, as one of those undone ones, I have a divine right and warrant to take him as my own Saviour and Redeemer, my Lord and my God, and to say, "He loved me; he gave himself for me." On the ground of this gift, and the offer made by the God of truth, you may confidently say, I believe that I have a right thus to take and appropriate Christ, as my own Saviour; not because I have repented, for that is his own gift and purchase, not because I have merited, by any works of my own, this mercy; but because I am poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked, ready to perish, and far from righteousness; and because Christ declares in his word, *that he died for such*. I believe this testimony, I am perishing with hunger, he offers to all the bread of life, and I will not "make him a liar," by refusing to believe that he means me. This free offer of this bread to all, is warrant to me to take it, and live for ever, to eat, and never die. He does not offer it on conditions: no condition is required in the gospel: the only condition of the covenant of grace, is the righteousness of Christ. The gospel is just good news of a free gift, the glad tidings of a free grant of Christ and his salvation, to dying sinners, without money and without price. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. I take him at his word; I have nothing of my own to merit his favour. "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." "O our God, we have no might, and our eyes are upon thee."

To believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, then, is to believe in his true and proper Deity, as the eternal Son of God: to receive him, and see the soul's need of him, in all his offices, as our Prophet, our Priest, and our King; to see how, by his atonement, the claims of justice against his redeemed are blotted out; and the sentence of death against the soul cancelled by his own death.

Faith views Jesus as the only Saviour:—through no other name, and in no other way can salvation be obtained. Acts iv. 12. Faith views him as an all-sufficient Saviour:—His power able to save to the uttermost, and his blood to cleanse from all sin. 1 John i. 7, Heb. vii. 25. Faith believes that Christ is offered to us freely in the gospel, and that we have an undoubted right, yea, a Divine warrant to claim him as our own. As the sentence of death pro-

nounced by the law on the guilty, in general, is on every soul in particular, so faith turns the promises of pardon to the guilty, into personal promises. Jesus declares in his word, that he is come to seek and to save the lost; invites the weary to come to him for rest:—all whose sins are as crimson to come to him for cleansing;—yea, “whosoever will let him take the water of life freely.” Matt. ii. 28. xviii. 11. Isa. i. 18. Rev. xxii. 17. Now, the believing soul seeing that his sins are as scarlet, that he is lost, weary, and in danger of eternal death, appropriates to himself this general declaration of pardon; believes that God will do as he has said; will blot out his transgressions; bless him with the water of life; be merciful to his unrighteousness; and without money, or price, give him a free and full pardon. You may see the nature of saving faith, from the expressions made use of in the Bible, to point out this duty. Believing on Jesus Christ, is called a receiving him. John i. 12. Faith, as a condition, does not buy, does not merit this boundless blessing; but (as the helpless beggar an alms,) receives, what God gives freely;—eternal life through his Son. To believe in Jesus, is to come to him:—to flee to him:—to come away from all other refuges, as utterly vain, to one who is able, and willing to give life and relief; to hasten trembling from the storm, to the ark of safety; from the avenger of blood, to the city of refuge. John vi. 35—37, Matt. xi. 28, Heb. vi. 18.

Believing is just looking to Jesus. Isa. xlv. 22, Heb. xii. 2. As the Israelites, dying in agony from the bite of the fiery serpents, looking to the brazen serpent, in the midst of the camp, were healed, so the dying soul, regarding Jesus as the only Saviour, looks to him and lives.

Faith, again, is said to be a putting on the Lord Jesus:—a putting on his righteousness, as the only covering in which we shall be presented faultless before the throne: it is said to be an eating his flesh and drinking his blood: a taking hold of his strength, and the covenant sealed with his blood. Rom. xiii. 14, John vi. 51—56, Isa. xxvii. 5, lvi. 4. Now, while these passages prove that faith itself does not justify, but the righteousness of Christ on which faith lays hold, and pleads that it is not the “act of eating,” which nourishes, but the bread of life received into the soul: they also prove, that faith applies and appropriates Christ to the soul, as our own Saviour, and that without this, we must perish. To believe that Christ died for sinners in general, will not save us: devils and hypocrites profess this faith, and yet perish eternally. Bread will not nourish if we do not eat it; “wine and milk,” the blessings of salvation spread before us, in the gospel, will not save, if we do not ourselves eat and live. To believe that all are welcome, will not satisfy our hungry and dying souls;—to believe that all who look to Jesus will be healed of the plague, and poison of sin, will not cure us, unless we ourselves look to this only remedy.

MAXTON.

---

#### ART. IV.—*Our Present Position.*

It will not be denied, I believe, by any, that these are degenerate times in which we live, that there is a lamentable falling off in zeal for the spread of the gospel and the advancement of Christ's kingdom amongst us. Indeed, many most important duties are left unperformed, passed unnoticed both by ministers and people. Our attention for a number of years has been occupied too much, almost

entirely, in maintaining our profession against the attacks of designing men, seasoned with considerable party cavil and personal disputation. I find no fault with the principles, nor our defence of them; it is the manner in which that defence has been conducted, and the all-absorbing influence they have exerted, having dried up the streams—the very fountain itself of the Synod's influence, and left presbyteries, congregations and individuals, unwatered. Other churches have been passing through the same refining crucible, yet have lost none of their missionary spirit, nor flagged in benevolent exertion. Why should this be necessary with us? There is a manifest want of that spirit of Christian forbearance, that should ever mark the representatives and professed followers of the Lamb of God. And in the absence of that *charity* which "*suffereth long and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, beareth all things, endureth all things and rejoiceth in the truth,*" wrangling and party opposition, as might be expected, have sprung up; leanness, blasting and mildew, have in a great measure been sent us, instead of the refreshing showers of the Spirit's influence. Coldness and deadness have overspread the whole church, entered almost every pulpit, pervaded nearly every heart. Such is the weight that now bears us down—so totally has it prostrated Christian exertion, that every enterprise, however good and scriptural, is hushed, as soon as proposed, by the deafening cry of Mammon's worshippers, Gold! gold! give us gold! It is high time these abuses were reformed and a spirit of active benevolence and Christian philanthropy cultivated. Thanks to the great Head of the church, the cure is within our reach. Do you ask what it is? It is prayer, my brethren, prayer. "Hitherto, ye have asked nothing—ask, and ye shall receive—" "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, he will give it you:" the residue of the Spirit is with him. O! that he would pour out upon *us* the Spirit of grace and supplication, that we might give him no rest day nor night until the windows of heaven were opened and the Spirit, heaven's choicest blessing, poured out upon us. Then, and not till then, may we expect the "wilderness to become a fruitful field and the fruitful field be counted for a forest." The dry bones would be seen to move, new life would be imparted to ministers and people. The pulpit and the pew would *then* be entered from the closet, and the closet from the church. Cold and dry remarks on a portion of scripture would be superseded by plain, luminous and practical discourses, accompanied with a deeply marked solicitude for immortal souls. The consciences of men would be appealed to, and searched as with lighted candles. The doctrines of the Bible, natural depravity, would be boldly proclaimed, pungently enforced and fearlessly maintained against all opposition; and free and sovereign grace—Christ crucified, would be exhibited in his fulness and all-sufficiency, excellence and glory, in that unadorned, impressive and affecting eloquence, the grandness and importance of the subjects alike inspire and demand. The feelings would thus be aroused, the judgment informed, and the "still small voice" of the gospel heard.

I will not now speak of the mode of exhibiting divine truth, that obtains currency, as by authority, in our church. Suffice it, that we do not copy after the style of Paul at Athens, or before king Agrippa: nor do we follow the example of our Lord, as recorded

in the latter part of the twenty-third chapter of Matthew's, and fourteenth of Luke's Gospel. The Fathers we hold in utter contempt, so far as *good speaking* is concerned. Proof: empty churches, an *illiberal* and discontented people, many of whom confess with sorrow, that they retire from the church, after sleeping a goodly portion of the time as dead, stupid and prayerless as they entered. Show me the man who faithfully preaches the doctrines of the gospel, in their own simple, unadorned eloquence, visits from house to house, making himself at home wherever he goes; devotes himself to their spiritual and eternal interests, and "watches for their souls as one that has to render an account, that he may do it with joy and not with grief;" and I will show you a full church, a pious, brotherly, intelligent people, and a pastor beloved and respected by his people and approved of his Master. I am aware that some will say the fault is the hearers'; of blame I shall take my full share, but the disease has become so common, bordering on universality, that those in *high places* must share the responsibility with us; "like ministers, like people." Certain it is, guilt lies somewhere, and it becomes all to search out, and seek its removal.

How can we expect the natural man, who cares not for, neither can discern spiritual things, to go and hear a dry, lifeless, abstract sermon, however sound, in preference to a well delivered, although erroneous one? I have never known it; but, on the contrary, have heard it urged again and again, as an excuse for non-attendance. Few enter our church, if we except those who have been educated in her communion, or those who have no other alternative. We must do something to attract the eye and the ear—something to draw the people to the house of God, and Christ will draw them to himself. Where, O where are the "street and lane, highway and hedge" preachers, compelling them to come in, that their Master's house may be filled? Where is the acting, never-ceasing benevolence of our pattern and exemplar?—"the all things to all men, that he might by any means save some," of the Apostle? On whom has the mantle of the Fathers fallen? who has received the Spirit of Christ—pre-eminently enjoyed by *our* Apostle? But, alas, alas! evidences of the Spirit's withdrawal do not stop here. Our Sabbath-schools, those nurseries of piety and fountains of religious knowledge when organized, with few exceptions are either dead or languishing, and the young forgotten. Prayer-meetings in many instances have become so formal, as to exert little or no influence on the lives of the very few who attend them: indeed, it is a fact, which cannot be disguised, but which ought to be deeply felt, and sincerely repented of: That *we are not a praying people*. Our Bible Society under its present organization, is *not* to circulate the word of life *free* of any charge, or on such terms as will meet the wants of a destitute community—*not* to cheer them in their poverty, and direct them how to obtain the true riches—*not* to pour the balm of consolation into the wounded heart—*not* to deliver the captive and give to all who believe, eternal life. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The Bible is the blessed medium: "Search the scriptures, &c." Such is the declared design of other societies, and why not of ours? Would that it were; that in every congregation we could find a society, and even individuals actively en-

gaged in its delightful duties: then might we look for fruit. What then is its object? It is this. O I blush to record it! We undertake to furnish the Bible, bound in any form, with the metrical version of David's Psalms, to all contributors, (if they choose to demand it) to the amount of their subscriptions, at a cheap rate; and thus save the pockets of the rich, without benefiting the poor. This may not have been the original design; but *thus* it now operates. Is it fair, is it honourable, for a person to give five dollars to the society, and take it out in Bibles for his own family use?

We have no home nor foreign missionaries actively engaged in carrying the message of salvation to lost and perishing sinners. But, I shall be told, we have not enough to supply our own wants: how, then, can we send any abroad? Have we taken the proper means to procure them? Have we, without ceasing, asked the Husbandman for more labourers, and refused to depart without them? Have we sought, by every means, to enlighten—to awaken an interest in the church in this important Christian duty? No. Well, then, go and do it now, and depend upon it we will have as many as we require, and as much work as we can accomplish. This cannot be done to-morrow, nor, perhaps, next day: but in due time, only *begin*. That we have not a sufficient supply for our present wants is a fact; that we have not sought them is, perhaps, equally true, and did sloth obviate the difficulty, verily our wants would have been all supplied long since. Yet, that is no reason why we are not to respect the wants of others. Did the Apostles remain at Jerusalem, or Paul at Corinth, Ephesus, or any other city, until all were converted? I believe not. Then why should we? We have for years, and years answered the daily cry for bread, of the poor famishing heathen, with, "I cannot—will not give you." Poor creatures, they are represented as following the missionaries, praying and beseeching them, to give them, were it but one *tract*, a *single leaf*, of that book, of which they had heard, but never seen. Will we not rise and give them? not, even, for "their importunity." "No, the little we have, we would willingly bestow, to cover your nakedness, appease your hunger and quench your thirst; but, the distance is so great between us, that we are unable to send a messenger of our own with it, and our consciences will not permit us to convey it through the polluted sources of other sectaries; they will not find our authorized metrical version of the Psalms of David with the Bible!" "Tell it not in Gath!" Who would withhold bread from a man dying for want, because, forsooth, he had not a carriage of his own in which to convey it; nor the best butter to put upon it? None, I presume, but the miser counting his gold, or the sluggard with folded hands. Be awakened, then, ye sleepy watchmen—give the alarm—*sound* the trumpet—arise, ye sluggards; hear ye not the Master's call, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" Has he told you, "to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature?" Do you refuse? it is at your peril. Is this world to become the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Ye leaders of the people, ye soldiers of the cross, buckle on your armour; fight no longer *only* on the defensive, if indeed ye *fight* at all; but go forth—*lead the way*, arrayed in the panoply of truth, under the great Captain of our salvation, and meeting the enemy in the field, as will be the case, as surely as we go, pursue him from point to point, from strong



hold to strong hold—storm the capitol of his mighty empire—seize and bind him and set the prisoners free. What a glorious enterprise! This is no fancy—no chimera. It is matter of promise and will all be accomplished—accomplished by means—used too by the church of Christ. Is it so, then, that we, while all this work is being accomplished, are to stand idle spectators? Shall *we* bring no glory to our Redeemer, nor help to place the crown upon his head, and unite with myriads more in swelling the triumphant shout, “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.”

In connexion with Bible and missionary operations, I beg leave to notice *Tract societies*. No, no, I hear proclaimed from one end of the church to the other—and wherefore No? “Because other denominations have them in operation, numbers are engaged in this work to the neglect of their own affairs, and many trust to this, and other works of a similar nature, for salvation.” Is the preaching of the gospel to be discontinued, because many refuse its call, and it incidentally proves their destruction? Are we to withhold our alms, because in many instances our liberality has been abused? Do we cease doing good, when that good is evil spoken of? God forbid, the principle is inadmissible. But how came we to sit in judgment on our fellow-men? I at least know some, thus engaged, who are not seeking salvation by “the deeds of the law,” but are proving their faith by their works of benevolence and love. Our great inquiry should be, are these means scriptural? have they been blessed by the Head of the church? This point has been, I think, satisfactorily settled by your intelligent correspondent, E. Why, then, not use these means, every scriptural mean, with our utmost energy and perseverance? But another objects, that “many of their tracts are unsound and spread disease and death, instead of health and life.” This is a reason, above all others, why we should, if possible, occupy the field before them. Ah, the field, to our shame be it said, is already occupied, the tares sown before the wheat! and it becomes us, now, to spread far and wide, an antidote to the poison, which overspreads the land. Ought we not to meet the enemy, with weapons that are scriptural?—meet him, too, on the very ground he is wresting from us? What physician would seek to counteract a disease by absenting himself from his patient until it becomes constitutional or incurable? Yet, this is what we are doing. That great numbers of the tracts of the present day are unsound, is to be lamented; *them, we* are not called upon to distribute. Yet, thousands of them are as sound as our Testimony, and I know numerous instances of the good they have been the means of effecting. They are messengers of peace, bearing the seeds of life and salvation to millions, not in this country only, but in every country on the globe; and if by *their* means a single brand is plucked from the burning, all that has ever been done or may yet be accomplished, will be amply rewarded. This, however, is not all we shall gain. By selecting pious and benevolent individuals to distribute them, (and surely every congregation can furnish a few such,) the disconsolate widow, the destitute orphan, and the poor man’s case, will be represented to the church or some charitable society, for their seasonable relief, and many by these means saved from vice, possibly, death.

Allow me here to introduce to your notice another important

**Society.** I know the mention of its name will call a smile to the countenance of some, and, it may be, a grin, to that of others. For this I care not, let its merits be discussed—by the Bible let it stand or fall. It is the Temperance, or if you please total abstinence Society. I grant that all church members are bound or bind themselves, in the most solemn manner to be temperate; would that all kept this vow. But, have we no duties to perform to those that are without? is the demon of intemperance to stalk abroad, attended with wasting and destruction with our tacit approval, bearing his thousands to the grave, it may be to eternal death, and shall we not make one effort? not deny ourselves a single gratification, to gain the peace of families—to save immortal souls? Methinks, we set little value on that, to save which, cost the precious blood of God's dear Son. "If all things are lawful unto us, all things are not expedient," or profitable. It is, therefore, no sin to abstain from the use of some. And if doing so would save a father or mother, son or daughter, husband or wife, brother or sister, friend or foe, from temporal ruin or eternal death; cease to taste the poisonous cup, "avoid every appearance of evil," remembering, that, the sixth commandment requires "all lawful endeavours to preserve the life of others, as our own."

Permit me then, in conclusion, to suggest the propriety—to urge the duty of establishing a monthly prayer-meeting in every congregation throughout the church, to bring our case before the Lord, and seek counsel of him, who "is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working—who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not;" beseeching him for the outpouring of his Holy Spirit, a revival of his own work, and to send forth the labourers into his vineyard. Let our cry "come up before him, even into his ears," let it ascend from every pulpit, social meeting, family, closet and heart: and the Lord may "hearken and hear, and write a book of remembrance before him; for them that fear the Lord and have thought upon his name." If we do not ask, seek and cry, and that mightily, we will not receive, cannot find, nor need we expect to be heard.

Institute meetings for the purpose of reading missionary reports and religious intelligence of every kind; as to their success both at home and abroad, their piety, devotion, and self-denial, that we may light our dying tapers at their blazing lamps, and imitate their burning zeal; as to their difficulties and dangers, how heroically they brave them! How interesting, to the true believer, is it, to know their cares, their wants, privation and sufferings! It may be we could in some degree alleviate them, and pour the balm of consolation into their wounds. Delightful thought! Who would not be thus, good Samaritan-like, engaged? Let us follow them in their every step with our sympathy and prayers. This, with God's blessing, (that ever attends duty performed in faith) would help to unite us as a band of brothers, fighting manfully in the cause of Christ; at present, we are content that others fight and conquer for us. Make these meetings interesting to the people, give them light and life, and depend upon it the result will be a rich soil—an abundant harvest, where, now, we find sterility, "briers and thorns." Make every congregation a very hive of busy bees, each in his proper sphere. Set the *youth* to work and not place them in the background as heretofore—push *them* forward and interest them in Zion's peace and prosperity, and we need not fear the result.

Synod's late meeting, I see from your June number, is barren of interest on these subjects. O how I desire to see, and so will every true lover of Zion, the advancement of Christ's kingdom both at home and abroad. The wants of weak and destitute stations and districts, take the chief place in their deliberations, instead of . . . . How cheering to Zion's King and Zion's citizens. O that 'Spread the gospel,' were on every tongue—the watchman's watch-word. "On, Christians, on, until Satan's kingdom be destroyed and that of grace be triumphant."

Shall I be answered by the messengers of Christ, "We have not the means, our people are poor, have enough to do, to raise money to pay our stipends." Have you asked them—urged upon them the duty of contributing for the support and spread of the gospel? Have you pressed upon them, not on one, but on every suitable occasion, the claims of Christ and his precious gospel? While directing their attention to the errors of your Christian brethren of other denominations, and lifting up your warning voice, have you turned aside to recount their many virtues, incessant labours, for the good of souls—frequent and liberal contributions for the spread of the gospel, and the Bible, and urged them to follow their example, "Depart from evil and do good?" I believe not, yet this had been justice—had been charitable and might have done good. Have you told them of the poor—the dying heathen, recounted to us our privileges, who were in ignorance and want as they; and the fruits, it is incumbent upon us to bring forth; that for three years he has been looking for it, and if another passes alike unproductive, the peremptory command may go forth to "cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" I have no hesitation in giving a negative reply to one and all of these questions. See to it, that no blood be required at your hands. It is not expected that all will be accomplished at once. It is a common saying, that "Rome was not built in one day," yet *that city was* commenced, *that city became* the mistress of the world. Let us begin if it should be with the use of one mean, prayer, yea, if only a meeting to discuss its propriety. We never can accomplish any, the least thing, without effort, and so long as we stand idle, just so long will we be a reproach to the cause we have espoused—a stumbling-block in the way of others. If all the churches were to follow our example, what would be the consequences? When were the people appealed to in such a cause in vain? Never: try you the experiment, and it will be found, that we can both *feel* and *act* like *men*—like Christians. Does not every branch of the visible church in this country and Great Britain testify to this truth? Yes, and when we look abroad on what they have done and are now doing, and then turn to ourselves to compare the contrast, ought not the crimson blush of shame to mantle every cheek? But the people *are* ready to act, and blame the Synod for not making provision to receive their bounty; this, perhaps, is an idler's excuse for keeping his hands folded. Be that as it may, I cannot see how the Synod's neglect of duty exonerates us from performing ours. Ministers of the gospel, heralds of the cross, stewards of heaven's mysteries, I call upon you—Christ—the Christian church—all, all call upon you—voices like trumpets, that heaven and earth may hear, and hell tremble. Resolve, that from henceforth, "for Zion's sake you will not hold your peace, and for Jerusalem's sake

you will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof, as a lamp that burneth."

In presenting these few thoughts for the church's consideration, I am actuated only with a desire, that our Zion may become a praise in the earth, and our brethren no longer reproach us for want of zeal in our Redeemer's cause. I have merely named the different topics, more with a view to elicit discussion from able writers on both sides—that iron may sharpen iron—that we may "see eye to eye," and with "one heart and one mind, strive together for the faith of the gospel," than to throw any light upon them myself.

May the Great Head of the church, into whose hands I confidently commit them, bless this feeble effort, for his own glory and his people's good; and pour out his Spirit upon us, that under his blessed influence, we may "grow up as among the grass, and as willows by the water courses."

JUVENIS OBSERVATOR.

#### ART. V.—*Vindication of C.'s Position.*

MR. EDITOR,—In the May number of the Monitor, I offered a few remarks on ministerial authority, in answer to some queries in a previous number. I had no thought of fully discussing the subject in the limits I then had, and for the sake of brevity, was obliged to pass over some important points without full explanation. One of my positions was, that when the church court, to whom the jurisdiction belongs, have deposed a man from the ministry, even *unjustly*, he is deposed and no longer a minister. This I endeavoured to illustrate by the case of a man deposed from a civil office, and some other examples. The editor, however, remarks in the same number, that he "cannot yield assent to the position, that unjust deposition divests a man of his office." Thus far he undoubtedly has a right to his opinion; but he proceeds to say, "it is despotic, unscriptural, dangerous, grates with that intuitive sense of right and wrong, implanted in the breast of every man." Now, if all, or any one of these charges can be proved, I shall heartily renounce the doctrine at once; and if the editor had offered any argument, I might have been convinced, but his naked assertion is not sufficient. *He says*, indeed, "the example of civil deposition is not parallel to ecclesiastical," but this is only another naked assertion; the dissimilarity is not pointed out, nor is any notice taken of the other examples adduced. It would, therefore, be a sufficient answer to the editor's remarks, and a perfect parallel to his mode of reasoning, if I should now dogmatically maintain, in one word, that the doctrine is *not* of the character he has given it. But as this style of discourse is neither respectful nor useful, I shall rather give some farther explanations of my position, and then add a few things by way of confirmation.

First, then, when I speak of deposition by an ecclesiastical court, I mean the highest authority in the church, for we may suppose it to be carried up, if need be, though indeed the decisions of inferior courts are binding while unreversed.

Secondly, there is great difference in degrees of injustice. Perhaps my language led the editor to imagine a church court passing an act of known and designed injustice, merely because they pos-

sessed the power; but such a case is not supposable, and probably such a case never existed. For though courts may proceed by very unsound arguments, to a very unjust decision against an individual, and though many sinful passions may mingle with their reasonings, to bias their judgment, still it is to be presumed, that they consider it upon the view of the whole matter, to be a just decision. But there is a farther difference as to the matter judged; for example, if the court shall first require the man solemnly to profess his resolution to adhere to the doctrine and order of the church, as set forth in her standards, agreeably to the divine word, and afterwards condemn, and even depose him, for that very adherence, such deposition does not divest him of the office; not merely because it is unjust, but because he has an equally high authority, in the previous act, on much better ground to continue in the office. This was the case of the first Seceders; at their ordination they were required solemnly to vow adherence to the doctrine and order of the Scottish church, in agreeableness with the word; and it was afterward for that adherence that they were censured, and finally deposed; they were, therefore, justified in the course they pursued. The case of the Reformers is still more simple: if they disregarded the decisions of the popish tribunals, that whole community had long before ceased to be a church of Christ, and, therefore, had no authority to bind his people: it was their imperative duty to renounce her unholy yoke. Moreover, the Reformers lived in an extraordinary state of the church, and were extraordinary men: their example, therefore, would not invalidate the general rule, even if it did not, in all points, agree with it. But another case: if a minister, in the present settled state of the church, is charged with an offence, tried, condemned, and deposed, even though he may certainly know that he is not guilty, (and that is the same as to know that the decision is not just,) still he is thereby divested of the office. There might be many other examples with various shades of difference in their complexions; it is impracticable to specify them all: this one instance is sufficient to explain what I mean by unjust deposition, divesting a man of the office; and I make no doubt, the editor will still withhold his assent and express his abhorrence. I shall, therefore, now add a few things for confirming my position, and here I might repeat the illustrations offered in my former paper, not one of which has been even touched. If the injustice of the decision necessarily nullifies deposition, a corresponding injustice must nullify any other decision; for though it may be followed by more injurious consequences in one case than in another, yet in its bearing on the *validity* of an act, it is the same: now let us apply this to one of the cases formerly given. The ordaining of a man to the ministry, and the deposing of a man from that office, are acts perfectly equal and parallel; let us suppose they are both performed under circumstances of equal injustice, as before explained, the ordination is of far more dangerous consequences to the church, yet its validity will not be questioned; no more can the validity of the other decision. But, says the editor, "it grates with that intuitive sense of right and wrong implanted in the breast of every man." If he had said, with the self-love of every man, we might have agreed; it is because we are less disturbed by injustice, when it seems to favour the individual, than when it seems to be against him: less alarmed by it, when it affects the spiritual concerns of a person or

people, as the supposed ordination would do, than when it endangers his livelihood, as the deposition might do. This may be farther confirmed by another plain example. The exclusion of a man from the communion of the church, is, in some respects, a much heavier matter than his exclusion from an office. The very same injustice may exist in both cases, and there is nothing for the private member but submission; the same would be the case with a ruling elder deposed: neither of these have any temporalities at stake, and their station affords them less means of forcing their way over all authority than is possessed by a minister: still the editor thinks the principle "despotic and unscriptural" when applied to a minister. Then I observe, that the church court has power to bind ~~in~~ their final sentence in all cases belonging to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, therefore, also in the deposition of a minister. "Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose sins soever ye retain, they are retained. Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven," &c. At the same time I hold that there is no court infallible in their decision: here, at least, I will not be disputed; but these principles taken in connexion amount to this, that the court in deposing a minister may err in judgment of the cause, and still their sentence deprives him of the office. "Ah! but," says the editor, "their sentence is bound in heaven, *only* when it accords with truth and justice:" it would be injurious to the character of our Lord Jesus to suppose it to be otherwise. This is a common and plausible interpretation at first sight, but in reality it is a perversion of our Lord's meaning, and the subterfuge of all rebels. Let us consider; what is meant by being bound in heaven? It certainly does not give to men a power to anticipate the judgment of God, as if it were said, he will decide in the same manner as you shall have done; neither does it confer on them his prerogative of discerning men and matters according to their absolute reality, that they may remit sins in the popish sense: the utmost power given to men is to judge according to the outward appearance and evidence, and our Lord's words are the warrant of church courts to give final decision according to that rule, and binding all, by his divine authority, to submit to the same. This is evidently a first principle, essential to every government on earth, and to insert in the warrant a proviso, that the decision must be a just sentence, according to absolute truth, would perfectly neutralize it; as it would leave it always questionable, whether it had any binding force or not. But if any is aggrieved by the highest decision of the church, knowing it to be erroneous, he has an appeal to the King and Head himself, and must exercise patience and submission, till he, in his own time and way, give judgment. This, however, "grates" very much with the native pride, impatience, and self-love of men: they must have redress *now*, they must maintain their own cause by their own bravery, especially when their temporalities are concerned, and rather than fail they will take the law into their own hand.

The editor seems, like too many in the present day, to forget that Christ's government of his church on earth is an actual reality, and not a mere theory; that there are many cases reserved to his own infallible decision, cases that will never be fully opened nor decided according to their real character, till we shall all stand before his judgment seat. He has no where peremptorily promised to his ser-

vants in the ministry, that they shall not suffer injustice through the ignorance or corruptions of their brethren, any more than he has secured them from injury by the wicked world; and his permission of the one, is no more inconsistent with his character than the permission of the other. But let us now consider how the editor's principle would work. A minister is deposed, let us say, unjustly, as already explained; "it does not divest him of the office," says Mr. Editor; that is, he may still lawfully perform all its functions. I ask, by what authority is he now exercising the ministry? Do you say he holds his commission from the great Head of the church? It cannot be in the ordinary way; that is, through the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, for the deposition takes that from him. Do you then claim for him an extraordinary or immediate commission? Let him show his testimonials of the same character, and if he cannot do this, we will set him down as a false prophet, running unsent, and prophesying when the Lord has not spoken. And it will be difficult for any man to show the essential difference between him and the multitude of presumptuous impostors, who thrust themselves into the sacred office uncalled. But again; how is it known that the deposition is unjust? Where was it examined and decided? There ought certainly to be a competent authority for so important a step, as a practical nullifying of the decision of the highest court in the church. Do you consider the adherence of a party to the deposed man sufficient? Then you ought at once to abandon Presbyterian government altogether. But I cannot for a moment suppose this to be your idea. Perhaps rather the case should be, that the deposed, being conscious of innocence, "the intuitive sense of right and wrong implanted in his own breast," is a sufficient authority to him. Very well, I have no doubt many would concur in the happy idea; for it makes a man not only a judge, but the supreme judge in his own cause, independent of arguments or witnesses. It not only reaches to one offensive decision, but would render all decisions, and government, and courts, a perfect nullity; for a man would be bound by them no farther than his own pleasure: he could, at any moment, appeal to this Lord Chief Justice, intuitive sense, who would admit none into court but himself, and without fail decide in his favour; and, in short, no man could then be convicted of any crime, or censured with any censure contrary to his own will, either justly or unjustly. Now I wonder if this is what the editor considers the scriptural and safe principle, opposite to C.'s "unscriptural and dangerous" position. Calling it scriptural, I suppose he refers to the example of Israel, when they had no king or governor, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes; but I no where find that state of things commended for safety. There is a question or two, however, that would seem rather difficult to answer, on Mr. Editor's principle. On what ground does he blame those men who, having been deposed by the Associate Church, still continue to exercise the ministry? Why, certainly, because they were *justly* deposed. Very true; that was the judgment of the court, but the men themselves are very positive, it was *unjust*, and their "intuitive sense of right and wrong" impels them to resist it. They say they have proved the injustice, (but the church has never seen any such proof.) Now if the decision of the court has no intrinsic, weighty authority to bind a man to obedience, if it is not supreme for the

termination of process, it is absolutely nothing; the court and the panel are precisely on a level, the judgment or decision of the one is of no more value than that of the other, and there is none to judge between them; every man must be left, therefore, to do what is right in his own eyes. Again; the right of protest and appeal goes on the supposition that the decision appealed from, may be unjust. Now, a Presbytery depose a minister; he protests and appeals; I would ask, Mr. Editor, is he bound to submit to the deposition for the present, till the higher court reverse the sentence, or not? If he is, then you assent to C.'s dangerous position, that the sentence of the court divests him of the office, even though it may be unjust: for it makes no difference whether the deposition is continued for a few months only, or his lifetime; it is the same in itself still. If he is **not** bound, but may lawfully continue to exercise the ministry, then it must be that the judgment of the individual, and that while he stands a culprit at the bar, has more weight than that of the court: such an order "grates with our intuitive sense of right and wrong." It would also follow that schism might be, in all respects, lawful; for while the deposed man might lawfully exercise the ministry, the court deposing him by the same law, must refuse communion with him, and if this would be just on the decision of an inferior court, it would be equally so towards the supreme court. And those who for some years have been tormenting the Secession Church with this schismatical conduct, have been in the plain path of duty, and he who charges them with "seeking to break down the order and discipline of the church" deserves no light censure. Mr. Editor hopes C.'s sentiment will never be adopted as the doctrine of the Secession Church; but I can assure him, that it has been a radical principle in every organized form of government from the beginning of the world, and must continue to be so; it is a plain dictate of the light of nature, as well as of Scripture revelation. "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment . . . . . thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, that shall be in those days, and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment . . . . . thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee to the right hand or to the left," &c., Deut. xvii. 8—12. Their sentence was final, and there is no proviso inserted in their warrant; the man who would not submit was put to death. The reason is sufficiently plain, that though *certain and perfect justice* is not attainable in this world, yet as courts of judgment are the best means for it, it is incomparably better to rest in their decision, as it may be, than hazard the horrors of anarchy, which is the only other alternative, and more especially as courts are the divine institution to which we are, by the same authority, enjoined to submit.

Mr. Editor thinks some *particular cases* have had the effect to *warp* my judgment on first principles. I know of no cases that had, or could have any such tendency. I know of some men who have been deposed, but the justice of the sentence is as clear as the sun, and it is capable of demonstration, that if there had been no rich livings endangered by it, there had been no dispute on the matter, so that it is not easy to understand how these cases should warp any judgment, at least in such a direction.

In conclusion, I am aware that there are many collateral questions which arise in the line of my remarks. Such as, in case the court



decide unjustly *with knowledge*, in one degree or other, the right of acting under a protest in some cases, &c. &c. These might open new and wide fields which my limits do not now permit me to enter; but I hope if the editor, or any other, shall again condescend to notice me, he will first point out the fallacy of my arguments, particularly, or offer a few solid reasons of his own, before pronouncing his utter condemnation in such strong terms. This is the more logical order, I believe, and the most likely to give instruction. And I entirely concur in the sage admonition with which he concludes, that we ought carefully to guard against a biassing of the judgment on first principles, especially if we occupy a station that may extend the influence of our opinions over the whole church.

C.

*Remarks on the Vindication of C.*

Did we not fear that it might be deemed discourteous, we should pass by C.'s vindication of himself without comment. C. asserted, in substance, "that unjust deposition deprived a minister of his office." The editor declared that he "could not yield assent to the position." C. "was obliged to pass over some important points without full explanation." The editor merely dissented *without any explanation whatever*, which he was obliged to do for want of room. Consequently, C.'s lecture about "naked assertion," and his concluding paragraph, are wholly gratuitous. But as C. is a tolerable marksman, and seldom gives *himself* such a palpable *hit*, we shall pass this point.

As we do not much admire the general spirit and style of C.'s vindication of himself, any more than his reasoning, we shall content ourselves by calling the reader's attention to the following paragraph:—

"If the court shall first require the man solemnly to profess his resolution to adhere to the doctrine and order of the church, as set forth in her standards agreeably to the divine word, and afterwards condemn and even depose him, for that very adherence, such deposition does not divest him of his office, not merely because it is unjust, but because he has an equally high authority in the previous act, on much better ground, to continue in the office."

Now, as it is impossible for unjust deposition to take place without requiring something of the deposed man, contrary to the *doctrine and order* (or rather doctrine *or* order) of the church, he must, in the language of C., "*CONTINUE IN THE OFFICE.*" Consequently, C. has proved the editor's position and disproved his own! He is nearly equally unfortunate throughout his whole paper. But it will be time enough to answer his reasoning when he reconciles it with the above concession; and, in the mean time, the intelligent reader can detect the fallacy of it without the editor's assistance. If time and other circumstances permit, we may, hereafter, give our views on this point, unless some of our correspondents save us the labour.

ART. VI.—*Answer to Quero.*

MR. EDITOR,—I observe in the March number of the Monitor, over the signature of Quero, some half a dozen questions proposed to me to be answered, and although I do not wish to occupy the pages of the Monitor, to the exclusion of more able correspondents, yet if the following answers are judged of sufficient importance, you may give them an insertion.

Your correspondent alluded to, seems to think that I have not been entirely successful in establishing the doctrine that occasional hearing is sinful, even from my own premises; else he would, no doubt, have rested the question on the proposition he himself laid down, irrespective of what might have been taught in the standards of the church. "If it is a scriptural doctrine," says he, "let us fearlessly support it; if it is not, let it fall to the ground." This is precisely the position in which the writer attempted to place the truth of the doctrine without any reference to how clearly it might have been taught. And he wishes that there were such a heart in every one of us. As soon, then, as we were able to perceive the truth of a doctrine, we would no longer confer with flesh and blood to know where or how clearly men had taught it, but would immediately enter on the practice of the principle, regardless of consequences. Being thoroughly convinced in my own mind, after long and painful investigation, that the doctrine in question is a truth, and that the manner in which it was proposed to be discussed, is the most direct way to establish the point, either I must have been entirely unsuccessful in conveying the ideas intended, or else Quero has not read them with that attention necessary to perceive their connexion and weight. And I am somewhat inclined to the belief of the latter, from the consideration that he has asserted, that I had attempted to prove that occasional hearing is sinful, because contrary to the doctrines of the Associate Church. Although I asserted, in substance, in the introduction to that communication, that the doctrine in question was a principle of the Associate Church, I no where used this as an argument to prove it to be sinful. For this would have been but reasoning in a circle. If the ideas of a writer be not perceived by the reader, it matters little how conclusive are his arguments, they cannot carry conviction with them under such circumstances. There is nothing in nature more certain than mathematical demonstration; and yet, should a person read over so inattentively a demonstration of the most simple theorem in Euclid, as not to comprehend every idea as he advances, the conclusion would be to him no more certain than the most incoherent remarks.

Your correspondent, without either admitting or denying directly the truth of the doctrine, thinks I may be required to show where this doctrine is so plainly taught by the Associate Church as not to be mistaken by the humble inquirer after truth.

How long and how far an humble inquirer after truth may be so left, as not to be able to discover a doctrine to be taught, either in the standards of the church, or in the Scriptures, depends on circumstances, that man is neither able to foresee nor control. God is sovereign in his dealing with his children, and sometimes, for reasons inscrutable to us, he leaves some long, ere they discover some prac-

tical truths to be taught, even in the Scriptures, where no doubt they are taught sufficiently plain to render all inexcusable for not finding them. But the reason why persons are so left, are, more generally, two. First, in some period of their life individuals may have resisted convictions of the truth of a doctrine, so that afterwards, when they seek it more humbly, it is withheld from them until they are brought to that frame of mind, which is represented in the Scriptures as becoming like little children. It is, alas! a too prevalent opinion in these skeptical times, that *we* are exempt from those awfully severe and sudden judgments which God frequently visited on his offending people of old. But the writer is firmly persuaded that judgments, with the celerity of lightning, if not uniformly, are as frequently visited on transgressors now as then. Hardness of heart, and blindness of mind, to a greater or less degree, invariably follow impenitent transgressors,—judgments no less awful, because they are not perceived by those on whom they are visited.

Another reason why some humble inquirers after truth are unable, for a time, to find a doctrine, though taught in the standards of the church and Scriptures, is, because by their not attending to the reality of the thing expressed, they are misled by different terms being used to express the same idea or relation; or the reverse, when the same term is used to express an idea differing somewhat from another. Thus, when the terms fellowship and communion are used, some restrict them to sitting down at the communion table, without ever dreaming that there is fellowship and communion in hearing the word preached; and so, as in the first case, when the term *suspension* of an individual, and *separating* from a congregation, presbytery, or whole denomination, is used, it is never suspected that both these words mean, in all these cases, precisely the same thing, and that simply, that we will not hold communion with such, on account of their sins.

It was thought necessary to make these remarks before proceeding to answer Quero's questions, which I shall now endeavour to do, so far as they are judged important. He asks, "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?"

The precise idea intended by this question is not obvious. Had Quero stopped with the first part of the question, his meaning would have been precise, distinct, and plain, but by adding the last clause, "because sinful to act contrary to it in any case," he involves his entire meaning in obscurity. Should the writer, then, miss Quero's idea, he trusts he will stand acquitted of designed evasion. The question would seem to imply, Is, then, the doctrine that occasional hearing is sinful, clearly taught by the Associate Church, and condemned as censurable? This is the best idea that we are able to draw from the question, and, as it is in perfect harmony with the others proposed, we will answer it as the one intended. And to this we reply, without hesitation, in the affirmative. In the Declaration and Testimony, part third, and article fifth, we have this doctrine: "We believe it not only lawful but expedient to separate from a church which is not merely corrupt, but obstinate in apostacy; and especially from a church which is daily proceeding from one degree of it to another. We are commanded to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly; if from every brother, certainly from

a church or society of brethren who walk so." "But," says Quero, "what has all that to do with occasional hearing?—it is not so much as mentioned here; you must be hard pushed to quote such a passage as this to prove your point." But wait until we examine the idea of the quotation and find its meaning. It is presumed none will plead that we have *not* withdrawn from every brother in all other denominations: withdrawn how? not removed our habitation from theirs, not suspended all intercourse with them in the world, for then we must needs go out of the world, but withdrawn from ecclesiastical *ordinances* as dispensed by them. But the preaching of the word is an ordinance as much as baptism, or the sacrament of the supper, and must be included, or, the thing *professed* is not done. "This is your version of it," says Quero: "it means only to withdraw from the communion with them in sealing ordinances." But I reply it does not say so, the word withdraw is used without any restriction, and must mean to withdraw from all ecclesiastical connexion and intercourse with them.—To give it any other meaning, it would be necessary to add some word to limit the command to withdraw, and make it read thus:—We are commanded to withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly, and not partake with him in any of the ordinances except in the preaching of the word. This is very like the withdrawing of Naaman, the Syrian, from worshipping in the house of Rimmon. He had well resolved that henceforth he would "neither offer burnt offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord." "In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon; when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing." Naaman had been greatly honoured by his master, therefore he wished to retain his friendship. But he had discovered error in his religious profession, and, therefore, he was resolved to withdraw from it; but, like many now a days, to do it in such a way that it might not be known, lest they should think that he intended it as a testimony against them, and so lose their friendship. But that the writer may not be considered alone in these views, he will refer to the Book of Discipline, emitted by the Associate Church in 1817, which must be considered as the church's exposition of her own standards.

In Article second, and Section twelfth, reference is made to an act passed as early as 1796, by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, now the Associate Synod of North America, where it was declared, "That if we attend on the ministry of such as are involving themselves in the common defection, it is contrary to the profession we ourselves have made; for we thus take part with them as a church in the worship of God, while in our profession we expressly declare that we ought to maintain a separate communion, as a testimony against them: and as the Synod still adheres to these sentiments thus judicially declared, they do, therefore, judge the practice of attending on the ministrations of such as are known to be erroneous, as opposers of a testimony for truth, to be censurable." That the doctrine, then, in question is a principle of the Associate Church, and taught in her standards, is sufficiently plain. And yet forty-four years after the act alluded to was passed, and nearly twenty-three

years since the Book of Discipline has been in use for the direction of church courts, we are required to show where these things are taught in our standards. Men, sometimes, have dim eyes to perceive, and ministers, sometimes, are criminally backward to preach those doctrines "which, in some places, cannot be so much as mentioned without endangering the peace, and," according to Quero, "the prosperity of the church." It is greatly to be feared that one reason why the lay members do not know the doctrine in question to be a truth, and a truth of our profession, not obscurely taught, is, because the doctrine is exceedingly unpopular, and ministers, losing sight of their awful responsibility, herein shun to declare the whole counsel of God. If, however, ministers, themselves, do not know this to be a principle of their profession and a doctrine of the Scriptures, the humiliating question which our Saviour put to Nicodemus on another subject, may well be addressed to them; "Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?"

The next two questions which Quero proposes, are of that insinuating kind which the pharisees proposed to our Saviour: "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not?" And if he is at all acquainted with the subject in dispute, he can hardly be vindicated from the charge of disingenuousness.

He asks, "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?"

To answer these questions either in the affirmative or in the negative, would not be stating the truth fairly. By the phrases "*the door*," "*the term*," Quero would seem to insinuate that those who maintain that occasional hearing is sinful, make this the principal, if not the only term of communion. But how an *humble* inquirer after truth could so mistake the fact of the case, is a more difficult question to solve than any he has proposed. That the doctrine in question is, and ought to be made a term of communion by the Associate Church will be resolutely maintained; yet it is not expected that every applicant for communion in the Associate Church should certainly know this to be a truth any more than it is expected that they should understand every other principle professed by the church, for this would not admit of degrees of knowledge in the church. But thus far their assent should be required. They should agree to walk according to the principles of the church on this point, and if they could so promise without doing violence to their consciences, they should be admitted; for this would only imply a weakness of knowledge, and not the holding of error. The church is no where threatened, in Scripture, for the weakness of the knowledge of her members, provided they have built on the sure foundation, and are aiming at faithfulness in their testimony, and striving to hold fast that whereunto they have already attained. But judgments are frequently denounced against those churches that tolerate error in her members.

Quero farther asks, "Or, is it a doctrine professed by some and denied by others?"

However humiliating it may be, we must answer, truly, we have every reason to believe that it is. The writer has, for many years, looked on this state of things with regret, and has suffered not a lit-

the reproach for this manifest sin and inconsistency of our people; and it was from a secret hope that he might be the humble instrument of turning, if not many, at least some, to righteousness in the practice in question, that induced him to present his views to the public.

Quero, anticipating that the preceding question would necessarily be answered in the affirmative, bases another on this answer. "If this be true," he asks, "can they hold communion with one another while they disagree in their belief of this doctrine?"

So far as members in the same church disagree in their principles, just so far they can have no fellowship and communion with one another. And just as far as we disagree in our principles with the Scriptures, just so far it is impossible for us to have communion with God in his ordinances; for "what communion hath light with darkness; and what concord hath Christ with Belial?" And it would be our wisdom *now* to ponder this; for we have it from the highest authority, that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." We should, then, place the point at issue on the *merits* of the question, Whether occasional hearing be sinful without trying to shelter ourselves behind the miserable subterfuge, that it is not *clearly* taught in our standards. Such a plea as this will avail us little in that great and dreadful day, when the secrets of all hearts will be made manifest.

In the remaining question of Quero's, the writer feels no interest. Being born free, and taught from his youth up, to examine matters for himself, the mere opinions of others was never argument with him. Yet he cannot close this communication without noticing a concluding remark of Quero's. Referring to the doctrine that occasional hearing is sinful, he remarks, that "in some places it cannot so much as be mentioned without serious consequences to the peace and prosperity of the church." This appears to be the key to the whole difficulty. Such a disposition always prevents dispassionate investigation, and argues conscious weakness of a cause. Why feel alarmed if you have the truth on your side? He that is with you is more of might, by far, than all they that can be against you—if not, you cannot succeed. On the doctrines of the Scriptures is the church built, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. It is true popular opinion is on your side, but this avails you little. There are many professors, now, who can see nothing to be sinful, except what the *world* sees to be sins. Those breaches of God's law, which are only known by revelation, they have no knowledge of. And some there are who respect the doctrine in dispute to be a truth, but dare not preach or practise it, because they, like the wretched Saul of old, fear the people;—to whom we may well address the language of his reprover, "Behold! to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry."

Finally, Quero remarks, as has already been observed, "If it be a Scriptural doctrine, let us fearlessly support it; if it is not, let it fall to the ground." Than this proposal, nothing can be more reasonable. And those who will not acquiesce in it, can have but doubtful claims to Christianity or candour.

While the writer does not retreat from the ground occupied, in proof of the doctrine, in some preceding numbers of the Monitor,

as he believes that to be the most direct manner to prove the point in question; yet, for the sake of a certain class of readers, he will present the subject in another view.

There are in the church many pious, godly people, whose manner of education, and habits of thinking, have never led them to pursue any lengthy course of reasoning; and who can more readily perceive the error of a principle, by presenting to their views, the inconsistencies to which it would lead them; I will, therefore, briefly point them to an argument of this kind.

Far short as we may come of that disposition of heart, which prompted in Joshua the resolution "As for me and my house we will serve the Lord," it is believed there is not in the Associate Church a presbytery so loose in principle, and lost to a proper sense of consistency, as to ordain a man to preach the gospel who was not a member in regular standing in the Associate Church, or, in other words, a man who had been suspended for his errors, or, who could not be admitted on account of them. But how do matters stand in reference to other denominations? We will not commune with them, nor allow them to commune with us, on account of their errors, and consequently such could not be licensed by any of our presbyteries to preach the gospel. But what is the language of the conduct of those who practise occasional hearing? It is substantially this. Although we cannot license you, Christian brethren, to preach in our communion, on account of your errors, for that would be contrary to our profession, and a heinous sin, and, therefore, as we cannot hear you in our communion, just be so good as to step over to our neighbours, the Associate Reformed or General Assembly, with whose principles yours coincide, and get license from them, and then we can, consistently enough, have the courtesy to walk over, occasionally, to hear you preach. How crooked are the ways of sin!—how beautiful is consistency and the paths of holiness!

Another class of Christians there are, who think that if occasional hearing is sinful, we should be able to quote from the Scripture some text directly condemning the practice of hearing in other denominations. Now it is conceded that there is no one passage of Scripture that will prove so much, except by inference, necessarily drawn from the doctrine it teaches. And the reason is obvious from the slightest reflection. The phrase occasional hearing is not a Scripture, but a modern term coined for the purpose of expressing a number of ideas concisely, which all understand by common consent; and when we add to it the phrase, it is sinful, it contains two propositions and an historical fact, a fact which can no more be expected to be proved by the Scriptures than the revolutionary war. The fact is, that the church is broken up into separate fragments, each claiming to hold the truth, and refusing communion with all others on account of their alleged errors. The first proposition is, That the Associate Church is justifiable in withdrawing from all ecclesiastical connexion with all other denominations. Now, can this distinct proposition be proved directly by passages of Scripture? I think there can be but one opinion in the Associate Church. Such texts as the following are familiar to all. "Mark them that cause divisions, and avoid them." "Come out from among them, my people, and be ye separate." "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." "Withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly."

The second proposition included in the phrase is, That we should remain entirely separate, unless they return to us. But can this also be proved from Scripture? It most certainly can. "Let them return unto thee, but return not thou unto them." "If thy brother trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him." This last text implies, that unless he repent and turn to us, we are not to turn after him. Thus, the reader will perceive, that by separating the ideas included in the expression under consideration, they can be proved from Scripture with precision and ease. "But," says our objector, "all that you thus prove has always been admitted, and still we maintain, that the doctrine is not yet proved, because, to withdraw from other denominations, is only to withdraw from sealing ordinances." This objection has already been noticed at some length; but we again introduce it for the purpose of pursuing it farther, as herein, no doubt, lies the turning point of the question. And the whole difficulty lies in this, men have put asunder in their thoughts and practice, that which God has joined inseparably together. The question, then, is reduced to this,—Do we, when we withdraw from the dispensation of ordinances in other denominations, withdraw from the ordinances both of teaching and sealing, or from sealing ordinances only? Those who oppose the doctrine we are upholding, have no alternative, but to maintain that we withdraw from sealing ordinances only—while we maintain that we withdraw from all ecclesiastical connexion with them in government and in ordinances, both teaching and sealing. And this, we think, is a scriptural view of the question. They uniformly speak of the church as one communion and one dispensation of ordinances. The Apostles were commanded to "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and 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." The promise, added to this commission of the Apostles, shows that both commission and promise extend to faithful ministers now, as well as to them, and that it will to the end of time.

It was the duty of all who heard the Apostles preach, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, to repent and be baptized, and to commemorate his death; nor could they observe the first and refuse the last two, without being chargeable with sin. And precisely so, matters stand now with us, and all ministers whose authority over us, we acknowledge in any respect. What can be more inconsistent, Christian reader, than the conduct of some of our people, who assemble at the place of worship of some neighbouring denomination, we will suppose on a sacramental occasion (the most common time) and the minister exhorts them, yea, commands them to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved? They look on this as not only reasonable, but acknowledge tacitly by their presence that it is authoritative, as coming through an *acknowledged* ambassador of the Head of the church. A few minutes more roll on, and the table service commences, and the command is, "Do this in remembrance of me; for as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come," and they utterly refuse. This certainly is mysterious, if not suspicious conduct in professing Christians. And yet the best explanation of it, which



we have ever yet heard, is, "There is a great difference between teaching and sealing ordinances." But what light does this throw on the subject? Just none at all. Is it not, then, most fair and reasonable for us, in our turn, to ask, and let Quero answer, let him answer who can, Where, in all the compass of revelation, is the idea held out, that it is right to hear a minister preach, and wrong to observe baptism and the supper when dispensed by him? This is a practical question, and we hope it will be fairly met and answered by some of those who oppose the doctrine we have been advocating. We ought, at all times, to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in us; and equally so for our conduct, the rectitude of which is called in question.

Finally, let the reader examine well the idea contained in the last question proposed, for if it be thoroughly weighed, and we assume it as a truth, that we are justifiable in keeping up a separate denomination, we will find ourselves driven to the conclusion, that either occasional hearing is sinful, or open communion is a duty. "How long, then, will ye halt between two opinions?"

R.

---

#### ART. VII.—*Persecution of the Jews.*

As we would desire to be the friends of Israel, and rejoice sincerely in the prospect of the era, so clearly marked in the records of prophecy, when their wanderings shall cease, and they shall be again grafted into their own olive tree—we record with grief the following cruel sufferings to which the Jews have been exposed in several parts of the East. Clinging with fond affection to the land of their fathers, they are found in large numbers in Palestine and the adjacent countries; but they are generally objects of suspicion to the inhabitants; the ruling powers cruelly oppress them; and as they are glad to seize any pretext for injuring them, the imputation of the worst crimes to them obtains ready and implicit credit. Christians, as well as Mussulmans, are not only satisfied with very little proof against the degraded race of Abraham, but when there is no evidence at all, the accused is sometimes, without scruple, put to the torture to extort confessions. The following account is extracted from the *London Times*. How strikingly it verifies the judgments recorded in the Bible against the Jewish people for their rejection of the Messiah—and how loud a call does it address to Christians to labour and pray with renewed earnestness that the infidelity of the Jewish race may speedily terminate, and that the obstacles that prevent their return to the fold of the good Shepherd may be removed:—

In a letter from the Isle of Rhodes, we are informed that on the 15th of February a Greek boy of eleven years of age, residing at Trianda, a village distant about a league and a half from the city of Rhodes, was sent by his sister with a message to Signor Draghi, a Neapolitan, living in the neighbourhood of the village. The boy delivered the message, but never returned to Trianda. The mother complained to the Pasha, who set on foot a strict investigation, and ordered searches to be made in all directions for the boy—Some women, inhabitants of one of the suburbs came forward, and made a deposition that on the 15th they saw some Jews pass that way, accom-

panied by a boy, who corresponded in appearance with the description of the one missing. Immediately all the horrible traditions handed down from the middle ages, of Jews stealing children to immolate them in the performance of superstitious rites, were revived, and it was firmly believed that the child in question was doomed to be sacrificed. The whole island was agitated from one end to the other. Jews were every where arrested by order of the Pasha, and brought to Rhodes to be identified by the women. At last one unfortunate Israelite named Stamboli was without difficulty, fixed upon by these ladies as a Jew they had seen with a boy, or at least very like one of the party. Poor Stamboli was subjected to dreadful interrogatories. Repeatedly consigned to his dungeon and recalled to stand before his inquisitors, among whom the archbishop and the Greek primates performed the principal parts—questioned and requested, and literally “put to the question,” it is no wonder that his resolution failed him. In fact, he was brought to a sort of confession by the same means as old women in England were once induced to accuse themselves of witchcraft. He cast the blame, however, on three other Jews, who he said had carried off the boy. It is remarkable that this declaration was extorted from him by terror and suffering, at the moment when the Rabbi and the heads of the synagogue were prepared to prove by 200 witnesses, that Stamboli had not left the city during the whole of the day on which the boy disappeared. However the three Jews named by Stamboli were immediately arrested. What will be their fate may be easily conjectured. In the mean time the greatest excitement prevails in the island, and the Jews are exposed to imminent danger.

The other case occurred at Damascus. Father Thomas, superior of the Spanish convent, went out on the 9th of February, accompanied by a servant, and never returned. The head of another convent, called the Monastery of the Holy Land, gave information of the circumstance to the French Consul, who applied to the Pasha for assistance to discover the lost Padre. It was reported that Father Thomas and his servant had been seen going towards the quarter inhabited by the Jews; and thither the Pasha immediately ordered a detachment of soldiers, accompanied by masons, to pull down walls, lay open vaults, and ascertain whether any persons were concealed. Father Thomas had caused bills to be posted in different parts of the town, announcing the sale of the effects of a European recently deceased. One of these bills, which had been posted near the shop of a Jewish barber, was said to have been taken down by the barber, and afterwards posted up in a different manner from the original posting: even wafers of a different colour had been used in fixing it up. The priest had caused all the bills to be attached to the walls with eight pure white wafers, from his own convent. Whether the barber took offence either at the number or colour of the wafers is not explained. It is not said that they were disposed in a cruciform order. Be this as it may, the wicked Jew is said to have replaced the bill by two wafers only, a blue and a red, one at the top, the other at the bottom. This was proof enough. Nothing could be clearer to all Damascus than that there was a conspiracy among the Jews, of which the barber was the chief agent. He was arrested, as was also the servant of M. David Arrari, another Jew, who had been the bearer of some messages between his master and the barber. The two prisoners were first well basti-

nadoed, when they were put into separate cells, with soldiers beside them to prevent the enjoyment of a moment's repose. They were obliged to remain constantly in an upright position, and when they showed any symptoms of drowsiness they were roused by a severe beating. No less than sixty-four Jewish children were arrested in the hope of obtaining from them some evidence of the crime alleged against their parents. Afterwards seven Jews, including David Arrari, already mentioned, were arrested. The barber was put to the torture. His head was placed in a machine, and by the movement of a tourniquet his eyes were made to start from their sockets. Such was the effect of the terror and pain, that the hair of his head and beard became gray. He was promised his liberty, if he would tell the truth. Being now ready to say any thing his tormentors wished, he declared that Aaron Arrari, brother of David, sent for him on the day that Father Thomas disappeared; that on going to Arrari's house he found seven Jews assembled there. They told him that Father Thomas had come into the Jew's quarter, and that if he would assassinate the priest he should have 300 piasters. He refused, and knew nothing more of the affair. He added, that M. Isaac Picciotti had come to him in the prison to persuade him to submit to the bastinado rather than confess, and to assure him that he should receive half-a-gazi (about 4s. 6d.) for every blow. The seven prisoners, who were now brought before the Pasha, all denied the barber's story. but David Arrari was so alarmed that he fainted several times. Picciotti owned that he had visited the barber in prison, but merely for the purpose of prevailing on him to tell what he knew of the crime. Being a European, some communication with his Consul was necessary before Picciotti could be detained, and in the mean time, he fled. The house of David Arrari was rigidly searched, but neither there nor elsewhere has any trace of Father Thomas or his servant been discovered.

Within the last four days a deputation of Jews, residing in London, waited on the leading ministers of the crown, to request the interference of Government to put a stop to the cruel persecution of their brethren in the East. Such an interposition was promised, and there is a hope entertained that these atrocities may thus be soon terminated.

---

ART. VIII.—*Remarks on the Article entitled "Thoughts on Occasional Hearing."*

Neither time, nor the limited nature of our pages will permit us to follow "Pilgrim" through all his peregrinations. Nor is this necessary. It would be as futile as a pilgrimage to Mecca or the Holy Land. We have no fault to find either with his style or spirit; he is candid, undisguised; but we are constrained to regard his reasoning as not only at variance with the principles of the Associate Church and the word of God, but all sound theological writers.

The support which occasional hearing gives to error has generally been thought a valid objection to the practice. But "Pilgrim" appears to think he has demolished this bulwark, by the following ar-

guments, as nearly as they can be selected from his article.\* He assumes—

1. That we admit it is an act of moral rectitude in others to go and hear, &c. This cannot be admitted. Such an admission would be a flat contradiction of the divine injunction—"Cease to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." That cannot be an "act of moral rectitude" which infringes a positive command of God. On this false basis he puts a fancied speech into the mouth of Dr. Anderson, which indeed looks sufficiently ridiculous. But suppose we should let the Doctor speak, at least in part, for himself. "Sir, I am pleased to see you attending *occasionally* upon a sound dispensation of gospel ordinances, and it would be still more gratifying to me, if your attendance were *constant*. *Do not err—Be not deceived*. Error is ruining to the souls of men. Heresies are among *the works of the flesh*; of which the apostle says, "They who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Attendance upon an erroneous ministry implies a disregard to truth; and "to do any thing which implies a disregard to truth is not the way to save our own souls or bring others to a proper acknowledgment of the truth. To give countenance to corruptions is not the way to remove them."\*

2. "Pilgrim" lays great stress upon a minister's commission to preach to *every creature*, &c. The old prophet in Bethel mentioned in 1 Kings xiii. 11, doubtless had as good a commission as any teacher now living, yet the man of God lost his life by hearing him. And there is much cause to fear that many lose their souls through the same kind of instrumentality. Again: it is necessary to ascertain the evidence which supports a minister's commission. Is any secret appointment of God, known only to the person claiming the commission, intended? If so, it is to be rejected with abhorrence. Is regular ordination by some branch of the visible church intended? Still this is insufficient. Because it is well known that many such teach "damnable heresies;" else the injunction *Try the spirits*, &c., had been needless. And where is the Scripture to be found that recognises the commission of erroneous teachers? Or where is the authority of commissioned teachers to teach error? This argument has no bearing on deficiencies, or even occasional mistakes of ministers, as "Pilgrim" would have us believe; but refers to their neglect of, or determined opposition to, some revealed truth.

His remarks respecting witness-bearing are equally inapplicable to his purpose, for the simple reason conveyed in the homely adage—*actions speak louder than words*.

Christians of age and experience who are rooted and grounded in the faith will not be much disturbed, because "other denominations,

\* Alexander and Rufus, p. 393.

and the world at large, contemplate us as much estranged from the most orthodox of other communions as we are from the Roman Catholics themselves." But here the shoe pinches: men cannot endure to be singular; they cannot bear the reproach of Christ in a corrupt, adulterous age. Hence all the intellectual powers are put in requisition; ingenuity itself is stretched upon the rack to overthrow one of the plainest precepts of the Bible—"Cease to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." What though we are regarded in the light contemplated by "Pilgrim" in the eyes of other communions? What has this to do with our allegiance to Zion's king? Their estrangement from Catholics is no evidence of fidelity to God.

It is admitted by our author that a Ruling Elder would have made conclusive work of the argument, had he established his position that ministers of other denominations stand in the same relation to us that others do when suspended. This point, it is believed, he did make out. "But," says "Pilgrim," "they differ in *integrity* and *authority*." Is this really so? As to *authority*, it never has been and never can be shown that they have any authority to teach error, however great, and learned, and pious they may be reputed in the world. And as to *integrity*, that consists in a faithful execution of the trust reposed in them; but teaching error is a breach of this trust, and destructive to their boasted *integrity*. An executor must not rob the legatees, if he is desirous of maintaining his integrity. But as a Ruling Elder speaks for himself in the present number, we shall dismiss this subject without farther comment.



#### ART. IX.—*Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.*

This ecclesiastical judicatory held its meeting at Alleghenytown, Pa., June 16th, which was continued by adjournment to the 26th. We insert below such items as are of general interest.

The committee to whom were referred the letter signed John T. Pressly, and the documents accompanying, respectfully report:

The communication is respectful, and the object proposed must be viewed as laudable, and exceedingly desirable by every member of the mystical body of Christ. The unity of the visible church we are under the highest obligation to preserve; and when, through the sins and infirmities of her members, schisms obtain in the body, the same supreme authority requires that the causes be searched out, and the prescribed remedy applied. Proceeding in this order, there is encouragement held forth in the promise.

Error is a "work of the flesh," as truly as immorality exhibited in the outward conduct, and must be considered as sinful in the sight of the God of truth. It is a truth taught in the word of God, and manifested in his providence, that societies, no less than individuals, when an evil is felt, are more solicitous for its removal, than to

ascertain its causes and its nature. Your committee are of opinion, that this constitutional principle of our fallen nature is quite legible in the Conventional proceedings referred to. Communion in order to union appears to be an inverting of the natural and scriptural order.

The following preamble and resolutions are recommended for your adoption.

Whereas, most of the schisms that exist among the denominations popularly styled orthodox have originated in a departure by some from Reformation attainments; and

Whereas, there is no disposition manifested on the part of those who have declined from the doctrines and order of a covenanted Reformation, to retrace their steps; but the contrary; and

Whereas, a motion being carried by the Convention, to which delegates from this Synod are invited, to strike out of certain articles of agreement, the doctrine of the power of the civil magistrate as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, furnishes additional and lamentable evidence of growing hostility to a very prominent feature in the aforesaid Reformation: and

Whereas, this Synod will not do any act that might be construed as implying an abandonment of any part of our terms of communion; therefore,

1st. Resolved, That this Synod, while it recognises the object of the Convention as legitimate, must view the means as unwarrantable.

2nd. Resolved, That we cannot in faithfulness comply with the invitation.

D. STEELE, *Chairman.*

Whereas, trafficking in ardent spirits or intoxicating liquors for common drinks, is literally holding the bottle to the face of a neighbour to excite a lustful appetite in our neighbour, which we ought to mortify in ourselves; and whereas, this subject has recently undergone such a thorough investigation among the sober and the pious of all other denominations, that all freedom in these things is now peculiarly scandalous; therefore,

Resolved, That all such traffic be, and is hereby prohibited in this church. Hab. ii. 15: "Wo unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and maketh him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness."

---

#### ART. X.—*Letter to the Editor.*

DEAR SIR, I take the liberty of informing you that I wish to discontinue my subscription for the Religious Monitor. I had thought of doing so for some time, but still deferred it, expecting to see it published in that order and for the purposes set forth on the title page—"devoted to the Principles of the Reformation, as set forth in the formularies of the Westminster Divines." This, sir, is what I expected to see published, and to read for the edification of myself, my family and others. But, instead of this, for a considerable time we have been amused with the doctrine of abolitionists under the mild character of anti-slavery, and the unscriptural doctrine of societyism

mostly under the title of Voluntary Associations. If these doctrines are set forth in the Confession of Faith or in the Act and Testimony of the Associate Church, it has escaped my notice. Nay, my dear friend, you know they are not contained in them, nor in the standards of any church recognised as a church of Christ since the earliest period; but have their origin in the age in which we live, an age famous for inventions: a time, to be sure, when there are not wanting a host of new discoveries, and a sufficient number to sow the seeds of discord, both in church and state. Dear sir, if you intend to promote those new measures, it would be well to consider; for they certainly come in contact with the opinions of those fathers in the church whose expositions have been a standard and way-mark so long, and to which the pious, intelligent and attentive reader looks as a subordinate guide. By overturning those established views, you increase the doubts of the skeptic and strengthen the hands of the infidel.

In conclusion, I hope you will not take offence at my writing so plainly to you. I have done what I believe to be my duty, in giving you my views, and these are the reasons why I withdraw my support at this time.

We insert the above letter as an illustration of the remarks made in the advertisement to the present volume. It indicates an unhealthy state of morals. The public mind is feverish. The social fabric is in danger of being dissolved into its original elements. Those who profess adherence to the scriptures, resist stoutly the light of nature, and place themselves in a condition that would sink a Pagan nation. It is scarcely to be credited that any person should suppose that traffic in "slaves and souls of men" was approved by the Reformers, and those holy men "whose expositions of scripture have been a standard and way-mark so long." It is also not a little remarkable that the editor should be taken to task, for advocating Voluntary Associations, who, so far as public opinion in the Associate Church is known to him, is regarded as a perfect HERETIC on that subject, on account of his doubts respecting such Associations. It is hoped our old patron will read attentively the Pastoral Letter published in the Minutes of Synod, reconsider this matter, and try the Monitor a little longer, lest unhappily he should be found fighting against God, not for withdrawing his patronage from any work of man, but by resisting the immutable perfections and government of Jehovah.

---

#### ART. XI.—*Commission of Synod.*

Baltimore, June 5th, 1840.

The Commission appointed by Synod in the case of the Associate Presbytery of Vermont met, and all the members, viz. Messrs. A. Anderson, Martin, and Cooper, being present, chose Mr. Martin Moderator, and A. Anderson Clerk. The Clerk was directed to cite the Presbytery of Vermont according to the deed of Synod. Ad-

journed to meet at Barnet on the second Friday of July, at 2 o'clock P. M.

Barnet, Friday, July 10th, 1840. 2 P. M.

The commission met according to appointment; all the members were present. Mr. Martin being unwell, Mr. Anderson opened the commission with prayer. Mr. Cooper was then chosen moderator in place of Mr. Martin. The decision of Synod appointing the commission and containing their instructions was read. A call was then made whether the Presbytery of Vermont were present: whereupon Mr. Thos. Goodwillie arose and said that they were present, that he was moderator of the Presbytery and that their clerk had in his hands resolutions adopted by their presbytery, which he would lay on the commission's table. A paper containing resolutions of the Presbytery of Vermont, purporting to be their decision on the subject of submission to the late deed of synod in their case, was accordingly laid on the table by their clerk and read. This paper was discussed in connexion with the decisions of synod in the case of that presbytery, and after much dealing with the presbytery in order to induce them to submission, it was found, from the nature of this paper, and from the remarks of the moderator of the presbytery, that they absolutely refuse submission to the decision of synod. Whereupon, by order of the commission, the moderator did, agreeably to the instructions of synod, declare the Associate Presbytery of Vermont "dissolved;" and the ministerial members of that presbytery, viz. Messrs. Thos. Goodwillie and William Pringle, "suspended from the office of the holy ministry and the communion of the church until they acknowledge their sin and return to their duty." And the reference, by synod, of the members of the said presbytery, and of the congregations of Barnet and Ryegate to the Presbytery of Cambridge, was also intimated. While the commission were dealing with the presbytery, Mr. Martin withdrew on account of ill health. Mr. Goodwillie asked extracts of the minutes of the commission. The request was granted.

The minutes were read and approved, and ordered to be published.

The commission adjourned. Closed with prayer.

A. ANDERSON, Clerk of the Commission.

The following is a copy of the resolutions of the presbytery of Vermont laid before the commission, and referred to in the minutes; viz.

"At Barnet, this 26th day of June, A. D. 1840, the Associate Presbytery of Vermont being met and constituted, and all the members being present, on motion, it was unanimously Resolved,

1. That the Associate Presbytery of Vermont cannot submit to the decision of the Associate Synod of North America, passed at the late meeting at Baltimore, with relation to this presbytery, as we cannot conscientiously acknowledge the heinous sins imputed to us in the charges contained under the first resolution passed respecting the Presbytery of Vermont, May 25th, 1840;—the synod having found this presbytery guilty on these charges, and having since refused to pass a resolution to recede from any of these charges, which are therefore included in the sentence and censure to which the synod requires this presbytery to submit.

2. That the Associate Presbytery of Vermont is now in the full possession and exercise of all the rights, powers and privileges of a presby-



tery according to the word of God, and that this presbytery now claims, and will continue to claim and exercise, all these presbyterial rights, powers and privileges, notwithstanding any sentence affecting the Presbytery of Vermont that has been passed by the Associate Synod, and notwithstanding the execution of any such sentence by the synod's commission appointed in this case—and that this presbytery will hold such sentence and the execution of it null and void from the beginning, and of no force and effect whatever.

3. That the ministerial members of the Presbytery of Vermont are now in the full possession of the office of the gospel ministry and the exercise of that office according to the word of God, and that they now claim, and will continue to claim and exercise that office as God shall give them ability and opportunity, notwithstanding any sentence that has been passed by the Associate Synod affecting their office, or the exercise of it, and notwithstanding the execution of any such sentence by the synod's commission appointed in this case—and that the Presbytery of Vermont will hold such sentence and the execution of it null and void from the beginning, and of no force and effect whatever.

On motion, it was unanimously resolved to protest against the deeds of the last meeting of synod in relation to the Presbytery of Vermont, for reasons to be given in. By order of the Presbytery.

CLAUD GILFILLAN, *Clerk of the Presbytery.*

A true copy.

A. ANDERSON,  
*Clerk of the Commission.*

## ART. XII.—*Kirk of Scotland.*

By the *Veto Act*, as it is commonly called, which was passed by the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland in 1834, it is made a rule, that "*If the majority of male heads of families, being communicants, forbid the induction of a presentee or minister appointed by the Patron, the Presbytery shall forthwith refuse to 'take him upon trials,' or to give ecclesiastical force to the presentation.*" The evangelical party are in favour of the Veto, which is opposed by all those who hold that "every communicant is equally a member of the Church of Christ, and every clergyman is equally a minister of the gospel."

Under the operation of the Veto law, four cases have occurred which show its practical results:—

I. AUCHTERADER.—Our readers are already acquainted with the history of this case, and of MARNOCK.

III. LETHENDY.—In 1835, Mr. Clark was nominated by the government, who are the Patron of Lethendy, on the application of the then superannuated incumbent, to be his assistant and successor: Mr. Clark having been *vetoed* by the people, the administration appointed Mr. Kessen. As soon as Mr. Clark received notice of the second nomination, he applied to the Court of Session for an interdict, forbidding the Presbytery of Dunkeld to give effect to the presentation. That injunction was granted, but disobeyed by the Presbytery; who, acting by the advice of the General Assembly of May, 1838, proceeded in defiance of the civil Court, to induct and settle Mr. Kessen. For that offence, the members of the Presbytery of Dunkeld were

summoned to the bar of the Court of Session, where they appeared in June, 1839, accompanied by some of the principal ministers of Edinburgh. They were solemnly reprimanded, and were told that they had violated the laws of their country—that in this instance they would be dealt with leniently, but that if they or any other clergymen should dare thereafter to commit a similar offence, they would be imprisoned. Mr. Kessen was lately fulfilling the duties as pastor of Lethendy, with no dependence for support but the voluntary offerings of the people who are attached to him. It is optional at any time for Mr. Clark to move the Court to put him in possession of his legal rights.

IV. DAVIOT.—Another collision arose in December, 1839, at Daviot. The presentee, it seems, having anticipated the opposition of a majority of the communicants, obtained an interdict of the Civil Court, forbidding the people to exercise the right which the General Assembly have bestowed upon them, of *vetoing* the appointment. The Presbytery of Inverness met to act upon the call, when the communicants presented a memorial, stating that they were under coercion by an extra-ecclesiastical power, and solicited the Presbytery to defer all proceedings in the settlement, until they had liberty to avail themselves of their rights. The majority of that Presbytery acceded to the request, and postponed all farther action in that case until after the meeting of the General Assembly in May, 1840.

We have examined the published account of the proceedings of the Scotch General Assembly for 1840, but there is no notice of the affair at Daviot.

V.—STRATHBOGIE CASE.—That most serious controversy was introduced for discussion into the General Assembly of Scotland on May 25, 1840. A long and very animated debate occurred, which was terminated by the adoption of the following resolution:—“*that the Assembly find and declare, that the seven ministers in the Presbytery of Strathbogie have been duly suspended in terms of the sentence of the Commission.*”

The minority *protested* that “the resolution of the Assembly is an invasion of civil right, which might be attended with penal consequences,” and avowed that they would not be held liable for any such results.

On the general question of “*the existing collision between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts,*” Dr. Chalmers introduced a report and resolution to the consideration of the General Assembly, in which “the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church in spiritual matters is asserted, combined with the supremacy of the civil power over all the temporalities of the Establishment.”

On May 28, the *Strathbogie case* was again discussed; and after a *keen* debate of several hours, the General Assembly resolved, “That the seven ministers of the Strathbogie Presbytery are censurable, and liable to be proceeded against according to the laws of the Church; but before pronouncing any sentence, a Committee shall be appointed to deal with those men, and report to the Assembly.”

The protest of Dr. Cook and others was read on Friday, May 29.

It asserted the following principles:—1. “That the Commission of the General Assembly, in suspending the seven ministers of the Strathbogie Presbytery, assumed a power which does not belong to them,

either by the law of the Kirk or of the State. 2. That the censure of those seven ministers counteracts the great purposes which the institution of a gospel ministry is designed to promote; for they are not censurable—being men of exemplary life; sound in doctrine, devoted to the church, and useful and acceptable labourers in our blessed Master's vineyard. 3. That the conduct of those seven ministers, in yielding obedience to the supreme civil judicatories of the realm is conformable to the express injunctions of revelation; and that if they had acted otherwise, they would have violated their duty as good citizens. 4. That it is highly unbecoming that such a judgment pronounced upon seven ministers for having obeyed the law of the land, should have proceeded from *the supreme judicatory of a Church protected and endowed by the State*. 5. That this act endangers the connexion between Church and State, and hazards the necessity of their withdrawal from the Establishment—thereby forfeiting its privileges, weakening its influence, and creating much temporal destitution. 6. That the sentence of censure and suspension is totally invalid, unconstitutional, illegal, and will be declared so by the supreme civil authorities of the realm."

On June 1, the committee "appointed to deal with Messrs. *Allardyce* of Rhynie, *Cowie* of Cairny, *Cruikshank* of Glass, *Cruikshank* of Mortach, *Masson* of Botriphnie, *Thomson* of Keith, and *Walker* of Huntly, the seven suspended ministers of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, made their report. A letter signed by those ministers was also presented, in which, after stating their conscientious adhesion to the doctrines and discipline of the Church, and that their OBEEDIENCE TO THE CIVIL LAW CANNOT BE CONTUMACY AGAINST THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED BY THAT LAW, they deny *that they have justly become the objects of censure by the Church*." The General Assembly, notwithstanding, continued the suspension; and threatened them with a "*libel for contumacy*." They also appointed supplies of the Churches, in contempt of the Mandamus of the Court of Session. Thus the affair stood on June 1, 1840.

Dr. Chalmers has lately issued a publication, entitled, "*Remarks on the present position of the Kirk of Scotland*." An extract from that essay will shed light upon this topic.

The Dean of Faculty, the leader of the Scotch lawyers, "tells us of the right of church membership; and which may be prosecuted by any of the citizens in a court of law; so that, if armed with their authority, he could force his way to the communion table. Ere he can forfeit that privilege, there must be some specific delinquency palpable enough for condemnation by secular judges. In vain would the prostrate church lift her reclaiming voice by telling of a morality without godliness—of social virtues which may exist in utter disjunction from those of sacredness, of the difference between earthly moralities which adorn the citizen of this world, and those saintly graces which alone qualify for heaven. Such things are vastly too ethereal for the vision of this world's tribunals; yet at their bidding, by the doctrine of the Dean of Faculty, we must not only receive *their* ministers into our pulpits, but *their* communicants into our solemn festivals. *If this be State religion, THE SOONER IT IS BANISHED FROM OUR LAND THE BETTER for the good of the Church, and for the moral well-being and peace of the Commonwealth!* If such be the necessary consequences of an ecclesiastical establishment, IN THE NAME OF ALL THAT

IS SACRED, LET OUR ESTABLISHMENTS PERISH!" If a blow is struck at the spiritual independence of the Church, the time cannot be far distant when *the cause of religious establishments shall be abandoned, as having a taint and leprosy of evil essentially and incurably adhering to them.*"

---

ART. XIII.—*Queries.*

What is the practice of the Associate Church in the admission of members to her communion?

Ought not the candidate to be carefully examined, prayed with and for?

What after means, if any, does she use, to ascertain their progress in the divine life?

Would it not be both more edifying and orderly, on a sacramental occasion, for the minister officiating to take his seat while communicants are taking the seals of the covenant?

How sweet to the true believer to enjoy ten or fifteen minutes undisturbed communion with his Kinsman Redeemer, at his own table; that he may draw from the overflowing fountain of his free love, grace to supply his own particular wants! This method would afford a short respite to the speaker. Such a scene would have a solemnizing effect on the general audience.

What is her practice when a member makes application for the baptism of his child?

Should he not be conversed with on the subject, prayed with and for, not only on the first, but on every succeeding occasion?

Parents cannot be too deeply impressed with its importance, and the binding nature of the vows under which they come—too well acquainted with its design; nor the shepherd too familiar with the minds of his flock.

Ought Christians to engage in any thing that is not duty?

And is there any *one* duty, either *public*, private, or secret, before the performance of which, they may or ought not to seek the blessing of God? "In **EVERY THING** by *prayer and supplication*, with thanksgiving, let your request be made known unto God."

In this age of revivals it might be well to inquire, with a view to a proper estimate of them,

What is a scriptural revival of religion?

What are the signs of its approach, and some of its appropriate fruits?

Is it not much wanted in the Associate Church at the present time?

Is it not our duty to pray for it, even to *set apart special seasons* to seek it, to wrestle for it, with our new covenant Head?

The Editor's own, or any of his brethren's answers to these queries, are respectfully solicited by

JUVENIS OBSERVATOR.

---

ART. XIV.—*Highland Psalmody.*

"It is a singular fact, that although the New Testament was translated into the Irish so far back as the year 1609, and the Old Testament in 1682, a metrical version of the Psalms has never yet been prepared for the people; while on the other hand the Highlanders of Scotland, speaking the Gaelic, have had a metrical version for 118 years

before the New Testament was prepared for them in their own dialect, and 143 before they were in possession of the Gaelic Bible entire. The contrast is here very singular, the friends of Scotch Gael showed themselves possessed of much wisdom in availing themselves of the advantage arising from the enthusiastic attachment of that romantic people for poetry and tender melody. Soon after the Psalms were prepared for them, teachers of sacred music were sent forth over all the country to instruct the people in singing the Psalms. The effect was most rapid and extraordinary. The Highlanders became enthusiastic in their love of Gaelic psalmody. The hymns of the Druids, venerated for ages, and the wild legends of fairies and mountain spirits, yielded to the songs of Zion—the holy effusions of the contrite and chastened David supplanted the *coronach* for the dead and wail for the dying. The high enthusiasm of the people was not destroyed, but it received a new and holy direction. Indeed it forms a new era in the history of our country; when those songs ‘which were first sung on Salem’s towers’ were heard from our glens and isles; when the plaintive lay of martyrs so ‘justly dear to every Scottish heart,’ the ‘*Warbling Measure*’ of sweet Dundee and of noble Elgin became mountain melodies. These were days of marked revival. I have heard aged men declare that from the fleet of fishing boats along the coasts of Cantyre and Arran, amounting at times to several hundreds, might be heard in the breeze of the evening, not the warlike music of the bagpipe, which referring to feuds of clans and scenes of strife, often engendered bitter and angry feeling, but one rapturous burst of sacred melody, and after a solemn pause, coming afresh again in full harmonious swell. Mighty was the effect of all this in producing social order, honesty, and Christian kindness. I cannot withhold from you one anecdote which I lately heard with much delight. A mournful band of poor emigrants were expatriated their native valley, a few years ago in the north of Scotland, forced to leave the glen where their clan and people had resided for generations, and to seek a home in the dark and distant woods of America. In their melancholy progress towards the sea shore, they came to the parish church, where they were wont to worship God, and near to which the remains of their fathers were deposited; they entered the sacred enclosure—stood on the tombs of their relatives—‘returned and wept, and still returned to weep.’ A good old patriarch addressed a few words of comfort to them; he took out the Gaelic Psalm book from his pocket. ‘Let us sing,’ said he, ‘the 46th Psalm, a prayer was offered up to the God of their fathers—their souls were refreshed—they proceeded without a murmur or complaint, without one expression of resentment or vengeance against the unfeeling chieftain. There is a magic spell in the true simplicity of sacred melody and sacred poetry which cannot fail to enchant and command the heart; and no hearts on earth are more susceptible of such impressions than those of the Irish. They *must*, therefore, have the Psalms of David in their own language, and in poetry, and set to music sweet and simple as their own simplest melodies. The experiment has remained too long untried. Not one hour longer must be lost; and if a gracious and kind master has been pleased to enable me to contribute to this most desirable object, I shall feel that I have not lived in vain.’

[From the Lady's Book.]

## THE DYING WIFE.

BY DR. O. H. COSTILL.

Oh! let them call him quickly,  
For I feel that I must die,  
My breath comes up so thickly,  
And clouds are floating nigh.

I shall not see to-morrow—  
Lord, may I come to thee?  
Thou carest for the sparrow,  
Be merciful to me.

My husband! art thou near me,  
To glad the heart once more,  
That long has loved thee dearly?  
Its throbs will soon be o'er.

'Tis sudden—and the token  
Is fearful—"dust to dust,"  
But mercy's voice hath spoken—  
I feel that I may trust.

But oh! 'tis hard to leave thee,  
Who loved me long and true,  
To see how parting grieves thee,  
And leave my children too!

I would not break their slumber,  
Nor have you call them now,  
But kisses without number,  
Press on each little brow.

And tell them that their mother  
Did pray that they might be,

Still kind unto each other,  
A blessing dear to thee.

Thou knowest our little Mary  
Is fragile as she's fair;  
Oh, shield her from each peril,  
And save her from each snare.

And little Charley, noble boy!  
I fear for him e'en more,  
The dangers and the sad alloy  
That life may have in store.

Thou know'st, my dear, I've taught them  
Each morn and eve to bow,  
To Him whose mercy bought them—  
Oh! may He bless them now!

My failing heart would rather,  
Have put away this cup;  
Oh! help me, heavenly Father,  
To give my treasures up:

For thou hast many mansions  
Free from sorrow and from care—  
My husband and my children  
We will meet together there.

My dear, my early lover  
I bless thee o'er and o'er—  
Press my hand—'twill soon be over—  
Oh! I can speak no more.

*Slander.*

How frequently is the honesty and integrity of a man disposed of by a shrug! How many good and generous actions have been sunk into oblivion by a mysterious and seasonable whisper! Look into companies of those whose gentle natures should disarm them, and we find no better account.—How large a portion of chastity is sent out of the world by distant hints—nodded away and cruelly winked into suspicion, by the envy of those who are past all temptation of it themselves! How often does the reputation of a helpless creature bleed by a report—which the party who is at the pains to propagate it beholds with much pity and fellow-feeling—that she is heartily sorry for it—hopes, indeed, it is not true; however, as Archbishop Tillotson wittily observes upon it, is resolved in the mean time to give the report her pass, that at least it may have fair play to make its fortune in the world—to be believed or not, according to the charity of those whose hands it shall fall into!

To CORRESPONDENTS.—While we acknowledge the liberal favours of correspondents, it is suggested that brevity would promote the interest which readers take in their productions. If the length of most articles were reduced one half, and the number doubled, it would certainly promote the usefulness and stability of the work.

"Neophitus," "Quero, and "A. G," in the next.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

OCTOBER, 1840.

---

ART. I.—*Salvation, addressed chiefly to the Young.* No. IV.

To you then, O reader, however guilty, is the word of this salvation sent. Dost thou believe what God says? Tell us not you cannot believe. True, of yourself, you cannot. In the Lord Jesus Christ alone have you either righteousness to justify, or strength to believe. But this strength, this faith is offered as a free gift. Relying on the testimony of God's law, that you are condemned, and perishing; relying on the testimony of his gospel, that Christ is made over to *you*, as thus lost, for righteousness, sanctification and redemption, have you prayed for faith, as God's gift, and the purchase of the Saviour's blood? Earnestly studying the nature and necessity of the atonement, prayerfully, and diligently using the means of God's appointment, and trying to stretch out the withered arm, are you at the same time confessing, that God only can strengthen it; enable you to believe, and lay hold of the righteousness of Jesus for justification? Thus come, and ye shall obtain mercy; thus seek, and ye shall find pardon and peace. To every sinner, to the most unworthy upon earth, we are authorized to say, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Come, and you shall not be cast out. We do not tell you, that salvation is offered you, on the ground of your foreseen faith, and good works. All that is good about you, is God's gift; faith and repentance are the purchase of the Saviour's blood; and if you are enabled to perform good works, the sap, which nourishes the branch, and makes it fruitful, is all from the root—the vine, which bears the branch. We do not tell you, that Christ died for you, on condition, that your corrupt heart, out of which hourly proceed evil thoughts, idle words, and sinful deeds, should change itself, and repent, and believe the gospel. No. Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Can the dead in trespasses and sins rise from the grave of spiritual death, and live the life of angels? It is a mere mockery of the sinner's misery, to tell him, that his free will can break these bonds of death; that, if his free will breathes upon the dead bones, they will live:—that, if *he* chooses, *he can* burst his fetters, and walk forth, trampling on the power of Satan, bursting open his spiritual grave, and blotting out,

VOL. XVII.—17

with his own hand, his sentence of death. No; this change is the work of Omnipotence. The God of grace alone, can give grace to believe on Jesus. The new heart, and the new spirit must be sought for, as a gift of mercy, at his hand, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." Yes; this new heart is offered as one of the covenant blessings purchased by Christ: faith, repentance, and ability to keep God's law are all as really the purchase of the blood of Christ, as eternal glory:—all are promised as gifts; gifts, God only can bestow; gifts, given for the asking; free as the air you breathe; free as the running stream. Come then, renouncing all dependence upon self, come, as one utterly worthless, and helpless, to receive salvation, as a free gift; and from first to last, the purchase of the precious blood of the Son of God.

Great as may be your guilt, thus come to God, through the Son he spared not, and heaven is yours. And now, my dear reader, contemplate, with delight and gratitude, the boundless mercy of the God of love. Can you think of it unmoved? O how shall we escape if we neglect this great salvation? Look by faith to a bleeding Redeemer. Contemplate his infinite glory, and his deep abasement. Turn to Isaiah vi. 1—4, John xii. 41; with the prophet, see him on the throne of heaven; and then come with the disciples, to the grave in the rock, and see the place where the Lord lay. He took not on him the nature of angels. He did not come wearing the form, even of one of these glorious seraphim who were adoring before him; but he took on him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: submitting through life, for us, to shame, and sorrow; and then became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross:—a death of infamy, a death of agony; yea, in that death enduring what would have crushed the universe of men and angels into dust: *the wrath of God* poured out upon his soul, as the surety, and substitute of his guilty people. Look up to heaven, and behold the splendour of his glory: look down to Gethsemane, and behold him sinking there, under the wrath of the Almighty, while the anguish of his soul drives the blood from every pore of his tortured frame. Look up to heaven, and behold the seraphim veiling their faces with their wings, before the brightness of his glory; and then, look down to earth, and see that sacred face defiled with shame, and spitting; and struck by a hand his mercy would not wither; when, after blind-folding him, they insultingly cried, "prophesy unto us, thou Christ, who is it that smote thee?" Look up, and behold the seraphim adoring him; look to Pilate's hall, and see the Roman soldiers tearing his body with the lashes of the scourge:—a scoffing populace bowing the knee in mockery, and saying, "Hail, king of the Jews!" Look up, and listen to the adoring song of the seraphim:—"Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts;"—look down, and listen to the terrible imprecation, which burst from the lips of malignant men:—"Away with him—Crucify him, crucify him—His blood be on us and on our children." Look up, and behold him as the Lord of hosts, reigning on the throne of the universe; look down to Calvary, and see the Lord of life, tortured, bleeding, and sinking in death. See him nailed to the cross. See his life blood poured out like water. See his heart melted like wax in the fire of wrath. See the Lord of hosts brought, for us, to the dust of death: the Lord



of angels, made lower than the angels: the Prince of heaven, in the tomb of Joseph. And yet, he had but to speak, and the powerful seraphim, whom Isaiah beheld, hundreds of years before, around his throne, would, in a moment, have hastened to his rescue:—nay, he had but to speak, and the earth would have opened her mouth on the murderers; the stars, in their courses, would have blasted them with death: the thunderbolts of heaven would have avenged the foul and terrible deed. But no, as we have seen, he was a willing victim. Love to you, love to his lost people, led him to the cross, and bound him there, a sacrifice for your sins: love bared his side to the spear, his soul to the avenging sword:—the voice of love forbade, so to speak, his angels to interfere, or his omnipotence to resist. Can you think of these sorrows of Jesus, and yet indulge in sin? Can you think of the woes of his soul, and your heart not melt at the remembrance of his sufferings for you? Had God the Father spared *him*; had he, as the guardian of a violated law, permitted justice to take its course, and seize the guilty, where now, and what now, would have been our doom? Had he punished us, and spared his Son:—had he displayed his justice, by our eternal punishment in hell, it would have been neither wonderful, nor unjust. But to glorify his attributes by delivering up his Son to death; to display the holiness of his nature, and maintain the honour of his law, at the expense of Emmanuel's blood, when sin imputed lay upon him;—will be the wonder of angels, and the redeemed through eternity. And should it not constrain you now, to live to Christ? Is there a single truth of the Saviour who died for you, that you can disregard:—a single command of Him, who was delivered to death for your soul, that you can disobey? O we charge you, by the love of him who came down from his throne, not to condemn but to save you, live not unto yourselves, but unto him who died for you, and rose again, that you might live for ever. Give to him all the glory of salvation. You are a sinner, and no works of the sinful, and rebellious, can ever please an infinitely holy God. But Christ died for the *ungodly*, and for the sake of his finished work, God will bestow upon you freely, his full salvation. Rely on this finished redemption; believe this word, and you are safe for eternity. And O beware of sin. By the wrath of God, which fell on the Saviour's soul, in Gethsemane and Calvary, for your sins:—by the terrors of justice, which brought him from the throne of heaven, and pursued him, till he lay a lifeless corpse in the grave:—by the thorns that wounded his sacred head, by the nails which pierced his hands, and his feet; by the terrible fires of Divine wrath which encircled and consumed this Divine victim; you are bound to glorify God, in your body and spirit which are God's; to love holiness, to live at eternal war with sin, and relying entirely on the grace of your Redeemer, to press on to the promised land.

To rouse you to an instant discharge of this duty, consider the awful danger of those who deny their need of a Saviour, and neglect the great salvation. There is only one Mediator between God and men. Jesus of Nazareth, the eternal Son of God, is the only intercessor before the throne of Jehovah. O how dreadful the situation of those, who have no "Days-man" between them and an offended God: no interest in that intercession, which alone can stay the coming

wrath. Dear reader, to you this is a subject of unutterable importance. If you neglect the great salvation, you cannot escape eternal misery. If you will not be indebted to free and sovereign grace for pardon, if you will not receive eternal life, as a free gift, it will never be yours. This life is now within your reach. Ask, and it shall be given, freely given. Say not, at some more convenient season you will seek life; that to-morrow, perhaps, you will think of these things, prepare for eternity, and flee from the coming wrath; when, it may be, you have not another day to live. "Boast not thyself of to-morrow." The avenger of blood is pursuing. This may be the last offer of mercy. This night you may die in your sins. And O, if you are not found in Christ at death, it is terrible to think of the doom of the departing soul. Think how dreadful to die with a fearful looking for of judgment; to sink in death without a hope to cling to; to appear before the judgment seat unprotected by the blood of sprinkling. Listen to-day to the voice of the God of mercy, "harden not your heart, lest he swear in his wrath that you shall not enter into his rest." Let not this evening pass till you have bowed your knees before the throne of mercy, and pleaded for the salvation of your soul. Come to this throne as you are now, come, come and ask for faith, for repentance, for love, for grace and strength to perform good works, as gifts the Saviour only can bestow:—come and plead for pardon and life through the Saviour's death:—to be washed, from every stain in his atoning blood. Plead thus, as one whose eternal all is at stake, lest this night your "feet stumble on the dark mountains," and the key turn, and the door of mercy be closed against you for ever. The Judge standeth at the door. The great day of his wrath is near, will you be able to stand before him then? We are sinking into the grave. Be sober, be vigilant, be faithful. Let not death find you slumbering upon your post. "Watch, for ye know not the hour when the Son of man cometh." Thus "I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse; therefore, choose life, that you may live," and not die for ever.

MAXTON.

---

ART. II.—*Symbolical Language of Scripture.* No. III.

8. *Day and night, light and darkness, evening and morning.* These expressions are so closely related, that they may be considered as one figure, and the meaning is not difficult.

1. *Day*, and more particularly *light*, signifies a state, or time of knowledge, spiritual, saving knowledge. *Night* and *darkness* of course signify the opposite. Rom. xiii. 12: "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." The time of heathen ignorance and wickedness is in a good degree past, and the true knowledge of God by the gospel prevails. 1 Thess. v. 5, is of the same import. John i. 5: "The light shineth in darkness."—Christ, the perfection of all true knowledge, was exhibited among those who were sunk in ignorance and unbelief.

2. *Light* is sometimes also used to signify holiness, and *darkness* the opposite. 1 John i. 5: "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." That is, in him is the perfection of knowledge, holiness and truth; he is infinitely removed from all error, falsehood and sin.

3. *Light* often signifies comfort and prosperity, and darkness, adversity or misery. Job v. 14: "They meet with darkness in the day time;" that is, sudden adversity in the midst of their enjoyments, and when least expected. Ps. cxii. 4: "Unto the upright, there ariseth light in the darkness." They have spiritual comfort and even prosperity in the midst of outward adversity. Zech. xiv. 6: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear nor dark." It will be a time neither of clear knowledge and unmingled comfort, nor of utter ignorance and unbelief. Verse 7: "But it shall come to pass that at evening time it shall be light. That is, towards the close of that period, and as the life of religion seems about to disappear, it shall be wonderfully revived. *Night* and *morning* are particularly used in this sense. Ps. xxx. 5: "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. Here we have the figure, and signification in the same sentence; night is a time of sorrow and weeping, the morning is the return of comfort and joy. Ps. xlii. 8: "Yet the Lord will command his loving-kindness in the *day time*, and in the *night* his song shall be with me." Song iii. 1: "By *night* on my bed, I sought him whom my soul loveth," &c.; and other similar expressions may readily be explained according to this. Also by what is observed above, Ps. lxxxviii. 6: "Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in *darkness*, in the deeps." Verse 18: "Lover and friend hast thou put far from me, and mine acquaintance into *darkness*, and like expressions may be understood. Ps. xviii. 11: "He made *darkness* his secret place." That is, God's perfections and dispensations, are so mysterious that they are hid from our knowledge and penetration, as in a dark, secret place.

4. *Walking in darkness*, when connected with a character of godliness, is a continuance in deep distress and sorrow. Isaiah l. 10: "Who is among you that feareth the Lord and obeyeth the voice of his servant, that *walketh in darkness* and hath no light." That is, a godly person under heavy and prolonged, spiritual affliction. Jer. xiii. 16, and some others are of the same general meaning. But when the expression is directly connected with an opposite character, it signifies continuance in ignorance, unbelief and the dominion of sin, as, 1 John ii. 11: "But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and *walketh in darkness*, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes. That is, he gives evidence that he has never been savingly enlightened, but is still under the power of sin.

5. *Day-break*, *day-dawn*, *day-spring*, are one expression, and will be easily understood. Song ii. 17: "Until the *day break*"—2 Peter i. 19: "Until the *day dawn*." Luke i. 78: "Whereby the *day-spring* from on high hath visited us." That is, the commencement of a season of greater knowledge and comfort.

*Clouds* and *shadows* are frequently mentioned in the symbols of scripture; they are sometimes both used together or with the same meaning, and as they naturally suggest several ideas, their figurative signification is also somewhat various.

1. They naturally present the idea of covering, protection or swiftness, and as they are related to darkness they of course have the same meaning; a cloud also appears to the eye like a vast multitude: these, together with the circumstances in which they are

connected, will sufficiently explain the figure. Ps. xci. 1: "He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High, shall abide under the *shadow* of the Almighty." That is, under his care and protection. Isaiah iv. 5: "And the Lord will create upon every dwelling-place of Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day."—The allusion plainly is to the wonderful care of God over Israel in the wilderness, when he spread a cloud for covering, and the meaning here immediately follows; namely, upon all the glory shall be a defence. Isaiah xlix. 2: "In the shadow of his hand hath he hid me. That is, kept me safely under his protecting power. Song ii. 3: "I sat down under his shadow with great delight." The shadow here not only signifies care and protection, but from the circumstances of the case, includes also rest and refreshment.

2. A cloud connected with unfavourable circumstances, signifies trouble and sorrow, as Lam. ii. 1: "How hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger?" That is, he has at once despoiled her of all her glory and cast her into the greatest adversity. The same figure and same meaning occurs, Ezek. xxx. 18.

3. When clouds and shadows are considered as obstructing the view, they signify ignorance, doubts, sins, temptations and the like evils. Song iv. 6: "Until the day break and the shadows flee away." Till a time of more clearness of understanding, (as before noticed) when the remains of ignorance, doubts, &c., shall be removed.—Ps. xcvi. 2: "Clouds and darkness are round about him." This is substantially the same as Ps. xviii. 11, already noticed, namely, Such perfection and mystery, that we cannot penetrate it, by reason of our ignorance. Rev. x. 1: "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud."—He is of such majesty and perfection, that he cannot be fully known by creatures.—

4. Clouds and shadows considered as moving, signify swiftness and sometimes also multitude. Isaiah lx. 8: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as doves to their windows?" That is, they fly swiftly and in vast multitudes.—Heb. xii. 1.—A great *cloud*, that is, a multitude of witnesses. Joh. viii. 9: "We are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow. They pass swiftly away, and have no substance in them." The same figure occurs with the same meaning, 1 Chron. xxix. 15.

5. *Riding on the clouds*, besides swiftness, signifies also majesty and power, as, Ps. civ. 3: "Who maketh the clouds his chariots, who walketh upon the wings of the wind." He proceeds with great majesty, power and swiftness to execute his will. The same ideas are suggested by Matt. xxiv. 30: "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven;" that is, as it follows, "with power and great glory." Sometimes a special property of the cloud is noticed, to denote something corresponding in the case described, as, Isaiah xix. 6: "Behold the Lord rideth upon a *swift* cloud." The judgment here threatened was fast approaching, near at hand, and would be particularly sudden in the infliction. Rev. xiv. 14: "And I looked, and behold a *white* cloud, &c.;" denoting the glorious character of the work about to be commenced, as respects the church.

6. *The shadow of death* signifies the lowest extremity of affliction, as, Ps. xxiii. 4: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death." That is, in the greatest possible trouble. It is,

however, here considered as of a providential kind. Isaiah ix. 2: "They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." The trouble here intended, is a state of sin and misery, of ignorance and ungodliness. The same figure, with the same general meaning, occurs Ps. xlv. 19, and cvii. 10.

The *wind* is frequently employed as a symbol, and as it may either be gentle and pleasant, or stormy and hurtful, it signifies good or evil, according to the circumstances with which it is connected.

1. Considered in itself, without respect to its effects, it signifies that which is vain and empty, Job vii. 7: "O remember that my life is wind." That is, of no continuance or substance.—Isaiah xxvi. 18: "We have, as it were, brought forth wind." All our labour and anxious expectations have come to nothing. Hosea xii. 1: "Ephraim feedeth on wind." That is, they seek satisfaction in things that are utterly vain and empty. The figure is used Ps. xviii. 39.—

2. The wind, considered as enlivening and refreshing, signifies the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. Ezek. xxxvii. 9: "Prophecy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord God, Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live." Denoting the remarkable power of the Holy Spirit, by which God's ancient people will be restored to spiritual life in the latter days. Song iv. 16: "Awake, O north wind, and come, thou south, blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out." Let the Holy Spirit with special power work on my soul, that the grace he has there implanted may be excited to lively exercise.

3. When the wind is considered as boisterous or stormy, it signifies calamities arising either among men or coming immediately from the hand of God. Ps. lv. 8: "I would hasten my escape from the windy storm and tempest." That is, from reproach and oppression of wicked men. Jer. iv. 11, 12: "At that time shall it be said to the people and to Jerusalem, A dry wind of the high places in the wilderness, toward the daughter of my people, not to fan, nor to cleanse; even a full wind, &c." A consideration of the whole context plainly shows that the desolating judgment of war is here predicted. Rev. vii. 1: "After these things I saw four angels standing upon the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow, &c. The winds here denote the complicated judgments that were about to come, especially damnable heresies. From these examples the figure may easily be understood in other places, as, Isaiah xxvii. 8: "He stayeth his rough wind, in the day of his east wind." God does not send one trial above another, beyond what his people are able to bear. Isaiah xxxii. 2: "A man shall be as a hiding-place from the wind, &c." Christ Jesus hides his people from the wrath and curse of God, and also from the bitterness of all temporal calamities.

4. The whirlwind signifies in general the most sudden and desolating judgments, but when immediately related to God denotes also his power and majesty. Job xxxviii. 1: "And the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind." It was here an emblem of the calamities under which Job was suffering. Hosea viii. 7: "They have sown the wind and shall reap the whirlwind." The vanity and wickedness of their idolatry shall speedily bring upon them its necessary consequences, desolating judgments. The figure occurs with a si-

similar signification, Jer. xxiii. 19: chap. xiv. 32, and xxx. 23, &c. Also Amos i. 14. Nahum i. 3.

*Dew* and *rain* are frequently employed as symbols, and generally symbols of good things: but, 1. When the dew is considered as falling upon a person it denotes a state of exposure and suffering. Dan. iv. 25: "And they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven." Thou shalt be exposed to great hardships and privations. (Though it was also literal,) Song v. 2: "My head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night." Christ here reminds the believer of the great exposures and sufferings to which he had submitted for his sake.

2. The dew considered as falling on the ground, denotes refreshment and reviving. Ps. cx. 3: "Thou hast the dew of thy youth." This is a double figure, first, the cause is put for the effect, dew, for the freshness and beauty caused by the dew, then there is the symbol itself. The meaning is, that God will in due time restore his ancient people to all that spiritual life, beauty and fruitfulness that marked their early and best days, when the blessing descended like the dew upon them. The same figure occurs Isaiah xxvi. 19, which also serves to explain the one here. "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs." They are here addressed as though they had been dead and buried, but now called to life by the promise of a reviving and refreshing of the Holy Spirit, like the renewal of the decayed herbs by the dew. Mic. v. 7: "And the remnant of Jacob, shall be in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord of Hosts, and as showers upon the grass." That is, when the Jews shall be converted to the faith of the gospel they will be remarkably instrumental in the quickening and ingathering of others in all nations.

3. The same may be remarked of the rain, that was noticed of the wind: it is to be considered either as gentle and refreshing, or as belonging to storms. The gentle rain is of the same meaning as the dew or gentle wind, namely; the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. Isaiah v. 6: "I will command the clouds, that they rain no rain upon it." Zech. xiv. 17: "Even upon them shall be no rain." Both expressions denote the restraining the Holy Spirit's influences.

4. The great rain, is much of the same meaning as the stormy wind, namely, overwhelming judgments; accordingly, it is frequently connected with other such symbols. Ezek. xxxviii. 22: "And I will rain upon him, and upon his lands and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain and great hail stones, fire and brimstone." That is, I will destroy him by the most tremendous judgments. Isaiah iv. 6: "There shall be a tabernacle, for a shadow in the day time from the heat and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain." That is, there shall be defence and protection from every calamity. Matt. vii. 25: "And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house," &c. Denoting the great trials of men's trust, adversity, temptation, death and judgment. Song ii. 11: "For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone." That is, the great calamities by persecution, &c."

5. Storms and hail are frequently spoken of, when there is no mention of rain; but they uniformly have the same meaning, namely,

great judgments. Pa. lxxxiii. 15: "So persecute them with thy tempest, and make them afraid with thy storm." That is, with thy judgments. Isaiah xxviii. 17: "And the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding-place." God's judgments will be varied so as to apply exactly to the various false contrivances of wicked men for safety. Rev. viii. 7: "And the first angel sounded, and there followed hail and fire, mingled with blood." That is, the judgment of war in its most terrible form.

Under this particular, we may notice Ezek. i. 4: "And I looked, and behold a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire unfolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the colour of amber, out of the midst of the fire." This is a peculiar and very complicated symbol; but we may observe (1.) The whirlwind denotes a desolating judgment coming with great swiftness. (2.) The great cloud, in this connexion, points out the great sorrow and suffering of the people by the approaching judgment, and also the mystery of such a dispensation. (3.) The fire unfolding itself denotes the holiness and avenging justice of God; and the bright shining like amber intimates the display of his glory in the whole proceeding.

Finally, all appears coming out of the north, that is, from Babylon. It is, therefore, an emblem of the utter ruin of the Jewish nation by the Babylonians, the judgment then impending and fast hastening to its accomplishment.

### ART. III.—*Thoughts on Occasional Hearing.* No. 2.

MR. EDITOR,—Having, in my first number, met the doctor's arguments on three points: to wit, encouragement of error, inconsistency with testimony bearing, and implied admission that open communion is lawful, I shall now proceed to notice various suggestions on which my remarks, heretofore made, do not directly bear, and conclude by examining the Scriptures on which he relies to support his positions.

The reference of our author and others to authorities, deserves particular consideration, not only on account of their bearing on the subject on hand, but their bearing on the doctrine and practice of religion generally. While it is admitted that the opinions and conduct of eminent saints ought to be treated with deference and respect, all friends of reformation principles acknowledge that they do not bind the conscience, nor does this writer advert to them with any such design. Their example is cited only with the view of enforcing arguments, which he supposes are founded in the word of God. No objection need be made to such a course, as it is at least consolatory to reflect that our sentiments and practice are in accordance with the sentiments and practice of the great and good who have gone before us. Some things, however, ought to be particularly noted before we even comfort ourselves with such consolations. It is not enough that we assure ourselves that our *exemplars* were great and good men, but we ought to be assured that they possessed the light necessary to form a correct judgment, and that there were no extraneous influences which were likely to bias them in their practice.

That the reformation was a glorious work, and that those exalted characters who toiled and bled during its progress, are entitled to the thanks of mankind, few will deny, who are not besotted with ignorance and infamy, or utterly regardless of the best interests of the human family. Let us not, however, yield them a blind submission, nor regard their decisions as of oracular authority. They were men of like passions with their descendants, and since they had not the unerring directions of the Spirit, we must conclude they were often in error. It ought to be borne in mind that they themselves, in common with others, had been enveloped in gloom and darkness, and that in much which they did, they must have followed the fitful glimmering of the morning star through a beclouded sky, rather than the sun in his mid-day splendour. That light burst upon them in a remarkable manner is too evident to be denied; but the attentive student will be at no loss to discover that it did not shine with equal lustre on every subject. Hence, we may justly infer the necessity of examining with scrutinizing care what they decided without full evidence of the case before them, and clear of all bias from passion or prejudice re-examine for ourselves decisions made when much darkness prevailed and when it was hardly possible it could be otherwise.

However favourable revolutions in church or state may be for developing the latent energies of the mind, they are not, in general, favourable to calm, deliberate thought, and, of course, are unfavourable to the settling of regular, peaceful, well-guarded principles of action. From this cause it is that jurists and legislators hesitate to admit precedents drawn from revolutionary or highly excited party times, as of binding force and authority. The reason of this is obvious, for every one knows that excitement unhinges the understanding, and that passion blinds us to the claims of right and justice. The reasons for setting aside the decisions of saints, or of churches, when under such unhallowed influences, are just as cogent as for setting aside those of jurists or legislators.

I feel not disposed to disturb the ashes of the slumbering dead, or remove the mantle which time has thrown over their failings or their faults, but justice to the living may require at our hands an investigation of the principles on which they acted, or the light which they enjoyed. If such an investigation were instituted, I presume in no point would the worthies of by-gone centuries be found less worthy of imitation than in their principles of toleration. The light of divine truth, the pleadings of humanity, their own most horrible sufferings, expended their force in vain upon their (in this respect) unilluminated minds. Of such an uncompromising nature did they regard the claims of truth, that error must be met with the devouring sword, the loathsome prison, or the consuming flame, as if Heaven in its wrath had commissioned them to execute the vengeance of eternal fire. Nor was this the thing of a day, a fleeting phantom which was here to-day, and to-morrow gone for ever, but it was the settled purpose and deliberate action of long-continued and successive generations. From the authority of precedents drawn from such a source as this, is it strange that I should demur?

The examples cited from the early ages of the church appear to have little force, as few will advocate either the stated or occasional



hearing of such as preach another gospel, or even plead for liberty to associate with those who countenance such administrations. If I at all understand the sentiments of men who insist that occasional hearing is not sinful, they do not mean that it is lawful to hear any and every one who may please to call himself by the Christian name? Names are said to be nothing, and if a follower of Mohamed were to call himself a believer in the Saviour of the world, he would be a Mohamedan still. If the saints of old would not lend their countenance to Arians, does that prove that they would have kept themselves at an equal distance from the various evangelical denominations which now divide the church?

This author's reasoning, attempting to show that if religious sects, which stand in opposition to each other, were to define accurately the points on which they differ, and keep their members from mingling together, they would not only have more respect for each other, but the prospect of a profitable union would be more promising, is singular enough. If I mistake not, such reasoning, in reference to the common affairs of life, would be looked upon as wild and absurd in the extreme. If families or civil communities become estranged from each other by differences of opinion or clashing interests, would it be prudent? would it be wise to interdict all communication? How very often are such disturbances the result of hastily formed opinions or misapprehension of each others' real intentions? It is true, indeed, that if they should meet under the influence of raging passions and deeply imbibed feelings, the breach would be more likely to be widened than closed; but who would not desire to see them commingle together as frequently and as freely as the points of difference would permit? The force of such reasoning, if it has any, must rest on the assumption, that those who differ have not attempted to investigate the subjects in controversy, or that they are deficient in talent or probity. Whatever may be assigned as the cause why such opposing sentiments are entertained, we dare not assert, that the parties thus opposed are peculiarly destitute of these essential requisites of head and heart.

Our author gives us a specimen of the manner in which we ought to treat denominations which stand in opposition to us, that we may impress upon their minds a proper sense of the sins which they have committed. He calls the Methodists "*wicked Arminians*." So I suppose we ought to call the General Assembly bodies *idolatrous Presbyterians*—the Associate Reformed *faithless Seceders*, &c. It would hardly be possible, that men who possess the smallest ingredient of the milk of human kindness, should not regard the use of such sanctified and holy language as any thing else than expressions of hearts overflowing with meekness and good will, and, of course, its tendency would be to increase their respect for our persons, and confidence in the rectitude and stability of our principles. Irony itself, however, will hardly bear us out in asserting that such denunciations would foster in our own bosoms the love of complacency, or even that of benevolence for those against whom they are levelled. But on this point I shall probably speak more at large when I come to review those Scriptures on which the doctrine taught in the sermon is supposed to be founded.

But to carry out the argument with a show of plausibility, resort is had to a sweeping denunciation of such hearers, which, if true,

would cast much discredit on it in the estimation of many, if not of all. Is it, indeed, a fact that occasional hearers are only tattlers and tale-bearers? Do they attend on the ministrations of other denominations only, that they may obtain food for their malignant passions and viperous tongues? It would prove no difficult task to overthrow the most rational proposition, which it would be possible to suggest, if, with one fell swoop of the pen, we are permitted to clear the board of all the reasons, of all the motives, and all the respectability of those who advocate it. If this accusation be true, is it not the most palpable folly imaginable, to incur such odium for the sake of tale-bearers—of *busy bodies*? If persons of this character only will indulge in this practice, is it not unquestionable, even for edification, that they should be restrained? One leading design of the institution of divine ordinances, is, to bring to light the hidden corruptions of the heart, and no external rules of action ought to be prescribed, the alone tendency of which is to keep them concealed—not from the world, but from the persons themselves.

But who are the tattlers and tale-bearers at whom this denunciation is levelled? It would be easier to tell who they are not, than who they are, for we stand almost alone in maintaining this singular position, unless we call for the Roman Catholics as authority. But even they will but poorly sustain us, for they can plead consistency, at least, since they deny that beyond the pale of their communion, there are any real ambassadors sent by the Head of the church. What credit can we expect to be awarded to us for our intelligence, or even integrity, when we denounce such men as Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Miller, and a host of other worthies, as no better than busy bodies, whose occupation is to disturb the repose and peace of the church? Is it indeed so, that men who are eminent for attainments and piety, too, associate with other denominations, merely for the purpose of laying in a stock, on which they can trade to advantage, in slander and detraction? Admit the fact, that some do, when they hear in other communions than that to which they belong, make disparaging, ill-natured remarks—what does it prove? It proves one thing at least, and that is, that they possess not frames of heart to hear profitably the word preached any where. If any ordinance, or the administration of any ordinance is to be denounced, because some abuse that ordinance, or attend upon it in a light, irreverent manner, we had better, at once, close our sanctuaries, and our Bibles, too. This plan of reasoning against the proper and lawful use of a thing, because others abuse it, is exceedingly prevalent; but any one may see at a glance that it is perfectly illogical. Admit it to be a sound mode of reasoning, and we put our dearest rights, and most exalted privileges, at the mercy of the most base and worthless of mankind.

But, is not the Doctor inconsistent with himself? What is the burden of his argument against occasional hearing? Is it not to preserve people against the contaminating influence of error. If it be a preservative against the errors of other denominations to hedge people within a certain communion, will not the hedging of them within a communion where error prevails, have the same influence in keeping their minds imbued with the errors there prevailing? It will, doubtless, be as potent in the one case as in the other, and I see not how the great advantages promised are ever to be realized.

The fact is, I fear that many who profess a great reverence for truth, are too timid in their prescriptions to prove efficient champions. It is said that truth is mighty and will prevail, but prevail it cannot, unless it is unfettered and allowed an open field for the conflict. Error has possession of the strong holds, and it is the bounden duty of the champions of truth not only to challenge a contest, but to pursue the foe and rout the enemy in his most secret and impregnable retreats. Preaching is the grand ordinance instituted by Him who is the *truth*, the way, and the life, for dispelling the clouds of darkness which envelop our moral world, and from the very nature of the thing itself, if sacred writ were silent on the subject, we might clearly prove that not the smallest impediment should be thrown in the way of those who come commissioned from on high, heralding the glad tidings of salvation to miserable condemned rebels. That general would display neither discretion nor valour, who would invade an enemy's country with a powerful and well-appointed army, and would content himself with the possession of a few strong holds without ever sallying out to conquer the surrounding country. So long as recruits could be obtained within his own ranks, he might keep possession of such posts; but the entire conquest of the country would be impossible.

We have it intimated that there is a way of dealing with communions who stand opposed to us without admitting the lawfulness of occasional hearing, and that is by judicially lifting our voice in favour of the truth, and testifying against prevailing errors and delusions. Will such an assumption bear the test of scrutiny and candid examination? What will it avail for our church to meet in her judicial capacity and solemnly bear such testimony? For whose benefit is such a deed consummated? Not surely for our own members, for they are presumed to be in a good degree free from contamination. Not certainly for the men of the world, for they care for none of these things. It must then be for the advantage of those who profess to be followers of the Saviour, but who are not in all things walking in his footsteps. What can we promise ourselves by simply entering upon our records a declaration that our brethren, are, in some points, unsound in principle, and that their practice is, in various respects, unwarranted by the word of God? Would this not be, to all intents and purposes, burying our talent in the earth? Nor will it avail to print and send abroad to the world such declarations for the obvious reason that they may never be seen by those for whose special benefit they are intended, and if their eyes should ever happen to fall upon them, it must be under every possible disadvantage. The passions and prejudices of such readers are enlisted against us, and the peculiar truths which we maintain. Is it in the nature of things that the naked statement of a few propositions can carry conviction to the mind where interest, passion, and preconceived opinions are arrayed against them? Such a conclusion is contrary to revealed truth; contrary to the common sense of mankind; contrary to all our experience in all the concerns of life.

What, then, is the inevitable conclusion? Is it not that these mistaken views of our brethren must, by every practicable lawful means, be brought home to the understanding, to the conscience, to the heart of every individual from whose mind we would dispel the clouds of darkness? When we witness for a present truth, or testify against

a prevailing error; it is manifestly a letter of instruction to all, but especially to ministers of the gospel to herald aloud the contents thereof throughout the length and breadth of the land, enforcing them with all the powers of argument, and all the persuasions of eloquence. But I would respectfully inquire how they can possibly comply with a scriptural and rational injunction, if the truth of the doctrine under discussion be admitted? How can ministers of the gospel deal personally with sinners, if we deny them access to them? It will not do to answer that we forbid not Christian communion with any, and that, therefore, they may deal with them privately. The ambassadors of Christ possess not ubiquity, and can, of course, in this way minister to but few, and besides, such intercourse comes not with the sanction of the word preached.

There is, indeed, a loose sense in which the sinfulness of occasional hearing must be admitted, as when persons indulge in it through idle curiosity, heaping to themselves teachers, having itching ears, or when through petulance they forsake ministrations which they had previously solemnly bound themselves to encourage and support. It is not unfrequent that hearers of the word, through the prevalence of corruption in their hearts, become wearied with a constant attendance at a particular place of worship. Perhaps the people are not very fashionable, or otherwise so agreeable to their taste as they could wish. Perhaps their preacher is not gifted with such oratorical powers as tickle the ears and amuse the fancy. Perhaps he searches the heart too closely, or accuses the conscience with a force which it is inconvenient to bear. For these or other reasons, equally valid, he is forsaken and discouraged in his ministrations.

But that the sinfulness of such occasional hearing consists not absolutely in the fact, that it is unlawful to hear the word preached from ministers of any other denomination of Christians than that to which we belong, appears from the consideration, that such conduct would be sinful, even if people were to go on these conditions to hear ministers of our own communion. When members join a church and call a preacher to feed them with the bread of life, they enter into a solemn engagement to hold up his hands. When they associate with others in this work, they enter into a mutual bond to stand by each other for mutual aid and comfort. How far they redeem such pledges when they forsake the assemblies of God's people where they are immediately connected, and appear where they are, perhaps, unknown or unexpected, let the serious and candid answer. To preach to empty pews with becoming energy and zeal, is more than the man of God can do; and even to hear with pleasure and profit, when we view seats deserted, and their occupants gone we know not where, is more than frail mortals, such as we are, can accomplish.

Some of your readers, I dare say, will be ready to conclude from the freedom with which I have spoken, that my ideas of hearing the word preached, are exceedingly loose and unscriptural. I think such an inference cannot be fairly drawn. The worship of God is, by far, too serious and solemn a work to be trifled with, or lightly treated. We ought not only to be cautious and circumspect how we hear, but who we hear. There is, perhaps, much of the con-

trovery of the day about religious matters which ought to be attributed rather to *diversity* of views than opposition of principles; but after the utmost exercise of that charity which believeth and hopeth all things, we are constrained to doubt that many who profess to be sent as heralds of glad tidings, if not ravening wolves who devour the flock, are shepherds who possess no rightful authority to feed and guide it. Are not the words of our Saviour, in some respects, applicable to the time in which we live. "Then, if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or lo, there; believe it not." Nor is the danger all on one hand. If some, as a matter of recreation, go here and there, or any where, so others console themselves with the reflection that if they go to the right place, all must be well with them. All rules of action, especially such as respect our outward conduct, if they be not required by the divine law, are hurtful to the soul. This is true, even on the supposition that such rules do not directly conflict with it. Their tendency is to foster in our bosom that deep-rooted corruption in our hearts which rests in a form of godliness while destitute of the power. We, like the Pharisees of old, may make void the law by our traditions, and vainly imagine that by a strict adherence to such traditions, we manifest that we are more holy than others. The influence of such a course is not more favourable on those around us than on ourselves. We ought to be very careful not to offend Christ's little ones by throwing stumbling-blocks in their way, over which they are likely to fall. Let us not, without absolute necessity, do such things as will cause our good to be evil spoken of, even by those who judge uncharitably.

PILGRIM.

#### ART. IV.—*The Christian Mind drawn from Phil. ii. 5.*

Let the same mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.

One of the strongest characteristics of our fallen nature is selfishness. This is a supreme self-love or self-preference, which leads a person in his actions to direct all his purposes to the advancement of his own interests or happiness, regardless of the interests of all others. The universal desire of an unrenewed heart, is to gratify and exalt self. And even in those actions, in which he *seems* to have respect to the honour of God and the good of his fellow creatures, if properly examined, he will be found to have a pre-eminent regard to his own glory and fame. Too much of this spirit prevails among the professed disciples of Christ. A supreme regard for *self*, perpetually lowers their estimate of the character of all others, and effectually conceals from their observation every feature of excellence and worth. Hence some people have never a good remark to make about their neighbours or Christian brethren, because they do not find in them that measure of perfection which they imagine should constitute a good man. They make themselves the standards of comparison, and measure every body by it. The apostle found some such characters at Philippi who sought their own things rather than the things of Jesus Christ, v. 21. Against this he cautioned them in the most affectionate manner, and exhorted them to "fulfil his joy, being like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind," and to

let "nothing be done through strife or vain-glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves," and not "to look every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." And to give the greater weight to his exhortation, he reminds them of the example of Christ whom they professed to follow and imitate, and recommends *his* temper or mind, as the best possible pattern for the formation of their character: "Let the same mind be in you, which was also in Jesus Christ." Here our main business will be to point out that mind or temper of Jesus Christ which Christians should possess.

1. Love. 1 John iv. 8: "He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is *love*." The whole law is fulfilled in this one word *love*, love to God and love to man. This filled the heart of the glorious Redeemer, and actuated him in fulfilling his undertaking in behalf of poor sinners. This love, strong and invincible, made him encounter every difficulty and overcome every impediment which barred the sinner's access to the throne of grace. It supported him when bearing the curse of the broken law, that "we might be redeemed from the curse,"—when enduring the shameful and ignominious and cursed death of the cross,—when suffering the contradiction of sinners against himself; and when the sword of divine justice smote *him* and *he* bowed *his* head and gave up the ghost. In all that he did and suffered, he was actuated by love to God, therefore "he restored what he took not away," and by love to man, therefore he died, that by his obedience unto death, we might be brought nigh unto God. The same mind should be also in us, Eph. v. 1, 2: "Be ye therefore followers (imitators,) of God as dear children, and walk in *love*, as Christ also hath loved us and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour. Love to God and man, is the sum of the whole duty required of us, Matt. xxii. 37—39. If we love God with all our hearts, we will keep all his commandments, John xiv. 15, 21, 23. And if we love God, we will love our brother also, and count it our highest honour to promote his welfare. 1 John iv. 20, 21. In vain do we pretend to be the disciples and imitators of Christ, if we despise or set aside any part of the divine law or neglect to love our neighbour as ourselves, Matt. v. 18, 19. 1 John iii. 14—18.

2. Humility. v. 7, 8: "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Among all the instances of Christ's humility, this excels. If we contemplate the inconceivable glory and blessedness in which he existed before his incarnation, we must say, that no similar example of humility was ever exhibited. He was invested with "glory with the Father before the world was," he was "in the bosom of the Father" from all eternity; "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person;" the image of the invisible God, yea, God himself, equal with the eternal Father, for "he was the mighty God, the everlasting Father;" yet of all this divine splendour, in infinite condescension, he emptied himself, when he appeared clothed in our nature, for "the *word* was made flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." He stooped to the lowest condition, that poor fallen man might be eternally benefited; "For our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might

be made rich." This example is proposed for our imitation. Pride is connatural with man. It was a principal ingredient in the apostacy of angels, in the rebellion of Adam, and in the apostacy of all his descendants, although the most monstrous of all compositions to be found in the character of those who are "miserable, blind, poor, and naked." It swells the heart, with self-righteous boasting, overthrows free grace, exalts human merit, and makes the sinner doubly cursed and hated of God. But in opposition to this spirit of pride, we must cultivate a spirit of humility. We must behold the majesty and holiness of God, and our own comparative insignificance, Job xl. 4, 5: "Behold I am vile; what shall I answer thee? I will lay my hand upon my mouth,"—we must look to the cross of Christ, and glory only in it, "by which the world is crucified unto us, and we unto the world," Gal. vi. 14. We must consider that humility is the only true way to honour, "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall," but "before honour is humility," Luke xiv. 11;—and that God, to encourage this disposition, has given the richest promises of his favour. Is. lxvi. 2: "But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and, trembleth at my word." 1 Pet. v. 5: "Be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble."

3. Meekness. Matt. xi. 29: "Take my yoke upon you, for I am meek and lowly in heart," xxi. ch. 5. "Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek." Meekness is that peculiar temper of the mind, which is not easily provoked to resentment. This excellent disposition we see beautifully illustrated in the whole life and conduct of the Saviour. How meekly did he endure the contradiction of sinners against himself and submit to the vilest indignities and insults, yet "when he was reviled, he reviled not again, when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself unto him that judgeth righteously." The same mind must be possessed by us. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," "The meek and lowly he will guide in judgment just always, to meek and poor afflicted ones," &c. This holy temper is not the acquisition of nature, nor the result of education, but is the operation of the divine Spirit. Gal. v. 22. It discovers itself in preserving the mind unruffled amidst the turbulent scenes of the present life;—in that ease and readiness, with which forgiveness is extended to others for injuries received;—in self-possession, so that we are not easily provoked, but patiently bear contradiction, and in the government of that unruly member, the tongue,—for "if any man among you seemeth to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that man's religion is vain."

4. Compassion. Acts. x. 38: "Jesus of Nazareth,—who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed with the devil." The Lord is gracious and full of compassion." We repeatedly read of the compassion of the Saviour for the distressed, not only of poor invalid and impotent folk, but for poor dead sinners. When the possessed were brought to him, he had compassion on them and cast out the devil;—when the infirm and maimed were brought, he healed them;—when the multitude followed him, hungry, he fed them; and when he beheld "all Israel scattered like sheep having no shepherd," "slain and sold," he had compassion on them, and taught them to bring them back to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls. But

how entirely different is the temper and disposition of men generally! Man's heart is naturally hard and obdurate, and insusceptible of compassion and tenderness. Anger, malice, hatred and *prejudice* reign dominant, and make them more the picture of Satan than of Christ. And the majority of Christian professors, too, live to themselves, contented if they have harmed no one, though scarce a spark of compassion has been struck from their flinty hearts. They confine their compassion and sympathy to their relations, and esteem all that lost, which is bestowed for the relief of others. They "are slow of heart to believe," the miseries and calamities which their fellow men suffer from the *iron hand of oppression*, or the *delusion of superstition*, or the *blindness of heathenish darkness and idolatry*. Hence their charitable pittance is handed out with a caution which betokens a secret grudge or dislike; and their prayers are offered up for their fellow men, with a chilling coldness, that bespeaks indifference. But when divine grace renews the heart, this excellent disposition will predominate over that selfish, narrow, and contracted spirit, which knows none in adversity, nor sees the need of compassion. Christ has pronounced such blessed, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." We are exhorted to "put on bowels of mercies, kindness," &c, "be of one mind, having compassion one of another," "show mercy and compassion every man to his brother." And if we have experienced the sweet compassion of the Saviour, we will not be deficient in the exercise of the same disposition towards the sons and daughters of affliction and misery, wherever they may be found, 1 John iii. 17.

5. Sincerity. 1. Pet. ii. 22: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." Isa. liii. 9: "He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth." Sincerity and truth were eminently displayed in Jesus Christ. None among all those who closely watched his conduct, and narrowly inspected every word, could detect the least mark of insincerity. No sound of trumpet proclaimed his ascent to the mount of prayer;—no pretext was framed to divest the widow and fatherless of their possessions, and no external appearance was assumed to deceive and mislead the heart of the simple. He was uniform in the practice of godliness, and always persevering in the performance of the noblest acts of benevolence and mercy. And this is still the soul of religion. For what is all the exterior appearance and form without sincerity, but an empty shell. The Christian, above all other men, must of necessity be an honest man, honest to God in his profession, honest to man in his dealings, exact and conscientious, upright and irreproachable, "one that sweareth to his hurt, but changeth not," and who strictly conforms to that golden rule, "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." He must study to have his "conversation holy and unblamable;" and "his conscience void of offence toward God and men."

6. Spirituality. John iii. 31: "He that cometh from above, is above all; he that is of the earth, is earthly and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven, is above all." Our divine Lord was pre-eminently spiritually-minded. His whole delight and attention was directed to spiritual things. If he administered to the external necessities of men, it was subservient to their spiritual improvement. If he conversed freely, or mingled among publicans and sinners, it was for their spiritual health. He had no relish for the gaudy pageantry of the world. His doctrine, pure and heavenly, tended to



"stain the pride of human glory, and bring down the haughtiness of man and lay it low, even in the dust." The very opposite of all this, is found in us naturally. "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh." Natural men are all carnal, earthly, and sensual. They understand and pursue only earthly things; "spiritual things are foolishness to them, and they cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned." But those that are born of the Spirit, are spiritually minded, which is life and peace. This constitutes the grand difference between the children of God and the children of the world. The whole heart of the one is engrossed in the pursuit and acquisition of the "meat that perishes," but the other, having higher and more ennobling prospects, "labours for that meat which endures unto everlasting life," weighs every thing in the balance of eternity, and estimates their value by that which they will possess, when he begins to realize unseen and heavenly joys.

7. Contentment. As Jesus was a perfect example of spirituality, so of contentment. He always appeared satisfied. Though poor he envied not the luxuriant viands of the rich. As he taught his disciples that "having food and raiment, therewith to be content," so he enforced it by his example. He never complained, though "he had not where to lay his head," he murmured not, though he endured suffering and poverty, and when the cup was put into his hand, he said, "Not my will, but thine be done." This, too, is a feature of the Christian's character. A believing view of eternal things, and a confident hope by grace of being shortly put in possession of them, will produce in us a holy indifference, about those "which are seen, and are temporal, and will make us content with our lot. We must commit our way to the disposal of sovereign Providence, who will give what is good, and "will withhold no good from them that walk uprightly," and learn silently to acquiesce, whether this be little or much. This was the disposition of holy Paul, Phil. iv. 11: "I have learned in whatever state I am therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: every where and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need."

8. Benevolence. The birth of the Saviour was announced by the angels to the shepherds, as comprehending "on earth peace and good will toward man," and when he came as a public teacher, this principle of benevolence or good will appeared very conspicuously displayed. "He went about doing good." He traversed the whole land of Judea, preaching the gospel, and teaching and healing all manner of sickness or disease among the people. He "had pity on the miserable and ignorant, and those that were out of the way." The same spirit of benevolence must be cultivated by his followers. All men have a claim upon our benevolence, and we are bound to seek the promotion of their happiness, present and eternal, not simply by words and wishes, but in deed and in truth. All mankind are related to us as a part of the human family, and we cannot despise them and neglect their interests, without despising human nature itself. This disposition manifests itself "by our being pleased with that share of good, which every creature enjoys," in our willingness to increase it, in feeling an uneasiness at their sufferings, and in our abhorring all species of cruelty or oppression under whatever disguise or pretext it may be inflicted.

9. Zeal. Zeal is a sincere and passionate concern in the pursuit of an object, or in promoting the glory of God, and the spiritual welfare of our fellow men. We have a notable example of zeal in Christ, recorded in John ii. 14—17: "Jesus went up to Jerusalem, and found in the temple those that sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, and the changers of money sitting. And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables; and said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence: make not my Father's house a house of merchandise. And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." His whole life was characterized by his ardent zeal for the glory of his heavenly Father, and the spiritual profit of sinners. Hence he vindicated the law from the foul glosses and misinterpretations of the learned rabbies, Matth. v: who "made the commandments of God of none effect by their traditions." He vindicated the honour of his Father, and his own honour from the aspersions of the ignorant and worldly, John viii. 49. His zeal made him humble himself to the lowest condition, mingle with the poor and afflicted, the wretched and outcast from the higher orders of society, and converse freely with them, "if by any means he might save some." "To the poor the gospel was preached." He was the great Physician of the soul, and he was always among the sick. The same spirit of zealous affection should be in us, which "was also in Christ Jesus." "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing." It forbids our consulting "flesh and blood," or the reasonings of carnal nature, when duty is clear, and the service of God and the welfare of others demand our untiring exertions. The vast importance of spiritual things require this "fervour of spirit." It is the way of hypocrites to be very zealous about trifles, while they are indifferent about the greater duties of piety and morality, Matt. xxiii. 23, 24. But true Christian zeal, while it regards every thing pertaining to religion, pays a regard proportionable to their magnitude and importance.

It discovers itself by the continued effort which the Christian makes to rectify abuses at home, in his own heart, by his vigorous exertions to improve in the knowledge of his Father's will,—to grow in grace and to secure his own salvation, with fear and trembling, Phil. ii. 12, 13. It will also quicken his efforts for the reformation, correction, and salvation of others. David was grieved and shed tears, when he beheld transgressors. Lot was vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked. Paul's spirit was moved at the sight of Athenian idolatry. It will induce us to prosecute with firmness whatever is honest, and true, and lovely, and of good report, (Phil. iv. 10,) and "to give all diligence to add to our faith, virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and temperance, and patience, and godliness, and brotherly kindness, and charity," 2 Pet. 2, 5.

NEOPHITUS.

#### ART. V.—*Remarks on Voluntary Societies.*

MR. EDITOR.—I fully admit that every thing which can be done by one or by many for the glory of God or the good of man, may be done upon the principles of action set forth in the Scriptures, and is required to be done by the vows and obligations that lie upon the

people of God. It is also admitted, that if these principles were brought into full operation in church and state, there would be no place for what you call voluntary associations; for the Scriptures make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work. Church and state, in their own *proper character* and sphere, would not only walk up to the letter and spirit of religious duty, but they would go forward in every enterprise of glory to God and good will to man. But this has never been the case, neither have we any warrant to expect it.

(I think we must, in using the terms church and state, confine their meaning to the body acting in its own peculiar organic form; for otherwise they would mean the *people* that compose the church or the state, by whom every thing is done that is done under the sun.)

Suppose now that a very great majority in the church, in the purest and best church if you please, have become cold in their love, that this coldness extends to courts and official men, as well as congregations and private individuals, and the consequences are that the "knees are waxen feeble, and the hands hanging down," that they have ceased altogether to perform a great many offices of love, that were wont to be done, while the things which they continue to do are "ready to die," that this has been of so long continuance that the primitive practice in many things is entirely forgotten, that the multitude cannot or will not be induced to consider their ways, any farther back than the ways of their immediate fathers, which were much like their own, that sessions, presbyteries, and synods, have ceased for many generations to exercise any degree of discipline for the neglect of such things as were in primitive times required. Suppose, once more, that the deadly pestilence of a worldly spirit is spread over the whole earth, making *all to die* where it comes, that hath any symptoms of spiritual life remaining, but there are a few here and there not content to stop at the circumscribed limits of common dead formality, though they might do so with the common repute of regular professors, but have a desire to return to their first love and its first works. What must they do? Must they not try to find out and encourage each other to love and good works, by proposing some good work as a common end among themselves, and promising to help to the attainment of it by all lawful means within their power, *because no special act of their church courts* requires this at their hand, and lest they might be called a *Voluntary Society*? Mr. Editor, I think you will not say so. That the privilege and power of association for the accomplishing of some laudable end has been and still is abused and perverted I do not deny, and did some ten or eleven years ago endeavour to prove this on your pages; but that it *is* a privilege, and that its power can be directed to the accomplishment of great and excellent things without encroaching on either church or state prerogative I do affirm. I cannot subscribe to the correctness of the inference which you make, p. 87, from the nomination of *Abby Kelly*: namely, "that it is a natural illustration of the ultimate tendency and legitimate fruits of *all voluntary associations* of a moral character," any sooner than to the condition which Nahash the Ammonite offered to the men of Jabesh—"that he might thrust out all their right eyes, and lay it *for a reproach upon all Israel*," 1 Sam. xi. 2.

And pardon me, if I say that the reading of the last sentence on p. 91, gave me very sensible pain. *Provided always that we "do no-*

*thing against the the truth, but for the truth," especially as set forth in our public profession, it is not only lawful but praiseworthy for us two, or two hundred to carry any line of moral or religious action laid down in the Scriptures as far as we can.*

While I have found nothing in the word forbidding this, I have found what not only warrants it, but seems without any forced interpretation to require it. I name only one text, "And let us *consider one another, to provoke to love, and to good works,*" Heb. x. 24. Under the public profession here is no other limit set to association than *love and good works*. We may select any one of the ten thousand ways in which love acts, to act by concert and agreement. Is it possible, that there can be any thing contrary to love or good works in concert and agreement? What more is agreeing to *act together* than agreeing to *pray* together about it?

If this be allowed, as it certainly must be, then the words constitution, laws, officers, &c., need not give us any trouble, for they are not necessarily any thing more than this agreement.

There is a necessity for this, because no other order could be maintained, nor would there be any certainty of accomplishing any thing without it. If it is right for many to put their hand to the same good work, the Scriptures require that it be "done decently and in order," and that is the constitution and law.

I consider, that the proper business of such associations (call them voluntary if you will, although that term does not sufficiently distinguish them,) is to put private means into a system of combined and systematic observation, for the attainment of approved public ends. In this view they possess peculiar advantages, and combine elements which are not at the command either of church or state. As one instance of this, I mention commercial knowledge, which may afford them many facilities. Such associations have a peculiar fitness to promote a compliance with the apostolic exhortation "to provoke to love, and good works." For as iron sharpeneth iron, so doth the face of a man his friend. The exchange of thoughts and feeling, the narrative of fact requiring benevolent exertion, the concentrated example of generosity and good will, and the very meeting itself of so many friends together are eminently fitted to produce this effect.

They *may* be exceedingly helpful both to church and state; for the principle of individual benevolence is often too weak by itself to effect any thing, especially against a generation of worldly men and carnal cold-hearted professors, who are continually throwing obstacles in its way; but when it is brought into contact with others of like mind, it acquires new strength. The thought rises to expression, and expression brings forth action which *may* be so directed *as to give* the fullest effect to ecclesiastical decision, or to the public counsels of a nation. To illustrate this I will suppose what is no supposition, that the Associate Synod has resolved to prepare a whole edition of the Bible, that they may have it without pictures or blunders, and in a convenient form,—that they have resolved to send out and support ministers in weak congregations, and into new places,—that they will also aid and encourage talented religious youth in their preparatory studies for the ministry. But they can accomplish none of these excellent purposes without money. They tell the people through their ministers, and the presbytery send particular word to the sessions to try and do something for these purposes. It is, perhaps, a

long time before the sessions take up the subject at all. But it is taken up at length, when after prayer for the countenance of Christ, and the pouring out of his Spirit on church courts that *they* may be led to *scriptural decisions*, and that *labourers* may be *thrust* forth into the vineyard, &c., &c., remarks something like the following are made upon it: "It is very little that we can give," "we have enough to do with ourselves," "collections are so often called for," "times are hard," and "we think it not best to encourage *idleness*, those young men have made the best preachers who have suffered hardships in their studies," &c., &c.

How long, Mr. Editor, would it be before the synod could raise the necessary funds, by the spirit that breathes out such chilling expressions? You need not hesitate to let the word, *never*, pass as your answer, the benevolent prayers that preceded them notwithstanding.

There may be noble exceptions; but the number of excellent measures acted by the synod that have proved abortive, that drew their first and their last breath on the page of the minutes, will sustain me too well in giving the above as a specimen of the general course of action.

But suppose again that there had been in the bosom of every congregation a little band of males or females, or both, associated for the special purpose of aiding missions and young students under the care of synod, &c.,—self-trained to emulate each other in acts of benevolence, and that feasted their souls with the sweet blessedness of *giving*, how long would the synod have to wait for want of funds? Only, sir, till it would meet to receive them.

These are not the only laudable ends of special associations. There are innumerable others. Were there societies formed for aiding poor congregations, for supplying distant places with church standard books and approved authors, or the poor with them gratis, or library companies, or to promote Christian manners generally, I would not fear the result, or adduce a single text of scripture to condemn them. Nay, if they should associate together for purposes in themselves indifferent, and say, "We will drink no wine, neither will we build houses, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyards, but all our days we will live in tents," I durst not oppose them, much less when the purpose is morally or righteously good and the means lawful.

I do not intend to discuss the merits of every existing society, but I think your implied opposition to "Voluntary Abolition Societies," is not the most happy. I am not a member of any of them, but so far as I understand their characteristic end it is the abolition of slavery as it exists in the United States, and the means by which they propose to effect this is *free discussion*. Notwithstanding that opposition to this has been carried in this country of boasted freedom to fury and madness, equal to any thing in the darkest age of superstition, I am unable to think of any end more laudable in itself, or any means less exceptionable. This end is not the peculiar work of the church or state; it is common to both. It is directly connected with every interest of mankind, through all its gradations. It is, therefore, the proper business of *human beings*. The means, *free discussion*, does not belong exclusively either to church, or state, or society, of any form or character, but to the *rights of man*. The time, the place, the manner or circumstances adventitiously connected with these, I

may oppose, if they be wrong, but these things themselves I never can, until I am prepared to bid adieu at once to liberty and religion together.

A. G.

#### ART. VI.—*Answer to Respondo.*

MR. EDITOR.—We feel no disposition to contend about a “bone;” but, to defend ourselves from unjustifiable hostilities, you will permit us to insert in the Monitor a brief review of Respondo’s work. Had he replied as every Christian should, we would not again have noticed this “disputed subject.” Indeed, had we not been forcibly struck with the defect of a ruling elder’s argument, which the editor himself could not pass unnoticed, it is highly probable that we would never have noticed it. As long as we profess any principles, we feel bound not to carry on hostilities against them. But it sometimes happens that if a person simply asks a question on a subject, he is immediately stigmatized as an enemy to it. It was, at least, faintly hoped that a little more honour and candour would have been used in replying to Quero. However, in this his hopes have not been realized, and he finds that in order to be a friend to the Associate Church, a person must not inquire about her principles or practice, lest some one will have the impertinence to call him an enemy designed or undesigned. It has always been considered an evidence against any cause when it will not bear an impartial and candid investigation, and the man who meets his opponent’s arguments by abuse and impeaching his motives, virtually confesses his inability to answer them. Every reflecting mind will see that neither impeaching the motives of others, nor charging them with hostility against their own principles, will supply the place of sound argument.

So then o’er this page let pass, in brief review,  
The work of Respondo and receive its due.

He begins his work by charging Quero with carrying “an air of defiance,” when he asks where the doctrine against Occasional Hearing is *so plainly taught* in the standards of the said church *that it cannot be mistaken*, &c. You will perceive that in replying to this question, he has not taken it as it is, but has omitted the main part, and formed it to suit his own purpose. The force of the inquiry depends upon the words *so plainly taught that it cannot be mistaken*. This he has omitted, and accordingly referred to some pages in the Testimony where he thinks the doctrine is plainly, yet obscurely taught. There it is said, “we confess it is the sin of multitudes in this land that they have hearkened to *such*.” But, lest some one might be mistaken, he thought it necessary to throw some light on the quotation, and tells us that *such* are “irregular and unsound preachers.” Perhaps if he had read a little more on that page, it would have explained itself, and not have answered his purpose any better than the words of Quero. It appears from the Testimony, that *such* are those who when they could not “obtain the ordinary call, which ministers of the gospel have in the choice of the people, in their ordination after trial, and ordination by a presbytery, they have *pretended an extraordinary or immediate call* by the Spirit of God:” *such* are *imposters*, and have no reference to

regularly called and lawfully ordained ministers of the gospel. There is a distinction between *such* and the ministers of Christ, who should not be indiscriminately classed with *such*. We confess it is the sin of multitudes in this land that they have hearkened to *such*. I do not bring forward this to inform Respondo, I do it for the sake of my readers, who might be *misled* by his quotation. The other quotation from the Testimony is of the same import with the above and need not be noticed. By the way, it is a pity that when any one attempts to point us to places where this doctrine is so plainly taught, that he would point to such obscure places.

In the next inquiry about the *term* of admission into the church, he has been a little more honest, and we give him credit for his honesty. When it is asked, is it the *term*, &c.? he replies it is not the only term, but belongs to the terms of communion as might be *gathered* from the above quotations and the Book of Discipline. With regard to what may *now* be considered terms of admission into the church, we are rather at a loss to know; but one thing we do know: namely, that in the latter part of the Testimony there is an act for "the admission of church members to communion," which requires them to profess "an adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, &c., as these are received and witnessed for by us in our Declaration and Testimony." Here this term is not mentioned, nor is there any reference to the Book of Discipline. How this has now become the indispensable term, and how applicants can be required to profess their adherence to the Book of Discipline, remains for Respondo to tell. Let the act, before referred to, in the administration of which direction is given to exercise the "greatest caution and tenderness," have its due weight with all acts of the church, *overtured* or not; but how it, rather than any other act, is now placed among the terms of admission to communion, is a little mysterious. It is the privilege of Protestants to read and understand the articles to which they profess their adherence, and it is a stubborn fact, that one half, perhaps two thirds of our members have never seen the Book of Discipline. But if this term is not plainly taught in the standards to which members are required to profess an adherence, but depends on *gatherings* and gleanings from quotations that are in themselves obscure, the inquiry where this doctrine is so plainly taught, &c., remains unanswered and untouched. But he closes this article by alluding to my profession; he says, that perhaps Quero before this time has lifted up his hand to the solemn engagements above quoted. It is hard to tell what is intended by this remark, for if he knows any thing in particular about Quero, he must know that he has more than ten years ago lifted up his hand to these engagements; and if he has not formerly known, he may now be informed that he never made his profession in disguise, or publicly swore to any article and afterwards privately denied and sneered at it. No, he believes, and has always acted on the principle, that "an honest man is the noblest work of God."

The truth of the next inquiry, about the disagreement of belief and practice in this doctrine, he has admitted, but has attempted to destroy its force by saying, that "Quero is at least one who is opposed" to this doctrine, "and *desirous* to excite others also to oppose it." He directs the minds of the readers to something else

than the question at issue, he turns then to Quero, and tells them that he is one of those who oppose the principles of the church, yet he gives them this information without the least shadow of evidence, unless the simple act of inquiring for information on any subject is taken for evidence "*prima facie*" against one. What would we think of a father who, when his son would ask him a few questions on some subject, would reply, Hold your tongue, you saucy fellow, you are opposed to it, and desirous to excite others to oppose it? What would we think of a teacher who would reply to his pupils in a similar manner?—so what will we think of Respondo? Let us not think too hard of him, for he may have thought he saw a shadow of evidence appearing in the quotation from an *eminent* man, whom he seems to think belongs to, and is claimed by those whom he pleases to call *opposers* of the church. When he attempts to show that if we batter down this "*troublesome doctrine*," that all the principles of the church will fall to the ground, and that Quero is "*desirous*" to batter them all down, he says, that this assertion is demonstrated from his account of *his* eminent man, who was considered in favour of the doctrine, &c. Quero does not claim him as his eminent man, (whose name he will not mention, lest he should be cast down from his eminence,) he belongs at least publicly to Respondo, and in the dark is "dashing out reproachful terms against our *peculiarities*." When he learns this, the shadow will disappear, and he will find, that in all his pursuit of *his* eminent man, he has been fighting against himself. But he farther sits as a supreme and infallible judge of the desires of the heart. He says that Quero is not only opposed to the doctrine, but "is *desirous* to excite others also to oppose it." Thus not only is the spirit of his remarks judged, but also the *silent desires of his soul*; and, as his judge was mistaken in the former part of his judgment, may he not be also in the latter? "To err is human."—

As to the inquiry, Can those who disagree in their belief of *this doctrine* hold communion with one another? he says the answer to it "is very easy," and yet he has taken the hard way of it. He has advanced his own feeble arguments and neglected the words of Scripture, which would furnish him with a ready solution: the words are "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" It is well known that this passage has reference to the communion of saints, and that they cannot do so without agreement.

With regard to the want of uniformity in the belief and practice of the church on this subject, and of the difficulty of mentioning it in some places, it is a matter of fact too well known to be answered by asking Quero to show *how* these people have become so "unreasonable and irritable beyond all parallel," that it cannot now be mentioned in those places without disturbing the peace of the church. Here Respondo might, with as much propriety, be asked to show how the people have become so unreasonable and irritable beyond all parallel that the subject of abolition cannot be mentioned in some places without disturbing the peace of the church and of society? Perhaps he may tell us that the subject is now like that of occasional hearing, brought up in such a way that the minds of the people are not prepared to receive it, and that you cannot at once remove all their prejudices, or erase their former views. But the evil exists,



and, as such, it must be met, the fever must be allayed, not by asking how it arose, but by suitable and skilful treatment, and also some tender nursing. Since the subject of slavery has been mentioned as a parallel, let it be remembered that the church has passed an act against the sin of slavery, and that there are now some in the church who protested against that act, some whom Respondo dares not call enemies to the Associate Church, and whose conduct he dares not say is only one "item of an extensive system of hostility" to her principles, although this act involves as much of the moral law as that of occasional hearing; and the friends of the church are as much bound to adopt that wholly as they are to adopt this. This is mentioned not to detract in the least from the standing of the protesters, but to show that a person may, at least in some cases, be a friend to the church without adopting wholly every act passed by her courts, and farther that a person may protest against an act of the church and remain in communion, whilst he cannot against any of her established doctrines.

The opposition to any *peculiarity* of the Associate Church, is thought by some to be a certain prelude to its corruption or destruction. This opposition first made its appearance, says Respondo, against the rule for the publication of marriage, the merits of which he would not speak, although it is expressly mentioned in the confession of his faith, whilst he himself has failed to show that the act on occasional hearing is expressly mentioned even there. It is probable he thought it was there, like a man who, not more than a year ago, positively asserted that it was mentioned in plain words in the Testimony, and being asked to show where, immediately examined his Testimony, but having failed to find it, candidly confessed "*Well, I thought it was there.*" From this he goes on to occasional hearing, close communion, and whatever else you please, and virtually tells us that the destruction of one of these *peculiarities* necessarily involves the destruction of the other, and finally, the destruction of the church. He has a better spirit of prophecy than we, if he is right in his predictions. Let us see if these are so linked together, that if one link is broken all is destroyed: the rule for the publication of marriage, has been virtually destroyed, and yet the rest of these peculiarities remain in all their force. So with regard to the practice of the church, it was customary not long ago to read and sing line by line. Now it is customary to read and sing two lines, and in some places without lining at all. When this custom was about to be introduced, some predicted that the next thing would be Dr. Watts' Psalms. The custom has been introduced, and yet we see no disposition in the Associate Church to introduce the Dr. So much for prophecy: and if the spirit of prophecy has long since ceased, as it certainly has, Respondo's argument here goes for nothing. It reminds us of the argument of pro-slavery men against the abolishment of slavery; they predict that if slavery is abolished, the blacks will all come up into the free states as so many thieves, and rob and plunder the whites, and thus they influence many in favour of the continuance of that unrighteous system. So Respondo would support his "troublesome doctrine" by scaring the people with fearful predictions. Perhaps this is one of the *many unanswerable essays* that have been written upon this subject.

As to the doubts of a certain worthy young man, it is clear that the presbytery have given him license, but it is not so clear to the church that his doubts on this "troublesome doctrine" are entirely removed. Respondo has not told us that they are, and the young man is one who does not change his views with the seasons, or every wind of doctrine.

In conclusion he says, "I do not charge Quero with a designed co-operation in such a plan of hostilities as I have described, or of being a designed enemy to the secession cause. It is more than I am warranted to say that any man has a premeditated purpose to break down the church." How to reconcile this with the foregoing part of his essay is more than we can do, unless he designs it as a palliative for all his broad insinuations and unwarrantable assertions. He is not warranted to say that any man has a premeditated purpose, to break down the church, nor has he a right to say that Quero is an enemy to the Associate Church, or that his queries are only one small item of an extensive system of hostilities to her principles. As well might he say that a protest against an act of the church, or a reference from a presbytery on this subject, was one item of an extensive system of hostilities to her principles, as to say that a few queries are; and as well might he call protestors against any act enemies, as to call Quero one for the crime of asking a few questions for the purpose of promoting a uniformity of belief and practice among members of the same communion. How is he warranted to call Quero an enemy to the secession cause, and raise this ecclesiastical slander against him, and pronounce upon the secret desires of his heart? If Quero knows his own heart, which he ought to know as well as Respondo, he prefers the principles of the Associate Church to those of any other, or he would not remain in it one day. There is no worldly inducement for him to remain. In his opinion, these principles are not only the most agreeable to the word of God, but they are also endeared to him by all the associations of his earliest and best feelings as belonging to the religion of his youth, the religion of his father, and his fathers as far back as a Scotsman can trace his ancestry, and nothing less than a change of views and the unkind, unchristian treatment of men, who will call *brethren* enemies of the church to which they belong, will ever make him abandon those principles. But Quero will not boast of his ancestry, nor the strictness of his life, of which things some have boasted. No, he is aware of his manifold infirmities, which are to him a cause of daily lamentation before the Searcher of hearts, whom he humbly implores and trusts that, by his grace reigning through Christ Jesus, he will at last attain to the resurrection of the just, and instead of being found an enemy to the church, he will be found of God in peace together "with all the saints."

Finally, it is a pity that when any one attempts to answer queries, that he would become so "*unreasonable and irritable beyond all parallel*" that he cannot write without calling the querist an enemy designed or undesigned, and without usurping the prerogative of the *Searcher of hearts*. But let no one infer from these remarks, that we are in favour of occasional hearing. No, we believe it is contrary to the spirit of our profession, that the practice is censurable, that the very act of raising a testimony against error, virtually says, that a separate communion must be maintained as long as the errors,

testified against, exist; and that the "spirit of religious gossip or gadding about," breaks down all sound principle, and destroys our ecclesiastical home.

Yours, respectfully,

QUERO.

#### ART. VII.—*National Education in Ireland.*

In our last number, we presented to our readers some historical details respecting the origin of the New National System of Irish Education, and exhibited a few of its leading features. From the statements which have been made, it must be apparent, that this system was not devised and adopted without a sacrifice of Protestant principle—that it was a deplorable concession to the deep-laid policy of Antichrist, and that, since its introduction it has powerfully tended to advance the interests of Popery. A few additional observations may not be unnecessary, for the farther development of its character and tendency, and to show the duty of honest Christian witnesses in relation to it.

The New System of National Education for Ireland affords a practical though partial, development of this method of disjoining religion from the concerns of government:—partial, because Romish priests, to meet whose prejudices it was confessedly devised, demand a regard to religion in education—in fact, they undervalue all literary instruction, and would place education entirely in the hands of the priesthood; and because it has been subjected to various modifications, which amount to an abandonment of a considerable part of its original design. Instead of declaring, that religion should not enter into the business of education, the framer and advocates of this measure lay it down, as a fundamental principle, that religion and morality should be inculcated on the young. But, then, to meet the views of all, they exclude religious instruction out of the ordinary school business, and make no effectual provision for its being given at all, in the National Schools: and under the much-injured name of religion, they regard, as equally entitled to favour, the most discordant sentiments—Popery and Protestantism, Orthodoxy, Socinianism, and Infidelity. In fact, the New System of Education knows no system of religion as the truth; and it is admirably fitted to train persons to scepticism or infidelity, and to subserve one of the grand aims of the Man of Sin—by shaking belief in the truth, or by confounding truth and error, to prepare the way for blind subjection to a church which entirely prohibits private judgment, and boasts loudly of her infallibility.

One leading design of the system, it has often been declared, was to establish, in this country, a *united* education; and to secure this object, the agreement struck with Romanists and Infidels was, that the Bible, the grand ground of contention, was to be entirely shut out of the schools, during school-hours. It were easy to show, that in the present state of Ireland, if the feelings of all parties are to be taken into the account, a united system of education, in which any instruction in religion is required, is impracticable. If established at all, it can only be reached by a compromise of valuable and fundamental truth. What kind of a system of Christian education is it, on which

Socinians, Romanists, Arminians, and Orthodox can all agree? How little real union would there be, after all, in this incongruous amalgamation, and how undeserving the name of Christian education would be the method adopted, to please all these parties! To effect what may safely be pronounced a mere whim of worldly politicians, and what, when effected, would be far from desirable, there seems to be no other course than the ill-fated and disastrous measure which the government have taken in the New System of Education for Ireland—to banish the word of God from the schools, inasmuch as its introduction would shed light on the darkness of Popery, and its holy truths would be offensive to others, who are to be parties to the proposed union. This is its leading pervading principle. Of former systems, which were supported by voluntary liberality, or which enjoyed government patronage, the grand grievance of the Popish priesthood—that which threatened, ere long, to subvert their dominion of darkness and superstition—was the daily use of the Scriptures in the schools. To remove complaints on this subject, by a most mistaken and disastrous policy, the government although professedly Christian and Protestant, yielded up, in this instance, the charter and safeguard of all its privileges; and, by the course which has been taken as far as the Government and schools are concerned, the *Bible is a forbidden book, and the only book that is forbidden*.

We need not surely ask, is such an exclusion worthy of a Christian Government? It is fatal to its dearest interests, and inflicts an irreparable injury on the rising generation. It is a matter of common observation, that an acquaintance with Scriptural truth, when connected with genuine religion, exercises a surprising power in invigorating the intellectual faculties of persons labouring under every disadvantage, in relation to education. Viewing the matter even in this subordinate light, why remove this best of all instruments for intellectual culture from the schools of the poor?—why separate its impressive and attractive lessons, and the restraining and overpowering motives which it supplies from the ordinary subjects of elementary instruction? Nothing, we are persuaded, will account for this fatuity of the advocates of modern systems of education, but the solemn declaration of the Word itself:—“*This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.*”\*

Independently of the grand revelation of a scheme of grace which the Bible contains, designed to raise man from the ruins of his fallen state, and to put him in possession of final felicity, its claims to a principal place in all elementary schools may be pleaded on other, and solid, and important grounds. It may be shown, for instance, that—“*No book in existence contains so many Facts, which it is important for a child to know, as the Bible*”† “A person who has never attended to the subject,” it has been properly remarked, “will be surprised to find, for how large a proportion of his knowledge he is indebted to the neglected book.” It is the only book which informs us of the birth of the world; of the origin and early character of its inhabitants; of the deluge; of the dispersion of the human race; of the

\* John ii. 19.

† See a well-written pamphlet, by Henry Dunn, Esq., *Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society*, entitled “*National Education, the Question of Questions being an Apology for the Bible in the Schools for the Nation.*”

prevalence and intent of sacrifices; and of the destinies of man beyond the grave. To it we are indebted for all our knowledge of the introduction of natural and moral evil into the world; for the only authentic accounts we possess of the countries which were the cradles of the human race; for the history of the Jewish people; and for every important fact connected with the rise and early propagation of Christianity. It is altogether wrong to regard the Bible as a mere text-book of theology; the *facts* which it records are in themselves very valuable, and just such as are most important to be early treasured up by the youthful mind. Again; it may easily be proved, that —“*No book is so well adapted to promote Intellectual Development as the Scriptures.*” Large portions of it are singularly adapted to the capacities of the young. The narratives both of the Old and New Testaments are inimitable specimens of simplicity and wisdom; and as they seldom fail to excite a strong interest in the minds of youth, so they are calculated to make a powerful and lasting impression. “The *whole volume*,” it has been justly said, “is at once exciting, expanding, and ennobling;” and as a knowledge of the laws, customs, geography, and chronology of large portions of the earth, is necessarily involved in its study, “it is impossible for any man to be a diligent student of the Bible without purifying his taste, and enlarging his mind as well as improving his heart.”

The Bible, moreover, is *pre-eminently a book of useful knowledge*,” and the information which it conveys is adapted to the circumstances of all classes of the community. It declares the duties of the ruler and the ruled; prescribes the conduct of masters and servants, and speaks authoritatively to men in every relation of life. Sound *political knowledge* can never be obtained by a man who is ignorant of the Scriptures, for the Bible furnishes *the only permanent basis for a just government*. It is the only book of universal authority, which contains the charter of the subject’s right—which prescribes the limits of the ruler’s power—which dares to give law to the legislator, and denounces penalties against the sovereigns of the earth. It presents a king who is above all kings; and a law which is paramount to every other law. It appoints a tribunal of appeal, to which the highest magistrate may be summoned, where power cannot overawe, right nor fraud pervert justice; and where the unjust judgment of the oppressor will be brought upon his own head. “It is *the safeguard of freedom*. The records of modern times do not present us with a single country blest with free institutions, on whose permanence and happy influence we can now rely, in which the influence of the Bible is not exerted. In proportion as that has been wanting, the spirit of despotism has maintained its sway; and ignorance, apathy, and slavery have been the portion of the people.”\* And if we consider the influence which the Bible has exercised and is still exercising on the moral and social condition of man, in all parts of the world, we may see still farther its value to civil rulers; and as a universal directory in the schools of the young.” Strange indeed must be the notions of that man who, under the shallow pretext of avoiding sectarianism, would thrust into obscurity a volume to which this country is indebted for every thing which distinguishes her from *savage tribes*;—the book which delivered her from idolatry, im-

\* Report to the Literary Convention of New York, in 1830.

purity, and blood,—which has distinguished her from other nations, by making her foremost in philanthropy; and which has, again and again, saved her from discord, revolution, and crime. The only book which has had power from God to change the character of *nations*;—which abolished the bloody rites of Diana,—threw down the polluted temples of Venus—terminated, for ever, the barbarous spectacles of Rome—and destroyed the blood-stained altars of the Druids; the book which, *within the recollection of this generation, and under our own observation*, has abolished the sacrifice of parents and the murder of children among savage tribes, in the wilds of Africa and in the islands of the Pacific; which has rescued the Hindoo infant from the Ganges, and the Hindoo widow from the funeral pile; and before which, idolatry and superstition, in every part of the world, are tottering to their fall.” Regarding the Bible, therefore, in this lower light, simply as a code of practical wisdom—“as the storehouse of truths which are *capable of practical application every day and hour in the life of every individual*, it is obvious, that the Bible, instead of being shut out of our places of instruction, *should be better understood and more thoroughly studied* than any other book whatsoever.”—*Belfast Covenanter*.

---

ART. VIII.—*Speech of Dr. Chalmers in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.*

Dr. Chalmers rose, and was for some time inaudible, as indeed he was at different parts of his address. There were two separate questions here, each resting on separate grounds of its own: but each had been mixed up with the other in such a way as to have in some measure confused the judgments of many, both in regard to the one and to the other. There was the question of the spiritual independence of the church, as distinct from the civil authorities; and the question of non-intrusion. He knew that many were invariably non-intrusionists who had no partiality for the veto law; and, on the other hand, there are many antivetoists, to whom the sound of the word was absolutely loathsome, who would respond to the watchword of the Church's independence. It might be admitted, even by the most strenuous of their adversaries, that the Civil Courts had intromitted with ecclesiastical business only in the matter of temporalities. Still under the guise of this generality, they might find a plea and pretext for the grossest invasion on those prerogatives and powers which had invariably belonged to every Christian Church, and to which, as long as they had continued a National Establishment, they had never submitted, and he trusted never would. For example, an annuity or lucrative office might be coupled with an addition that the holder should be one of their communicants; but they were not responsible for that condition. However, this civil or patrimonial interest might be made to hang on the question, to admit or not admit the candidate to their communion. Now who did not see, that although a temporality might be here implicated,—there would be a flagrant overstepping on their province by the civil power, if the latter should choose to interfere, and dictate to the Church in any manner of way connected with the conferring of a spiritual privilege on this candidate. Now

looking on this part of their cause, and putting out of view for a moment the question of non-intrusion altogether, there were many, very many, he trusted, who thought easily about the law of patronage and presentation, who had still that regard for the vitality and essence of a Christian establishment, that they would enter into one unflinching phalanx for the vindication of their spiritual independence—and if, even looking to all the perilous times of the Church, there was a time when the courage and consistency of men were called forth, it was the day on which they had now fallen, when the poison of false and hollow principles was undermining their strength from within, and when thousands of their enemies were on the tiptoe of expectation for the ruin of the establishment. Whatever the State chose to confer on them in the way of temporalities, was of course the State's own; but with whatever was the Church's own before and after those temporalities were conferred, the State has no right to intermeddle; or, in other words, they, the Church, must control the management of their own proper affairs, the same as if they received not one farthing out of the national funds. When the statute was passed founding the Establishment, they, in the brief and emphatic language of his friend Mr. Gray, gave the state their services, but not their liberties. They got a maintenance from the State, and engaged in return to minister unto the spiritual education of the people. This was a conjunction which had been fruitful in innumerable blessings to the people of the land, but a conjunction in which the value given by the Church was a hundred-fold greater than the maintenance bestowed by the State. Still, if the State was not satisfied with the bargain, they could at any time abandon it,—if, in addition to their services in things spiritual, the State also sought their submission in things spiritual, they, the church, must have answered it, “In this we have another Master, to whom, and to whom alone, we are responsible.” If the answer and the compact had been otherwise, the Church would have allied itself to an accursed thing,—it would have committed sacrilege; for in those things he was the sole and undivided Master. This was a principle of their Church at the present time—this was the principle it had maintained after its first victory, and during a persecution of a hundred years; and a principle which had cost them so much they were not willing to let go. And if the State will insist on them to surrender it, they were willing to try the same experiment, and brave the same course over again. A rock had been ascended, and the banner was there spread forth and expanded on the gale with the inscription which might be the motto of the Establishment to all eyes, “The Lord Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church of Scotland.” They had nailed that banner to the mast, and they would keep it there in all their fortunes, so that, whether in tempest or in sunshine, the winds of heaven might carry forth, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only head of the Church of Scotland. That was the watchword of the party with whom he sat;—and was there none on the other side to reiterate this? Yes, there might be many, probably all. (Cries of yes, yes, from the party appealed to.) Then, did not that just show the distinction he was drawing between the question of spiritual independence and that of the veto law. The only other distinction (for his question was honoured with an affirmative from a quarter so cheering,) was between a declaratory and an effective proposition. His friends on the

opposite side only joined in the declaratory—would they join in the effective? He had the proud confidence to believe that a goodly number would, and furthermore, that they would assert by deeds as well as by words the position that could not be split into a thousand definitions, like the veto law, and boldly proclaim that there would be no strike—no surrender. He did not wonder that Radicals and Voluntaries were now on the watch, and even at the present moment so intensely looking on. This was a question, he was fully aware, that the Voluntaries and Radicals considered essentially bound up with their own determination to pull down the religious establishment. They have joined in the outcry that we hear sounding from these incongruous sources,—they have furnished their contingent to that heterogeneous mass of clamour, ignorance, and insidious mischief, with which the Church had been assailed during her present righteous struggle. But they know well, that if the Church made even but a quirk-like acknowledgment of that law, so as to render her spiritualities subordinate to the secular power,—they know well that the minutest fraction of such an appearance would be the entering of a canker-worm into the vitals of every state religion. It would bring to the dust the National Establishment of Christianity in those realms. Those who had raised such an outcry against a Church and State Religion, were making the air resound with the cry of “The law—the law—the law. The law had come in to the aid of the Voluntaries. On the other hand, they found that the unconscious bigots who now clung to a State Religion were as unconsciously playing into the hands of the Voluntaries. In a few years they bade fair to have the law against themselves. But the Church of Scotland, on the ground now taken up, was the only break-water against this unlooked for combination. Whatever was the result of this war of opinions, let not the advocates of unchecked patronage think that they would come in for any share of spoil. Their system is conclusively gone for ever, never to lift up its head again in the estimation of general society, whether they the (Voluntaries) or those who were the members of a Church sustained by but not subjected to the State as regards spiritualities, should be in possession of those temporalities. The question had often been asked, what they desired for the Church; and he would answer it simply by saying, a recognition of the Church’s power to deal legislatively and judiciously with every question affecting the fitness of a presentee, and to admit or reject him as it might think fit. His meaning was clearly expressed by Mr. Campbell of Monzie on the hustings at Perth, in effect that the Church should be allowed to legislate for herself in every thing which referred to the induction of a presentee into any parish. If such a provision were embraced in Lord Aberdeen’s Bill,—and there might have been, but for the unconquerable antipathies of several influential parties to the veto—it would have met with his approval, and also with that of the Assembly. There were more reasons for an enactment in that particular form. It was not the enactment of a measure by Parliament which would settle the question, but it was the conveying over to the Church the task of obtaining a measure to herself. This was the more necessary; as a measure, to be truly beneficial to the Church, must be liable to modification. Now if the Church made its own law, it could alter it to suit itself; and he would only say, that however much they might at first be satisfied



with any measure, yet the lights and lessons of experience were always providing more information and knowledge on its practical operation, and suggesting alterations. There were three methods by which he thought that object would have been obtained, and he would press them on the serious attention of the House. The first way was by an act of the legislature, providing that the Church did not forfeit the rights and immunities of an establishment when, in the exercise of her legislative powers, she enacted a law of non-intrusion similar to her principles. In reference to the style of this legislation, what he would recommend was, that the inactive verb in all these acts of Parliament should govern the temporalities alone. The powers of the Church were not conferred on it by the State, but countenanced by the State. The State said how far it would combine the bestowal of these temporalities with the existence of these powers, but farther than that it could not go; it could not destroy any right which the Church enjoyed, although it might withdraw the temporalities. He did not deny that the sacrifice of the temporalities of the Church was an important consideration, and that it possessed a great influence in the settlement of the question. Could any man in his senses deny that the temporalities which gave to the Church three-fourths of its efficiency in disseminating Christianity should be lightly abandoned? No! He should like, for this reason, that the power the Church wished should be adopted in any Act of Parliament. The act now before the House of Lords would even in that state be acceptable. But the Church would not, even to save the temporalities, forfeit her legislative privileges, and the benefit she would derive from the excellent principle of non-intrusion. The second form of a measure which he would accept would be one not making it binding on the Church to adopt any particular process as to the settlement of a minister, and granting it full power to legislate in regard to that particular branch of her polity. The Rev. Doctor here became inaudible, and explained the character of a third measure, in which he proposed that the utmost latitude for objections should be given to the congregations, which should be considered by the Presbyteries, and acted on by them under a sense of the importance of objections of any kind on the part of the people against a presentee, and should, on any ground they thought proper, reject the presentee without being answerable to the civil law. He wished to ask on what grounds of consistency the Church could consent to any deprivation of its spiritual independence. How could a Church which professed to derive all its powers from the Lord Jesus Christ consent to any abridgment of them? Now they did most zealously affirm that the Church had intrinsic powers, which she held immediately from its great Head in heaven. Such powers the State could neither continue nor take away—it could take away nothing but the temporalities. These they could withhold at their own pleasure, and on their own terms—the powers of the Church remained all the time stable and unchanged, whether as regarded a single parish or the Church at large. Lord Aberdeen's bill, indeed, was said to empower the Church to prevent the intrusion of unacceptable ministers into any parish, while it peremptorily refused the desired means of exercising that power. The State had no right to talk of empowering them—but if it had told them that they would not forfeit their endowments when, in the exercise of their powers in any particular instance they admitted or

rejected a presentee on any ground which seemed to them good, he would accept of it. If the Church could obtain such a bill as that, he would forthwith expunge non-intrusion from her vocabulary—He, for one, was willing to receive, and he would willingly forward acquiescence in that bill, and he was certain the majority of the General Assembly would give an obligation as strong and sacredly binding on them as language could make it to do so, provided that in no instance a minister should be intruded into a parish contrary to the honest, religious will of the people. Lord Aberdeen's bill struck at the root of the Establishment, and that was what they had received in place of the one embracing all the points upon which they had set their hearts. The bill left matters in such a way that things ecclesiastical were left at the disposal of the secular power. That was a question of life or death—because it affected the Church's liberties. It mattered not what the sacrifices might be which they might be called on to make in order to maintain them—but they were bound to insist, without one flaw or exception, for exclusive jurisdiction in the things which appertained to God. Now the settlement of ministers certainly came under that class, and therefore they were determined to have exclusive jurisdiction in respect to that important duty. He was willing to surrender all the blessings which belonged to them as a National Church, rather than have their arm made weak and powerless in effecting any thing for the Christian good of the people. He had every confidence in the people of the country, whose consciences were awakened to a sound view of the theology of the question. Dr. Chalmers then referred to a correspondence which had been carried on between Lord Aberdeen and the committee of the Assembly, in reference to his bill, and then stated, that since his Lordship had introduced his bill to the House of Lords, he had received a letter from him, and a correspondence had ensued. [Dr. Chalmers then read the correspondence, which showed that, being entirely dissatisfied with the provisions of Lord Aberdeen's bill, he wrote his Lordship to that effect, and after various ineffectual suggestions for alterations in its language and spirit, more especially in regard to the matter embraced in the parenthetical portion of the clause as to the reasons for which Presbyteries were to reject presentees—he had abandoned all hope of any satisfactory alteration being made. His Lordship remained more firmly wedded to his views than ever.] He then went on to point out the differences—insuperable differences, which existed betwixt the terms of the bill and the views of the majority of the Assembly, showing that it hung like a millstone round the neck of the Church, the nuisance of intrusion. He did not deny that the bill had originated in a good intention—he believed the noble Earl wished to relieve them, but he had only rendered more emphatic the grievances of which they had complained and superadded an ecclesiastical directory to the bargain. The bill was utterly inefficient in enabling the Church to give effect to that principle to which it was solemnly pledged; in fact, it was utterly hostile to that principle. It would allow them to take into consideration all other circumstances but that one solitary principle—and that was the notable result of all the hopes of an adjustment through such a measure. For himself, he would rather take a measure from Dr. Cook and the gentlemen opposite than from Lord Aberdeen. It was better to be lashed with whips than with scorpions. For him-

self, he would rather be under the swords of the Solomons on the other side of the House, than under the yoke of the Rehoboams in the British Parliament. Sir, many years ago, I spent a few days, towards the close of his life, with that venerable Christian patriarch, Dr. Davidson of Edinburgh, whose heavenward path was strongly depicted in his countenance. Apart from language altogether, it was impossible not to feel, that one was in the presence of a man who felt himself at the gate of heaven, and ready to pass into the presence of his everlasting Father. The remembrance of Dr. Davidson suggests an anecdote which struck me forcibly at the time—of an illiterate female in humble life, who applied for admission to the sacrament. Having undergone the customary examination, she could not make an articulate reply to a single question put to her. She was asked to explain the meaning of the mediation of Christ, or the purpose of his death? Not one word could she utter; and yet there was a certain expression of intelligence in her face, and a manifestation of right and appropriate feeling, which was strongly indicative—not by the sound of the voice, but by the external signs of emotion—that she fully responded to the words of the preacher, whether he spoke of the terrors of hell, or the blessed propitiation of the Saviour. Still she made no distinct reply to any of his questions, and she was in consequence refused as a communicant. When retiring from the room, in the extremity of her agitation and suffering, she called out, “I cannot speak for him; but I could die for him.” The minister, no longer doubtful, handed to her a sacramental token, for good and substantial reasons, although not for the sound of her voice. So he would speak of the collective mind of many a rustic congregation, who had not the power to express their feelings, although their convictions were decidedly bent in one direction.—After some farther remarks, during which the Rev. Doctor was interrupted by Mr. James Hope, he concluded his lengthened speech by the following anecdote, illustrative of the incapacity of English legislators, to form a right appreciation of the character of the forms of the Church of Scotland. In his opinion they were all Cockneys together. When he resided in Glasgow, an English lady came on a visit, who, for aught he knew, had never but once been beyond the confines of Piccadilly—she asked such odd questions. Having enjoyed a draught of *butter-milk*, one fine morning, he was exceedingly amused, when, on several cows passing, the lady innocently asked, “Pray, Mr. Chalmers, which of these cows is it that gives that fine buttermilk?” So it was with Englishmen in reference to the Church of Scotland. They had as little conception of a state of transition from presentation to induction, as the English lady had of the milk passing through more than one stage from the udder until it became *butter*.

---

ART. IX.—*Remarks on “Thoughts on Occasional Hearing.”*

It is believed that a very large majority of the Associate Church regard occasional, or rather *indiscriminate* hearing of the word as inconsistent with their public profession, and the requirements of the Scriptures. 1. Because such a practice is a violation of divine injunctions. Prov. xix. 27. Deut. xiii. 1—5. Matt. vii. 15. Mark iv. 24. “Take heed *what* you hear,” vii. 7. John x. 5. Eph. iv. 14.

VOL. XVII.—20

1 Tim. vi. 3—5. 2 Pet. ii. 1—3. 1 John iv. 1. 2 John 10. Rev. ii. 2. The reader will find it highly advantageous to examine these texts with some degree of attention. 2. Because it is inconsistent with that testimony which we have lifted up in defence of truth and against error, and for the faithful maintenance of which, we have erected a separate association, and promulgated a distinct constitution, against all other ecclesiastical bodies, who either neglect or oppose any portion of revealed truth embodied in our Testimony. The *conduct* of a witness should not contradict his *words*. This is probably as far as any enlightened member of the church could reasonably desire his brethren to go on this “disputed subject.” At least it is as far as the writer of this article desires any one to go.

But a ruling elder has started another argument, which appears to be the present “bone of contention,” which is, that ministers of all other denominations stand in the same ecclesiastical relation to us that our own do, when suspended. This is a fair, legitimate subject of discussion, and why it should engender such a degree of *heat* as has appeared in a certain quarter, is more than we can comprehend. And it is hoped that hereafter, the writers on this question will be more brief and direct to the point.

We are unable to discover any material defect in the argument of a ruling elder. The question does not respect the character or standing, either in the sight of God, or the world, or other portions of the visible church, of ministers in other bodies, but their official relation to us, and that only evidence by which we can recognise their commission, namely, *Speaking the truth in love*. Consequently their *outward* commission to preach the gospel to every creature, and our obligation to hear them are not correlative. The example of the old prophet adduced in our last number, and Deut. xiii. 1—5, are full and explicit on this point. The *outward signs* of a prophet are wholly insufficient. We have a more sure word of prophecy. Indeed God pays more regard to the moral duties, than to outward ceremonies, and puts more honour upon *moral-natural*, than *moral-positive* institutions. This appears not only from the Scriptures already cited, but also from Num. xi. 26—29. The two young men who prophesied in the camp, appear to have disregarded the outward form, but must not be opposed so long as they speak truth. Luke ix. 49, 50, is to the same effect. Also, Jer. xxiii. 21, 22. “I have not sent these prophets.” &c., but “if they had stood in my counsel, and caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.” Standing in the counsel of God, and causing the people to hear his words, are the true tests of a minister’s commission. All that is designed by these Scriptures is, to establish the position, that an outward commission is in itself insufficient; and that God will not acknowledge such a commission, unless accompanied with the necessary adjunct truth. He will acknowledge his own truth even when spoken without the outward commission. This argument makes nothing against the authority and necessity of ordination. It only proves its inferiority to truth, and the obligation devolving upon Christian people to bow down to the majesty of God’s revealed will. The truth depends not on ordination, but ordination is an appointed means for the propagation of truth, which cannot be disregarded without sin, but which, like all other means, sometimes fails to accomplish the end designed.

Suspension is always associated with the idea of immorality, or incompetency and disgrace. But when we say that ministers of other denominations stand in the same *official* relation to us that our own do when suspended, these ideas are to be excluded. We say nothing of their attainments, piety, or usefulness. On some points of revealed truth, more or less vital to the Christian system, our views differ from theirs, on account of which we declare an *ecclesiastical* separation, appealing the matters of difference to the ultimate decision of the Judge of quick and dead. This is neither to impeach the integrity of our neighbour, nor to sit in judgment upon his moral character. Neither is it properly intolerance: it is simply claiming the exercise of necessary Christian liberty, viz: the right to profess and maintain revealed truth, so far as known, and to decline association with all such as refuse to assist us in this great and good work.

These remarks were deemed necessary to pave the way for removing the errors of "Pilgrim," which are certainly most glaring, or we are yet a child in theological knowledge.

Having assumed, incorrectly, in his first paper, that it is an act of moral rectitude in others to hear those from whom we are separated, and that bearing testimony to moral and religious truth necessarily involves all the outward forms of judicial process in courts of law, he rears a superstructure more frail than the cobweb covering of the spider. His house will not bear even a refreshing breeze, to say nothing of the "pelting of the pitiless storm."

1. He seems to intimate, because the principle of toleration was not fully understood by the reformers, that we must demur from their decision on this point; which implies that a condemnation of occasional hearing betrays an illiberal, intolerant spirit. We deny that it proceeds from any such spirit, or has any such tendency. It is simply a question of duty to God and our fellow men, and it is of no consequence who may or may not regard it as intolerant. Did Pilgrim never in his youth fall into a company of young bloods, who regarded him as *intolerant*, because he refused to run with them into all their "excess of riot?" If not, he has been more fortunate than most young men. Does he not know that Unitarians regard Arminians as intolerant; Arminians regard Calvinists in the same light; and Calvinists, Papists, &c. Does he not know that many of our race are ruined both in body and soul, in every period of the world through fear of the senseless cry of bigotry, and intolerance, which is constantly poured out like a flood from the lips of the more profligate portion of mankind? Let us hear no more of intolerance, when honestly searching into the will of God, concerning his fallen creature man.

2. He appears, page 203, to be more concerned about others, and the effect our conduct may have on them, than about truth. It would be out of place to inquire at present into the causes of religious differences; these are in general ignorance, guilt, depravity, hatred of truth, and the want of divine illumination by a work of the Spirit of God. And it is not too much to assume, that in many cases those who differ from us have never honestly attempted to investigate the truth. He animadvert upon Dr. A. for using the phrase "wicked Arminians," but he has not told us where that phrase is to be found. If the Dr. did use it, as we suppose he did, it was not in his usual

happy manner of expressing himself. But we have no scruples of conscience in calling the system of doctrines usually denominated Arminian, a *wicked system*, another gospel, which is indeed no gospel, in its tendency dishonouring to God, destructive to the souls of men, and to be rejected with abhorrence. If we know any thing of God's word, Arminianism is a moral pestilence.

He assumes that our opposition to occasional hearing, amounts to a "hedging others in a communion where error prevails." Strange! We had always supposed the very opposite to be the truth. To say to others, You have laid aside some important truths and duties required in the word of God, therefore we cannot hear your ministers till these truths and duties are restored to their legitimate place; and if you would be found faithful witnesses to the despised truths of Jesus Christ, if you have a proper regard to your own and the eternal interests of your fellow men, we affectionately exhort you to imitate our example, withdraw entirely from such ministrations. Strange, indeed, that this should hedge people in an erroneous communion!

4. He assumes that our doctrine fetters the truth, and throws impediments in the way of those who are commissioned from on high to preach the gospel. This argument also proceeds on the false basis that the obligation to hear is correlative with an outward commission in the preacher, and also that a refusal to hear an *erroneous*, amounts to an impediment thrown in the way of a *sound* ministry; whereas it appears to us a child can hardly fail to see the opposite. What! opposition to error, an impediment to truth? But we shall be told that our argument assumes that *we* have discovered the truth. Certainly it does, so far as we have imbodyed it in our public profession. And if we have not, we are schismatics and presumptuous pharisees for maintaining a separate communion from others. Every Seceder has solemnly professed that the doctrines of our subordinate standards, are the doctrines of God's holy word, which we are under obligation to maintain in all *places*, and through life. And respecting other denominations, says Jehovah, "Let them return to thee, but return not thou to them."

Let it be for ever remembered that the continuance of an unfaithful ministry in the visible church, whom it is sinful to hear, is the effect of her unfaithfulness to her glorious Head, and sovereign Lord. How often, and how lamentably does she prove perfidious in his covenant!

But neither time nor limits will permit us to follow "Pilgrim" any farther. He is an interesting, candid, intelligent writer on many subjects. Though not personally acquainted with him, we owe him our hearty acknowledgments for his many valuable contributions to our pages, and hold him in high estimation. But our esteem for men must not deter us from pointing out those things which we honestly believe to be repugnant to the word of God, destructive to those high and holy ends which the Secession church, in these states, proposes to herself, by the maintenance of a separate constitution and communion, and dangerous both to the temporal and eternal well-being of the human race. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever." Yea, it is perfect, it is true, it is right, it is pure, it is "righteous altogether, more to be desired than gold, sweeter than honey, and in the keeping of it there is a great reward."

ART. X.—*Persecution for Righteousness' Sake.*

The days of persecution have returned upon us. It is now well ascertained that the gospel cannot be preached in many of the slave states. Mob law is clearly in the ascendant. The constitution and laws of the country are a dead letter; freedom of speech, and the rights of conscience exist only in name. The national declaration that "All men are born free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," means that a portion of the human race are born slaves, destitute not only of liberty, and the right of pursuing happiness, but even of volition.

It is known to our readers that the ministers belonging to the Presbytery of the Carolinas were suspended at the last meeting of Synod for disobedience to the act, which prohibits any member of the Associate Church from holding a human being in the character or condition of a slave, and that an ordained minister was sent into the bounds of said Presbytery, to officiate for three months, commencing the first of July. On this mission the Rev. *Thomas S. Kendall* was appointed, and accepted the appointment. We learn from a Southern paper, and a private letter, (not from Mr. Kendall) that his commission has been faithfully executed, at the hazard of his life, and in defiance of an infuriated mob.

This mob appears, according to their own account, to have followed Mr. K. from York District, South Carolina, through Chester, Fairfield, and Stirling, to Smyrna, gathering strength as they proceeded. At the conclusion of public worship on the Sabbath, he was arrested, carried back to Stirling, a distance of about twenty miles, "and the inhabitants of an extensive neighbourhood were summoned to investigate his case on the following day." The determination of this meeting was, that Mr. K. "is a thorough abolitionist." "It was the opinion of a member of the bar that the paper [the pastoral letter of the Synod] was so artfully drawn up, as to evade the existing laws." Yet, "it was determined by a fair trial before Judge Lynch to make, upon this pioneer of a fanatical religion, a *practical application*;" and then "FORCE upon the Legislature proper attention" to the defects in their laws, which gave them no countenance for this gross outrage upon the rights and person of a free born *white* American citizen, who according to their own confession had transgressed no law either human or divine!

Such is the account these reckless men give of themselves! such is the effrontery with which they glory in their shame! We have heard nothing from Mr. K. himself. To those, however, who *know* him, this event will cause no shame; the finer feelings of *their* hearts will intertwine around him with a tenacity which death only can sever; while the contemplation of his gentlemanly deport-

ment, his known prudence, his manly virtues, and his Christian heroism, will animate them to more vigorous exertions in the righteous cause for which he has suffered. The Christian philanthropist beholds a glory in this persecution for righteousness' sake. It carries our reflections back to the days when a similar mob dragged Paul "out of the temple," and to many incidents in the lives of Calvin, Luther, and Knox. Our infatuated countrymen have already covered themselves with disgrace in the estimation of the whole civilized world. An indelible stigma attaches itself to their national character. And they may continue for a season as they have begun, like the Jews, to persecute the "fanatical" religion of Jesus Christ, by personal violence and bloodshed; but like them they must become a hissing and an astonishment to the world. The disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ ever have been, and still are, "counted as sheep for the slaughter," by that portion of the human race who subsist on plunder. Yet the smiles of their Heavenly Father, the approbation of a good conscience, the great reward which they know awaits them at the termination of this brief state of existence, enable them to take "joyfully the spoiling of their goods," and the violence done to their persons.

We may be indulged in closing this article with a reference to the *chivalry* of the South. They very complaisantly tell us that they are the only "defenders of life and personal honour," on the American continent! They despise all meanness; they would never take advantage of the defenceless stranger, and our *white slaves* of the North urge upon us these high traits of character as an argument for the continuance of slavery! Such men will take no advantage of the defenceless, manacled victims of their power; better be their slave than your own freeman! Is not their treatment of Mr. Kendall an admirable commentary on Southern valour, manliness, and magnanimity? Noble men!—Brave men! A multitude of you succeeded in capturing on the Lord's day one defenceless, innocent, unsuspecting, minister of the gospel; also a citizen of a slave state, and confiding in Southern honour and manliness! No language of panegyric can do you justice. Is it not, however, a little remarkable, that thousands of you should be held at bay for five years, nay actually whipped by a few hundreds of half-starved Indians?

The reader will pardon this slight departure from the usual style of a religious publication. The nature of the subject demanded it. The doings of this character, so prevalent in the country, are not to be met with sober argument; for the actors in such scenes *know* that they are outlaws, and glory in being such.

But, beloved brethren, be "in nothing terrified by your adversaries; which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation and that of God. For unto you it is given in the behalf



of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to *suffer for his sake.*"

---

ART. XI.—*Free Communion.*

The following remarks are taken from a recent number of the Presbyterian. The Associate Church has probably been more reproached by the Presbyterians of the General Assembly on account of her steadfast opposition to free communion, than for the maintenance of any other single principle of her public profession. It is, however, pleasing to meet with an article in the organ of the Presbyterian church, which at least goes sufficiently far on this point to justify the position held by our church.

(1.) The churches of the New school are the abettors of great and dangerous error. Such was the solemn decision of the supreme judicatory of our Church. Some of the pastors in these churches are avowedly the supporters of opinions which are not only in conflict with the fundamental doctrines of the standards of our Church, but which are regarded as a semi-Pelagian heresy. Others, if they do not avow their belief in these doctrines, nevertheless uphold those who do, and regard them as unessential variations from the true faith. The sessions and members of such churches generally harmonize with their pastors, so that they are to be regarded as ecclesiastically one with them. (2.) We remark that on these accounts the supreme judicatory of our Church has unequivocally declared, that such facts were a bar to communion, and did accordingly separate such churches from their connexion. (3.) Christian fellowship can only consist with unity in the faith. Now in view of these things, we are unable to say how far a church may depart from the faith without forfeiting its character as a Christian institution; and hence, when we know that a church has fallen into serious error, we think all due caution should be used in expressing any opinion on the subject. If however the question is, may we recognise such a church by participating in the ordinances as therein administered, we unhesitatingly answer, *no*. We do not say that there should be no such participation because the church is not Christian, but, 1st. Because it is unnecessary. 2d. Because it is inexpedient, inasmuch as it is a countenancing of error, an implied censure upon the supreme judicatory of the Church, which has decided that there was not a proper basis of fellowship in the aggregate, and therefore not in particular churches or individuals; and finally, because, if such acts of communion should become frequent, it might and probably would, result in diminishing the sense of the evils of error, and perhaps lead to propositions for union in which the truth might be sacrificed. Whether individuals belonging to orthodox churches, who persist in such public intercommunion with new-school churches, should be made answerable to their session for their conduct, is another part of the question. We regard it as the duty of a session, to admonish such individuals, and explain to them the tendencies of the course they are pursuing, and by lenient measures, persuade them to desist. If this will not answer, they should be advised to retire from the church quietly; and if this is not effectual, the session must be directed by the circumstances of the case in the adoption of ulterior measures.

ART. XII.—*The Theatre.*

The Rev. Mr. Brainard of this city makes the following allusion to Fanny Elssler, the opera dancer, to whose carriage some of the citizens of Baltimore recently undertook to attach themselves.

“And what compensation has this female rendered for this vast appropriation of money? Has she, like Newton, struck out new principles in science? Has she, like Fulton, made new discoveries in the arts by which the public comfort and wealth have been promoted? Has she, like Howard or Mrs. Fry, come as a missionary to visit the prisoner in his solitude—“to take the gauge of human misery”—to move hearts to feel for human sorrow and hands to open in Christian charity?

Has she given a new impulse to principles of moral rectitude in their control over the public conscience, so that in all the relations of life we find more gentleness, industry, economy, piety and benevolence?

Has she brought a leaf plucked from the tree of life with which to stanch the wounds of a heart bleeding under guilt?

Has she hung up a brighter star over the path to immortality? Has she taught our young men and maidens more wisely to live and more safely to die? We gave Baron Steuben a single township of land in the cold north for coming from Prussia to fight the battles of liberty in the revolution. We gave to Lafayette, the young and chivalrous nobleman who left the wife of his youth and his little children to aid our struggles for independence, some fifty thousand dollars in land and money.

What boon of blessedness—what surpassing benefit has this German woman conferred upon us that we give her \$60,000 for 15 weeks?

*She has danced for us—that is all of it!*

While many intelligent, amiable and most worthy females, sunk from affluence to poverty, have plied the needle with aching heads and hearts until the midnight hour, for a compensation that hardly procured daily bread for their children—we have lavished \$60,000 upon a *strolling dancer!*

**THE VACANT SEATS IN HEAVEN.**—A lady of rank being once in company with Bengel, addressed him as follows: “I hear, Mr. Provost, that you are a prophet; therefore perhaps you can tell us whether, in the world above, there are any reserved seats for people of quality. “He replied, “I certainly, madam, am no prophet, though I acknowledge that God has granted me some acquaintance with his revealed word; and this informs me that reserved seats indeed there are; but that, alas, most of them are sadly in want of occupants. So I read in Matt. xix. 24, and 1 Cor. i. 26.”

**VOLUNTARY SOCIETIES.**—The present number contains a judicious article from A. G. on the subject of “Voluntary Associations.” About a year since, a number of our subscribers declared their hostility to these associations, and some of them discontinued their patronage on account of the insertion of articles advocating them.

Many other persons, not hostile, had serious doubts respecting their *authority* and *expediency*. Of this class the editor of the Monitor made one; consequently he invited a discussion of the question, which has been pretty full on the affirmative side. That this discussion has done good, he has not the least doubt. For although it has offended some who refuse to be convinced by argument however conclusive, it has removed lurking doubts from the minds of many candid persons. Respecting their authority, or rather *warrantableness*, after what has been said by correspondents, there can be no longer any reasonable doubt. It is believed, then, that there may be cases in which Christians should associate with others for the correction of abuses which official functionaries have either introduced or refuse to remove; but such cases are not so frequent as many suppose. Neither is it expedient to rush at once into a new association for the removal of evils which are, in a great measure, inseparable from the present condition of the human race, or which belong so directly to the whole political body, as to require the concurrence of a majority for their removal; especially when the church constitutes a very small minority of the community. Such things do certainly weaken the moral power of the church, and give her the appearance of a visionary, impotent body.

Our conclusion then of the whole matter is, that it is lawful for any number of persons to associate under such regulations as they may choose, not contrary to the word of God, for the accomplishment of any laudable end. But all things are not *expedient* which are lawful. Their *expediency* must then be left to the discretion and Christian liberty of the people, and the peculiar posture of affairs in the church and in the world at any given period. It might be expedient at one time and not at another, in one place and not another, and it might be expedient in all places at the same time to form such associations. If these views be correct, it is unchristian for brethren to contend with each other on this question, or to suffer their difference of views to alienate their mutual confidence and affection. That the church and the world are both afflicted with huge moral evils, and that the whole moral and intellectual power of the church should be put forth for their removal, all admit. And we should rejoice at any lawful effort of the people for the attainment of this holy end. And although we think the same amount of exertion would accomplish more good, if directed in a different manner, let us not despise the well intended efforts of God's people, lest we despise the good that is actually done, and be found strengthening the hands of the wicked. As it is not probable any thing farther can be offered on this question without repetition, it is proposed to close the discussion.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We have received an article from an old patron and respected friend, addressed “To the author of the Address

on Foreign Missions," and containing the writer's proper signature, which is inadmissible on account of its extravagance. He says he "was sorry to see the editor throwing on cold water to check the zeal, and destroy the force of the cogent and irresistible arguments of 'the young author;' nor will his 'rebuffs,' nor 'vain imaginations,' turn away their edge." This is not exactly a fair representation of the editor, as the reader may perceive by referring to page 143 of the Number for August, where the address is, on the whole, commended.

The following sentence will probably excite a smile—"Notwithstanding the church may sit down on her treasury of eight or ten thousand dollars, like Rachael on her golden god, your calculation, [the calculation of the Address,] page 106 of the Monitor, will become matter of history." He, however, demonstrates his sincerity by authorizing the "young author," whenever he is prepared to go to the heathen, to draw on him for one hundred dollars.

Finally, he thinks it a matter of lamentation that our Synod, at its last meeting, recommended "great caution" to her subordinate courts, "in dealing with persons in civil offices." This is the first time we remember to have heard a lamentation over ecclesiastical courts for the sin of recommending *prudence* in the doing of lawful things.

But while we have deemed it most prudent not to insert the article in question, we have not the least doubt that many in our church are blameable for withholding that support for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom which the Scriptures require. For such persons we have no extenuating plea. They are certainly culpable in the sight of God. And this withholding more than is meet may be, and doubtless is, one ground of God's controversy with us. It may be for this that he has broken our ranks, thinned our numbers, and sent upon us a spirit of *ultraism* which threatens our ecclesiastical extermination. "Thou makest us turn back from the enemy—thou hast given us as sheep for meat—thou sellest thy people for nought—thou makest us a reproach to our neighbours—thou makest us a by-word among the heathen! Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord? arise, cast us not off for ever. Arise for our help, and redeem us for thy mercies' sake."

"Respondo" and "Quero" have not given a reason of the hope that is in them with meekness and fear. Neither have they confined themselves to the subject which they undertook to discuss. It is with pain we notice such a departure from the meek and inoffensive spirit of the gospel. Having admitted the article of Respondo, we could not in justice refuse Quero a hearing. But should either of them favour us with any thing farther, they must change their tone and confine themselves to the subject, or give us permission to apply the pruning knife. To permit the continuance of such a discussion

as they have started would be a violation of our pledge to the public, and subversive of the design of this work.

**CORRECTION.**—In the Number for July, page 92, it is said, respecting the proceedings of church courts,—“If attended with levity, haste, or disorder, they lack that moral grandeur which *in reality* constitutes their binding obligation.” For the words “in reality,” the reader is requested to substitute *instrumentally*. It will then express the editor’s meaning; thus—“If attended with levity, haste, or disorder, they lack that moral grandeur which instrumentally constitutes their binding obligation.” Our thanks are due to the correspondent who called attention to the error.

**ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.**—At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, at Salem, June 26th, Mr. Isaac Law was, according to due order, licensed to preach the gospel. At a meeting of the same presbytery, in Hebron, July 10th, Archibald Reid was, in like manner, licensed to preach the gospel.

**BEAUTIES OF SLAVERY.**—A minister of the gospel, an old-school Presbyterian in one of the Southern States, advertises Sixty Slaves for sale, first rate *fellows and wenches*, that he may devote himself entirely to the work of the ministry!

**ANOTHER.**—A man was recently Lynched at Richmond, Va., for expressing abolition sentiments. These items are noticed as a sample of the actual state of affairs in this land of boasted liberty, law and religion.

**PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE JEWS.**—In the latest accounts which have been received from Mr. Nicolayson, who conducts the Mission at Jerusalem, it is stated, that the services of the Missionaries, in the Hebrew language, are attended by about 400 Jews, of whom about one-fourth part profess Christianity.

**JEWISH CONVERTS.**—Dr. Tholuck, of Germany, states, as an undoubted fact, that more proselytes to Christianity have been made from the Jews during the last twenty years, than in the first age of the church. This remark is made of the Jews on the continent. In the capital of Silesia there have been many conversions. The Royal Consistory of Silesia state, that from 1820 to 1834, no fewer than 247 individuals of the Jewish nation were baptized in the Protestant communion, and 10 in that of the Roman Catholics; making a total of 455 in 15 years. In 1835, thirty Israelites were baptized, and 26 in 1836, of whom only three were baptized in the Romish communion. In 1837, the number of baptisms was 43.

**SPEAK EVIL OF NO MAN.**—In a funeral discourse, by the Rev. Dr. Burder, of New England, occasioned by the death of Mrs. Clayton, the following anecdote is related.

“A certain person was dealing out accusatory and acrimonious remarks very liberally around him, and turning to Mrs. Clayton, and with an air and tone of rudeness rebuking her for silence, said, ‘Well, now I am determined to have your opinion.’ She coolly replied, ‘Why, sir, I had rather be excused from giving it.’ He rejoined,

'We must and will have it, for we live in times in which we ought to show our colours.' 'Well, sir,' she added, 'my opinion is this, that gentlemen had better keep their razors to shave their own faces, and not employ them to cut and slash every body who does not think exactly as they do. I also think, sir, that Paul judged the same, when he said to Titus, 'Put them in mind to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men.' Several pious friends are living who can confirm this statement, and who can recollect the effect produced on the whole company by the sudden check thus given to uncharitableness.'

**ORIENTAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.**—The following illustrations of Scripture are taken from the entertaining and instructive "Sketches of a Missionary's Travels in Egypt, Syria, Western Africa," &c., by Mr. Macbriar, the author of the Mandingo Grammar, and the translator of the Gospels into that language, a portion of which has been printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society.—*Lon. Obs.*

"The town of Beyrout is mean and confined, is surrounded by walls, and contains a motley group of inhabitants. Its environs, however, are pretty. I was much struck with the narrowness of the high-roads, and the shocking state of disrepair in which they are suffered to remain; and several passages of Scripture came to my mind, as being here finely illustrated. Foremost was that of Balaam and his ass. Many, like myself, have wondered how a public way could be so narrow as not to admit of a man passing by an ass; as it is written, 'But the angel of the Lord stood in a path of the vineyards, a wall being on this side, and a wall on that side; and the angel of the Lord went farther, and stood in a narrow place where there was no way to turn either to the right hand or to the left; and the ass fell down,' &c. (See Numbers xxii. 24, &c.) But in this neighbourhood a complete picture of such a place was frequently set before my view.

The gardens and orchards are embanked, so as to prevent the soil from being washed away by the heavy rains, which fall twice a year; and the road between them is generally only a few feet wide, being in some places so narrow that two asses could not pass each other; and much less could a loaded beast pass by a man standing in the middle of the path. The roads are full of stones; no care whatever being taken to clear away those hinderances which the rain washes down into them; so that the greatest circumspection is requisite for a foot-passenger, lest he stumble and fall; a circumstance which gives much force to the promise made in Psalm xci., that God's angels 'shall bare thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.' The ways are frequently so steep, that flights of stairs are made in them; and the beasts have to go up and down the steps with burdens upon their backs; and as the whole country is very mountainous and destitute of level roads, horses are rarely used, in comparison with asses and mules; the latter, which are of a superior breed, being much more sure-footed than the former. This fact accounts for the prophets and great men of old riding upon what we would esteem an inferior kind of animal, though actually more highly prized in such hilly districts. Fine horses are, however, used by grandees in the cities and plains."

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

NOVEMBER, 1840.

---

ART. I.—*Symbolical Language of Scripture.* No. IV.

THE *seasons* of the year are sometimes, though not often, employed as symbols. *Harvest* is most frequently mentioned, and as it naturally suggests to us, (1.) The results of former labours, (2.) A time of cutting down, and (3.) A time of gathering precious fruits, its meaning when used as a figure is corresponding, and readily determined by its connexion.

1. When connected with summer it has the first meaning, as Jer. viii. 20: "The harvest is past and the summer is ended, and we are not saved." That is, the whole season of opportunities has passed unimproved, and the time when we should have reaped the benefit of former diligence has of course produced us no good. 2. When it is considered as the time of cutting down, it signifies a season of judgment, as Joel iii. 13: "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe." This is, as it were, the word of command to the executioners of divine wrath, to proceed and cut down these sinners, for the time of their judgment was come. Rev. xiv. 14, 15, 16, is the same figure with the very same meaning. The *vintage* may be considered as the same symbol; it occurs in connexion with the harvest in the two passages just named. Hosea vi. 11: "Also, O Judah, he hath set a harvest for thee."—That is, a time of judgment will come upon thee. 3. When the harvest is considered as a time of in-gathering, it signifies a time of great mercy by the bringing of many to God. Mat. ix. 37, 38: "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few," &c. That is, there are vast multitudes ready to be gathered into the gospel church by the ministry of the word, and very few as yet to preach it. 4. *Winter* occurs only once as a symbol, namely, Song ii. 11, already considered.

*The Sea* is frequently employed as a symbol, and may be considered either in its raging, confusion, and destructive power, or as to its depth and vast extent. In respect of the first, it signifies, 1. Many people in a state of war and tumult. We have this interpretation expressly given, Rev. xvii. 15. Accordingly, Jer. li. 4: "The sea is come up upon Babylon," signifies that the multitudes of raging enemies have overwhelmed her. (Though it has also a literal fulfilment.) Dan. vii. 3: "And four great beasts came up from the sea." That is, they rose among the nations, amidst the tumults of war. The same occurs, Rev. vii. 2. 2. The sea, considered as to its depth, means

that which is utterly lost, or that which cannot be found out. Mic. vii. 19: "Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." That is, freely pardon and remove them, so that they shall no more be found to stand against them. Ps. lxxvii. 19: "Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters." So awfully mysterious that we cannot fathom or find them out, as it follows in the next words of the psalm. Rev. viii. 8: "And as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea." It was not only overthrown, but so completely destroyed as to be lost for ever. I am aware, that this expression is generally interpreted somewhat differently; but to cast anything into the sea, undoubtedly is the total loss of it, as is plain in the passage last mentioned. And as the same figure is explained, Rev. xviii. 21, therefore it is most natural and easy to understand it so here. Rev. xxi. 1: "For the first heavens and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea." The sea here signifies the rage and tumults of conflicting nations, as it is opposed to the peace and happiness characterizing the period described. Rev. xv. 2: "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand upon the sea of glass, having the harps of God." The figure here is mainly in the description or properties of this sea; it is of glass, that is, pure and clear water, which together with fire are the chief agents in purifying and refining, denoting here the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, mingling with the severe afflictions of the faithful as the great means of their final and glorious victory. *Floods* has the same general meaning as the sea. Ps. xxix. 10: "The Lord sitteth upon the flood." Ps. xciii. 3, 4: "The floods have lifted up, O Lord, the floods lift up their voice, the floods lift up their waves. The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea." The meaning of both passages is plainly the same, namely: The Lord rules and overrules all the nations amidst all their confusions. 4. Floods, considered as to their overwhelming depth, signify affliction. Song viii. 7: "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it." No variety, or amount of suffering can extinguish genuine love to Christ. Ps. xxxii. 6: "Surely in the floods of great waters, they shall not come nigh unto him." The greatest trouble cannot affect his standing in Christ. The same figure occurs, Ps. lxxix. 1, 2, 15.

*Rivers* naturally suggest to us, (1.) An abundance of water for drink or fertilizing the earth. (2.) Great and dangerous waters. (3.) Divisions of the land. As a symbol, it is most frequently taken under the first consideration. And (1.) When rivers are represented as fertilizing the earth, it signifies divine ordinances, and means of grace, Ps. xlv. 4: "There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God;" namely, the holy place, the holy ordinances of his house. Isa. xli. 18: "I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar," &c. That is, I will give abundance of ordinances to be enjoyed in all parts of the earth. Isa. xxxv. 7, is a figure of the same import. Ezek. xlvii. 6, 7: "Then he brought me, and caused me to return to the brink of the river. Now when I had returned, behold at the bank of the river, were very many trees, on the one side, and on the other," &c. Rev. xxii. 1: "And he showed me a pure river



of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." Both figures and prophecies are the same, and denote the abundance of gospel ordinances in purity that shall be enjoyed at the time referred to.

2. When rivers or waters are considered as affording drink they signify the comfortable influences of the Holy Spirit; this idea is very frequently connected with the preceding. Isa. xliii. 20: "The beasts of the field shall honour me, the dragons and the owls: because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen." Isa. lv. 1: "Ho, every one that thirsteth! come ye to the waters." In both places the figure denotes not only ordinances, but also true spiritual enjoyment by means of them. Ps. cx. vii: "He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head." I am aware of the many criticisms that have been made on this brook, but it is plain that it is here considered as affording drink; and drink is comfort and refreshment: these, again, are spiritually from no other source than the Holy Spirit.

3. Rivers, considered as dangerous situations, signify much the same thing as flood or deep waters; namely, great and calamitous suffering. Isa. xliii. 2: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee." Jer. xii. 5: "Then how wilt thou do in the swelling of Jordan." That is, in the greatest trials and dangers that are coming.

4. Rivers, considered as divisions or boundaries of land, signify the tribes or nations of these lands. Isai. viii. 7: "Now, therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many;" that is, as it immediately follows, "The king of Assyria and all his glory, and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks." Isai. xviii. 2: "—A nation meted out and trodden down, whose land the rivers have spoiled." Whose land the various nations have overrun, divided, and desolated.

*Waters, wells, and fountains.* Water in any situation may be considered, 1. As to its purifying property. 2. In a fountain or well as satisfying to thirst. 3. As flowing and continually extending. According to these ideas, we find its symbolical meaning.

1. When considered as purifying, it signifies the blood of Christ applied by the Holy Spirit. Ezek. xxxvi. 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean;" denoting the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. Zech. xiii. 1: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." That is, there shall be a full exhibition of Christ, in the perfect efficacy of his finished work.

2. A fountain or well, considered as affording drink, is of the same signification as rivers, before noticed, namely, the means of enjoyment: it has, however, a respect to the permanency of these means. John iv. 14: "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him, a well of" living "water, springing up into everlasting life." Our Lord here means the word of life, sent home to the heart by the Spirit. Isai. xii. 3: "Therefore, with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." That is, ye shall have great comfort and benefit, in waiting on ordinances. Rev. viii. 10, 11: "And there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it had been a lamp,

and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of water,—and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.” Signifying that at the time referred to, all ordinances would be so utterly poisoned with error in the Romish communion as to destroy instead of refreshing souls.

3. Waters or fountains, considered as flowing and extending, signify posterity, who proceed from parents like the various streams from a fountain. Num. xxiv. 7: “He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters;” that is, he shall have a numerous posterity, who shall spread into many nations. Isa. xlviii. 1: A similar figure of the same import. Prov. v. 16: “Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad.” That is, let thy posterity be numerous. Deut. xxxiii. 28: “The fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine.” Ps. lxviii. 26: “Bless the Lord, from the fountain of Israel.” In both of these passages the cause is put for the effect, the fountain for those who come of the fountain, that is, the posterity of Jacob.

4. To dry up a river or fountain, may be easily understood by the preceding remarks, namely, the diminishing or destroying of the power and prosperity of a people. Isai. xi. 15: “And the Lord shall utterly destroy the bay of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod.” Chap. xix. 5, 6: “And the water shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and dried up; and they shall turn the rivers far away, and the brooks of defence shall be emptied and dried up.”—Zech. x. 11: “And he shall pass through the sea with affliction, and shall smite the waves in the sea, and all the deeps of the river shall dry up.” These three places are one and the same prophecy, and the meaning of them all is given in the words that immediately follow; namely, “The pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away.” Hosea xiii. 15: “His springs shall become dry, and his fountains shall be dried up.” That is, all his prosperity, whether it consist in riches, privileges, or children, shall cease. See also Rev. xvi. 12.

*Mountains, valleys, hills and high places.* These naturally suggest to us several ideas: 1. Mountains and hills are elevated and valleys are depressed more than the generality of country. 2. Mountains, &c. are remarkable for their greatness and strength. 3. They are generally most barren, and destitute of moisture. 4. All these objects form great hinderances, or difficulties to travel. Therefore,

1. Mountains, considered in respect to their height, signify a state of honour and prosperity. Ps. xxx. 7: “Lord, by thy favour thou hast made my mountain to stand strong.” That is, thou didst uphold me in a condition of prosperity and exaltation. Isai. ii. 14: “The day of the Lord shall be upon all the high mountains, and upon all the hills that are lifted up.”—The meaning follows, verse 17: “The loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low.” In this sense, however, the expression *high places* is more frequently used. Deut. xxxii. 13: “He made him ride on the high places of the earth.” That is, made him most eminent and honourable among the nations. Isa. lviii. 14, we have the same figure, with the same signification. 2 Sam. xxii. 34: “He setteth me upon my high places.” That is, in safety and honour.

2. A valley naturally signifies the opposite of a high place, namely, a state of humiliation. Ps. xxiii. 4: "Yea, though I walk in the valley of the shadow of death." Ps. lxxxiv. 6: "Who, passing through the valley of Baca." Baca, signifying *weeping*, both passages mean a state of deep distress and humiliation. Song vi. 11: "I went down into the garden of nuts to see the fruits of the valley." That is, the fruits of holiness, found most abundant in a state of humiliation.

3. Mountains and hills, considered as to their greatness and durability, signify kingdoms. Ps. lxxviii. 16: "Why leap ye, ye high hills?" the kingdoms of the world exult in their worldly greatness; "this is the hill which God desires to dwell in."—The church is the kingdom of Christ. Isai. ii. 2: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and exalted above the hills." The church and kingdom of Christ shall be established in the greatest honour in all the kingdoms of the world. Mic. iv. 1: The same, and Dan. ii. 35. Jer. li. 25: "Behold, I am against thee, O destroying mountain;" namely, the kingdom of Babylon. Rev. viii. 8, is the same.

4. Considered as to their barrenness, mountains and high places signify the most rude heathen nations. Ps. lxxii. 16: "There shall be a handful of corn in the earth, upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon." The seed of the word shall take root and be abundantly fruitful even in the most rude parts of the earth. Isa. xli. 15: "I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys." That is, I will establish gospel ordinances in the most remote and savage lands, in the most unlikely places, and in all places.

5. Considered as hindering intercourse, mountains and valleys both signify all kinds of difficulties, dangers and enemies to the object desired. Zech. iv. 7: "Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain." That is, the great labour and complicated difficulties and opposition in rebuilding the city and temple should be completely overcome. Isai. xli. 15: "Thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and shalt make the hills as chaff." Thou shalt come off more than conqueror over all opposition and enemies. Song ii. 8: "Behold he cometh leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills." Christ in the greatness of his love to his people comes at once over many things that might be hinderances to his holding communion with them. Isa. xl. 4: "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low," &c. Chap. xlix. 11: "I will make all my mountains a way, and my high places shall be exalted." These passages are the same prophecy, and signify the removal of every obstruction, and the opening of a plain and direct way for the accomplishment of God's good promise in its time.

6. For the mountains and hills to smoke, to melt, or to be overthrown, signifies the *effect* of God's power in subduing the difficulties of his people, or his wrath in destroying their enemies. Ps. civ. 32: "He toucheth the hills, and they smoke." Ps. cxliv. 5, to the same purpose; namely, the least stroke of his hand is sufficient to consume the greatness of worldly power. Isa. lxiv. 1. 2: "—That thou wouldst come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence." The meaning follows: "to make thy name known to

their adversaries, that the nations may tremble at thy presence." Jer. xxxi. 25: "Behold I am against thee, O destroying mountain—I will roll thee down from the rocks, and make thee a burnt mountain." The overthrow and utter desolation of Babylon, by the wrath of God, is here foretold.

---

**ART. II.—*Plan of a School for preparing young Men to enter upon the Study of Theology in the Associate Church.***

[Although the following letter has not yet been laid before the presbyteries to which it is addressed, yet its public character seems to justify its insertion in the Monitor, especially as this will give the members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Philadelphia a better opportunity to examine the subject.]

To the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia:

DEAR BRETHREN,—At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, at Argyle, on the 4th inst. (Aug.) the subscriber was appointed to address you and solicit your co-operation in devising and carrying into effect a plan for establishing a school, or seminary, for the special purpose of preparing young men for the study of theology in our church.

The following Report of the committee appointed to draught a plan for carrying into effect the direction of the Synod at its late meeting in Baltimore, enjoining Presbyteries to take more efficient measures to aid and encourage young men of suitable qualifications, in preparing themselves for the work of the ministry, though not very particularly examined, was so far approved as to direct it to be laid before their sister Presbyteries of Philadelphia and Albany, and to request their views on the matters submitted as soon as practicable.

REPORT.—By a reference to the statistical tables published in the last minutes of synod, it is evident that the whole number of ministers in the Associate Church is by no means adequate to supply in a proper manner the congregations already organized. From that table it appears that there are at this time two hundred and twenty organized congregations under the care of the different presbyteries; and to supply these with divine ordinances, there are, as it appears from that table, only ninety-seven ministers. Of those who are included in that list, it is now known that five or six, by the operation of the necessary discipline of the church, have been suspended from the exercise of the office of the ministry. The services of two or three others, from age and other circumstances, can scarcely be considered available to the church: so that at present, even with the addition of six preachers from the student's roll this year, the whole ministerial force fit for service in the church does not exceed ninety, averaging nearly two and a half congregations to each minister. There must then be at least 130 congregations in the Associate Church in this country destitute of public ordinances every sabbath day. Besides, the minutes of synod for several years past show frequent earnest applications for supply of gospel ordinances from various quarters where there are as yet no organized congregations, and these applications have, in not a few instances, been altogether neglected for want of ministers and preachers to send. Indeed, all the supply which such places at any time get, is just so much more

withdrawn from the organized congregations. How, then, it may be asked, can the church under such circumstances extend her missionary operations. All that is done in the missionary field, must be taken from her own children, not now receiving more than one third of the spiritual provision they need and ought to have: it is obvious, then, that the first and main effort of the Associate Church should be to increase her ministerial force with pastors and teachers after God's own heart, to aid and encourage young men of approved piety and suitable gifts, and who understand, and with an honest heart love the principles of our public profession. There can be no question then, but that it is the pressing duty of the several Presbyteries to take the most efficient measures to carry into effect the design of the synod's directions. The present question is, How can it be most successfully done? In order to answer this question to advantage, it may be profitable to inquire briefly into the causes of this deficiency of ministerial help. The backwardness of the sons of the church to come to her help is no new complaint. "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth, neither is there any to take her by the hand of all the sons that she hath brought up." (Isa. xl. 18.) It is to be feared that the want is not felt in a right manner, either by those who enjoy the stated dispensation of gospel ordinances, or by those who are destitute; and because the want is not felt, there is not sufficient earnest and believing pleading with God for pastors and teachers according to his heart; and those who engage in that work unsent, sooner or later prove a curse instead of a blessing to the church. All promised blessings must be sought from God in believing prayer: "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find." Our blessed Lord, in the days of his flesh, "was moved with compassion when he saw the destitute multitudes, because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he send labourers into his harvest." (Matt. ix. 38.) It is his will that his people should *ask* labourers from him; and because they do not *ask*, he does not send.

Another cause may be found in the negligence of the friends of Zion, in using the means necessary to aid and encourage suitable youths to devote themselves to preparation for the work of the ministry by acquiring the necessary education. As our Synod has remarked, "Heretofore this matter has been left to the choice of the youth themselves, to the inclination of parents and guardians, and to their private means of effecting their object." But some, for want of means, are discouraged from attempting to prepare themselves: too many parents, feeling but little concern about their own salvation, and consequently less about the salvation of others, would rather see their sons pursuing some more lucrative course of life, dissuade rather than encourage them to devote themselves to the work of the ministry. Others, again, who in youth feel sufficiently disposed to engage in that work, but meeting with no encouragement from others, and in addition to this, not having the control of means, their time passes on until they become so far advanced in life, as on that account to be discouraged. But there is still another, and probably a more serious difficulty than any of these, which pious parents (who prefer

Jerusalem above their chief joy) have to contend with, particularly in devoting their sons to study at that age which would be most suitable: and this is the difficulty of finding a proper place where they can intrust their sons at that tender age most suitable, without being exposed to many and powerful temptations, dangerous both to their moral habits and religious principles. This is particularly felt by many in the Associate Church, who would rather see their sons "faithful labourers" in the harvest field of the Lord, than most successfully laying up for themselves the most abundant riches of earthly productions; who would rather see them in the employment of the King of kings, as ambassadors for Jesus Christ, than occupying the throne of the most potent monarch on earth. It is a fact deeply to be lamented, that in most of the public literary institutions in our country, there is a great want of the right kind of attention to the religious instruction of youth; and it is almost impossible that in most of them it can be otherwise, as they are at present constituted. If the student pay an external regard to religion and religious institutions, most public seminaries attend no farther to his religious instruction, and in many it would not be desirable that they should. The youthful student is then left to the influence of his room-mates, or more intimate associates, to imbibe such particular sentiments as these may happen to entertain; and thus the hopes and fond expectations of many a pious parent have been blasted. If a temporary religious excitement gets up in our public schools, it is generally marked with wild and visionary features, often more fatal to the cultivation of true scriptural Christian principles than the most cold indifference. The religious instruction which the youth, and especially one who is training up for the ministry needs, is that of the parent who watches for the soul of his child as one who must give account of his trust, and who feels a true concern in the spiritual and eternal welfare of his child. The child who is rightly trained up in his religious education in the family, imbibes his sentiments, not so much from the instructions he receives in precepts and directions, as from the influence of the daily deportment and example of those with whom he associates. The child who is sent from under the parental roof, before his religious principles are thus formed, unless it be into another family where all his associates are under the continued influence of sound religious principles, is continually exposed to embrace whatever principles chance or circumstances may throw in his way. Parents, who are properly sensible of the actual danger to which they expose their sons, by sending them to most of the public schools, or colleges, will not venture upon it without a trembling fear for the consequences, until they see their principles fully formed and established.

But there is still another difficulty in the way, which every minister of the gospel who has turned his attention seriously to this subject must have felt, and that is the unsuitableness and defectiveness of the present course of study in most if not all our colleges, as a foundation for the study of theology. We would not complain so much of the *unsuitableness* of any branch of human knowledge, if such did not supersede and really displace those that are essential or highly important. It must be admitted that ethics, mental philosophy, philology and classical learning, which are essential, as a proper foundation for the study of theology, receive now a much less share of at-

tention than they did in some ages past, when truth was sought with more diligence, ardour, and scrutiny than at present.

If these observations be well founded, it must be obvious that the subject is one of deep importance, and should engage the attention of the church. Indeed, if it be admitted, as it universally is, that some preparatory education is necessary to the study of theology, why, it may be asked, should not the church provide for and superintend that preparatory education, as well as that she should provide for and superintend the studies of her students in theology. It is believed that observation and experience will prove that it is equally necessary and equally important in order to keep up a well supplied, sound, and thoroughly educated ministry.

The remedy, it is believed, will be found in the several presbyteries taking up the subject, and carrying into effect in the most efficient manner practicable, the directions of synod; and in most cases it is believed that this can be most successfully done by each presbytery, (or, where the presbyteries are so situated that two or three can unite,) establishing a school or seminary for the special object of preparing students for the study of theology. The church under the Old Testament had her schools for the sons; that is, the prophets. Under the New Testament dispensation, each of the apostles seems to have been attended by some who were preparing for the work of the ministry.

Before attempting to point out any plan for carrying into effect the object proposed, it may be proper to notice some of the objections, which are usually brought against the adoption of any public measures for supplying the church with ministers of the word. Some of these, at first sight, may appear not altogether without weight. It may be said, that to increase the facilities or diminish the difficulties of obtaining a suitable education for a gospel minister, may have a tendency to fill the church with an indolent, time-serving, or otherwise unworthy ministry. It is admitted, that no human care will be sufficient at all times to prevent hypocrites from entering the church, and even the ministry,—and the Head of the church sometimes permits such to enter the church for his own wise purposes; “for there must be also heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you.” (1 Cor. ix. 19.) But the longer candidates for the ministry are under the inspection and supervision of the overseers of the church, will certainly not increase the facility of unworthy persons gaining admission into the ministry. Yet after all the care and vigilance that human prudence can exercise, it is to her omniscient Head that the church must look for faithful pastors: “Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.” (Psa. cxxvii. 1.) It is **JEHOVAH** alone that can give his church “pastors according to his own heart, to feed her with knowledge and understanding;” and he has expressly promised to do it. Hence it is that our Lord so strictly enjoined his disciples to “pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest.” (Mat. ix. 37.) And whatever it is the duty of the church to pray for, it is certain that she should use the ordinary means of obtaining.

But it may be farther objected, that the work of the gospel ministry is of such a nature that none ought to enter upon it who have not made it the object of their free and deliberate choice, and who do

not give reasonable evidence that they have been moved to make that choice by the Holy Spirit: therefore, to educate youths for that purpose before they have made that choice, or are capable of making it, is not the right way to provide the church with ministers. "It is better to wait till candidates come forward to offer themselves." The premises in this objection are admitted, but the conclusion is denied. None ever engaged in the gospel ministry from right motives, or with correct views, who are not deeply convinced that to promote the eternal salvation of sinners is a great and important work, highly glorifying to God; and none are ever truly convinced of this but by the Holy Spirit, who operates on the human mind by the instrumentality of means; and no means are more frequently blessed for leading the minds of youth to choose that which is good and acceptable in the sight of God, than early instruction and right education. Hence the proverb, "Train up a child in the way that he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." (Prov. xxii. 6.) Hannah's early devoting of the child Samuel to the ministry of God, in the service of the tabernacle, seems to have met with the approbation of God, and to have been attended with the most happy and blessed effects. Samuel's parents doubtless took all due pains by a suitable education to qualify him for the service for which he was intended, and we have no reason to doubt that the means used for this purpose were accompanied with much earnest prayer for the blessing, and their success. And why should not religious parents, pursuing a similar course, look still for similar results? The services of Samuel proved a great blessing to the church of God and mankind. The same thing might in a great measure be illustrated from the case of Timothy. He was instructed from infancy or childhood in the knowledge most suitable for the services to which he was afterwards called, and the happiest results were manifest. Let parents, let the church train up youths for the work of the ministry by taking a suitable care of their education: let them diligently seek the blessing of Zion's King upon their efforts, and soon shall the company of those who publish the gospel be great. It is only when we diligently use the appropriate means, that we can look for the divine blessing, and that we can confidently hope that our exertions will be crowned with success.

We think, then, it may safely be concluded, that no very serious or at least unanswerable objection can be brought against the public interference of the church with this subject, so important to the interests of the church and so loudly called for by the circumstances in which our Zion is at present placed.

To accomplish the object proposed, the following plan is respectfully suggested; namely,

1. That this Presbytery take measures to raise by subscription, donation, or otherwise, funds to establish on the cheapest and most economical plan practicable, an academy or high school, for the purpose of preparing for the study of theology young men to serve the church, either as stated pastors or missionaries, as the church may direct, and Providence open the door for them.

2. That the institution thus established be under the care and immediate superintendence of this Presbytery; or, if any other presbytery or presbyteries shall co-operate with it in accomplishing the object proposed, such presbytery or presbyteries shall have an equal participation in its management and oversight.



3. That the main object of this school shall be the education of young men for the gospel ministry, either as missionaries or fixed pastors, as their services may be most required: hence, the course of study to be pursued shall be such as will most directly tend to prepare them for the study of theology and their intended work.

4. That the presbytery or presbyteries shall provide the instructors, fix the course of study, shall judge when it is sufficiently completed, and shall also, at stated times, at least twice a year, diligently visit the school, hear the report of the instructors, and examine into the progress, the religious and moral deportment of the students, faithfully dealing with individuals as their case may require, and do all the duties of a board of trustees of said school.

5. That as soon as practicable a site shall be located for the school, convenient to a place of public worship in some one of the congregations of this presbytery, where economy, cheapness, and convenience can be best consulted.

6. In the whole management of the school, it shall be the design of the presbytery to make it attended with as little expense as possible consistent with the attainment of the end, and it shall also be the design of presbytery to extend, as far as practicable, assistance to such as need it, according to the directions of synod.

7. That students offering themselves with a view to prepare for the study of theology, and youths whose parents or guardians may wish to have them educated with this view, or others wishing to pursue any of the studies taught in said school, provided this latter class can be admitted without detriment to the interests of the former, shall be received as students.

It was resolved at the aforementioned meeting of this presbytery, to solicit the co-operation of the presbyteries of Philadelphia and Albany in establishing a school with the above design, on the plan here proposed, or the best plan that can be devised.

By order of Presbytery.

JAMES P. MILLER.

*Argyle, N. Y., August 11, 1840.*

### ART. III.—*Crosses on Protestant Places of Worship.*

WHEN we change our position, the object at which we had been formerly looking will be found to present, to some extent, a different appearance. All are aware of this, but all do not seem to be aware of the change that may be produced in our minds, and the extent to which our moral sentiments may be affected, sometimes by simply changing the position of the same object. It is almost impossible to conceive the effect that would be produced on a Protestant congregation, were the cross that has long stood conspicuous on the outside of the church to be found some Sabbath morning placed on the top of the pulpit. In any one of the congregations, we venture to affirm, that more than one Janet Geddes would be found ready to hurl a stool, or some other instrument of destruction, at the idol; and in no long time, the Nehushtan would be pounded to atoms, or committed to the flames; while the person who had dared to transfer the obnoxious thing from the outside to the inside of the church, would require for his protection a better defence than the logic of the schoolmen,

or the liberal opinions of the moderns. Nor would the Cathari spend time in inquiring whether the thing that has so offended them underwent any change in its nature by changing its position. It is enough that it is now found in the inside of the church. On the top of the spire it was regarded with indifference—on the top of the pulpit it is viewed with intolerable aversion, and out it is thrown with becoming Christian indignation.

Now, were we standing by, we should say, this is right—this is a piece of church reform—out with it—smash it—burn it—it ought not to be there. Papists may call this impiety. High churchmen may sneer at it, and if they choose, call it the wicked fanaticism of Knox. While those who pretend to liberal views may hint, that a cross can do no more harm on the top of a pulpit than on the church spire. This may be true; but our question is, why should it be on either—what have Protestant churches to do with crosses? For is a cross not the same thing, to all intents and purposes, whether placed on the summit of a mountain or above the altar of a cathedral? The Papist thinks it the same sacred thing—a thing to be adored wherever it is seen. In this he is consistent. The views we hold are widely different from this; and our views are also consistent; for we regard it as a mere piece of wood, yet withal very mischievous; and even when gilded, or were it solid gold, we have no reverence for it, but hate the very sight of it wherever it is seen, but never so intensely as when we happen to see it in Protestant places of worship. Let it not be inferred that crosses are frequently seen on Presbyterian churches. Indeed, we do not know a single Presbyterian church in the province that has a cross on it. We wish we could say the same thing regarding all Presbyterian places of worship in other parts of the world. Yet we are not aware that the thing is very common with our denomination in any country. With the Episcopal church nothing is more common. And we perceive, in this province, the custom we are reprehending is obtaining countenance, or rather, we should say, is giving countenance to others from a very high quarter. We were truly grieved, when lately in the city, to see the splendid Episcopal cathedral desecrated by a flaming gilded cross placed on the top of the spire. We do not take upon us to say what the motives were of those who put up that cross. But we repeat, to us it would not be more offensive had it been placed in any part of the inside of the building. The thing is the same wherever it is placed. Protestants ought not to have crosses in their places of worship. Conventional authority is in all cases something, and in many cases it is much. Now, by conventional authority—and all the world knows this—the cross is the *sign of the beast*, the *armorial bearings* of Popish Rome. Surely all good protestants ought to avoid the *badge* of that corrupt and persecuting church. And this will be done by all who are sincere in the *grand protest* that has been made.

It is true, that those who are but partially Protestant in their heart will see but little harm, and possibly some good, in crosses. If they have leanings to Popery, they may find this a suitable way of expressing their affection. We do fear this, in many cases, is the true explanation of the matter. Without any reference to individuals, may we not suppose, that the cross on a Protestant church is used, not unfrequently, as a sort of telegraph by which a commu-

nication is delicately kept up with the old Lady of the Seven Hills. May she not in this way be informed, that although some of her children have departed far, very far from her maternal care, still they have not forgotten *all* the lessons she has taught them, and in good time may yet—return. This telegraphic power of the cross may do more than the simple are aware of. But the thing may work in another way. Suppose a poor ignorant Papist, who hardly knows any thing more of his religion than to make the sign of the cross, and who regards it with reverence when he sees it, such a man cannot but look with some degree of respect at Protestant places of worship on which the object is placed, and must surely look upon such Protestants as not very far from the *true faith*, and no very bad heretics, at least, not nearly so bad as those who have no crosses on their churches. How far this may tend to confirm the man in his errors, will depend upon circumstances which we do not stop to notice. This, however, seems plain, that it may afford no small consolation to the Papist, if he ever needs such consolation, that he is so much safer, who has the whole of the spiritual apparatus at his service, than those who have only a part. But then, in the eyes of many, it is a main part. Let those who choose, talk of the sister church of Rome, and put up the symbol of relationship—we repudiate both the language and the sign, and in this case the thing signified. Yet symbols tend more to union than the simple think. The clear-headed understand this. And this will be found especially true among those with whom symbols constitute nearly every thing, and abstract truth is regarded as next to nothing.

Still, it is said, Protestants do not put up crosses as Roman Catholics do, to adore them. We do not accuse them of this, and yet, the respect, or reverence paid to such things, has its degrees. The Papist reveres the cross in a high degree. Some Protestants we know have revered it in a low degree: both we regard as in error, although both are not chargeable with the same amount of error. We put the simple question, why put up a cross at all? The answer of the Papist is ready, and it has the advantage of being explicit. All know what it is. On the other hand, the Protestant talks of it, as a matter of taste, an ornament, a thing that can do no harm, and may do some good; and above all, that the Gothic order requires it. Gothic, indeed; if we may be allowed a pun on such a serious object. So, we doubt not, thought the Waldenses, when they beheld it blazoned on those banners which were waved by the faithful servants of the church, over many a ruined village and many a desolated valley. Truly the visible cross has been to millions the sign of more than Gothic barbarity. How often have superstition, fanaticism, and hypocrisy mustered their respective bands under it, and then led them on to deeds of unutterable ferocity! Now this is one reason, and a very sufficient reason it is, why we dislike to see the cross on Protestant churches. It has, as we have already said, been made the sign and badge of Popish Rome. Let her keep it. The sign is all she has. In her hands, to the world a dreadful sign. We have the thing signified. We need not a cross of wood to teach us the glories of redemption. It can teach nothing of salvation which we may not know as fully had we never seen it. The believing penitent thinks not of the cross of wood, but of the glorious personage who died upon it. What can a piece of wood tell of God's justice, truth, and

holiness? or of his law and its claims, and its penalty, of man's guilt and his impotency? or of the person of Christ, and his glorious work, and his ability and willingness to save sinners? These are the precious truths on which Paul had his eye when he gloried in the cross of Christ, and these are the truths which must be understood and embraced by all who, like him, shall glory in that cross. But what of these does a piece of wood teach or illustrate? Preposterous folly! "To the law and to the testimony," is the declaration of Protestants; and those who have gone to the "living oracles of God," for their knowledge of salvation. What can they learn, what do they need to learn on this matter, from a cross of wood? Those who do not possess information drawn from the word of God, cannot obtain a single thought, or a single holy feeling from any symbol or relic. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself," "this is my blood shed for the remission of sins," "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," are but a few of a multitude of similar declarations which might be adduced; and we fear not to affirm, that any one of these, received by the authority of God, will do infinitely more to enlighten and console the mind than all the crosses in the world. Persons who make a show of wisdom or moderation by uttering truisms, may tell us that the best thing may be abused. We deny that a cross in the hand of a friar, or on the top of a spire, was ever a good thing. We ask, what good has it done, or can it do? It were indeed difficult to answer this. But it would not be difficult to show that it has done, and is still doing incalculable mischief. It is a grand instrument of superstition. This is enough to condemn it. Nor will it do to reply, that, according to our reasoning, all signs and symbols ought to be banished from the church, because they have been abused. We shall meet the objection here supposed, when once it is proved that the cross was appointed by God to the church as a sign or symbol. It is true it answered *one great* end, the Saviour died on it. But this end answered, the thing itself was to have no place among the symbols of religion. The brazen serpent put up by Moses, served an important purpose. That purpose accomplished, the value of the thing was at an end. But the Jews preserved it, and at length worshipped it. Many in the same way worship the cross. Yet we are told, the cross on churches may produce pious thoughts and divine emotions. A pile of grass may do this if the heart be right with God. But is it true that in those countries in which crosses every where meet the eye, the people are distinguished by piety and virtue? Is it so in Italy, or Spain? There, there is no want of crosses. The robber stabs you with a stiletto, the handle of which is embossed with the figure of a cross, and when he bends down to take your money, another cross suspended round his neck dangles in your face, and you are robbed amidst jingling of crosses and the sound of saints' names. It is indeed a thing that requires no proof, that in those Christian countries in which the traveller sees no cross he finds the *cross of Christ* best understood and revered.

Yet how often do we hear Protestants prate thus: A cross, if kept on the outside of a church, can do no harm and may do good. Then take it to the inside, and, that the amount of good may be increased, put an image upon it, and surround it with holy relics. Make the apparatus as complete as possible that the ignorant vulgar, (the phrase is a Popish phrase) who cannot think on any thing, may at least see something which may do good to their souls. This is the language (and the prac-

tice is in keeping with it) of the Romish priesthood. For certain very important ends, important to them, they have sunk the minds of men into the grossest ignorance, and have turned religion into show and fancy. Hence it is, that Popery has not only subverted Christianity, but has also seriously injured the human mind, speaking of mind in the language of the metaphysician. Within the circle which the priest draws, the intellect and the heart cannot enter. The senses and imagination, alone, find admission, and in the service of the Popish Church, they alone are called into exercise. This is placing human nature in a condition the most deplorable that can well be conceived; and this sufficiently accounts for the combination of superstition and fanaticism, which has been so often witnessed in the Church of Rome. Human beings thus in a sense deprived of intellect and heart, are in a fit state for being amused with the beggarly elements of monkish trumpery, such as crosses and relics.

In fact, the Protestant who conceives that such things can in any way be serviceable to religion, is in the worst sense more than half a Papist. And we venture to affirm, that the man who holds such views, only requires the spur of a motive (and not a very powerful touch) in order to make him pass into that church, which he has been taught to regard, from a similarity in certain symbols, as a sister communion. There is much in this, which not a few persons of the Protestant Church of England would require to ponder well; for it cannot be denied that not a few in that church occupy ground which will not be much longer tenable. Such Protestants as the Oxford divines, for example, and the followers of Laud in Canada, cannot much longer protest.

Still it will be said, why all this anxiety? A cross is but a part of Gothic architecture, or only a mere ornament. To this we reply, that a cross, as it simply strikes the eye, is certainly no ornament. Such, at least, is our taste in the matter, that we cannot regard it as adding any beauty to a building. But even were it an ornamental object, we should have serious objections against putting it up merely to adorn an edifice, just as we would object to many other things mentioned in Scripture, as having been closely connected with certain great events in religion, being employed to embellish life, or minister merely to taste. But, again, what shall be said when a cross is put on a building, the architecture of which in no sense requires it? The plain answer is, the thing is liked, and liked for other reasons than its being an ornament. There is more in these things, says the papist, than meets the eye: certainly there is to those who hanker after them. And when we hear the word *ornament* used as an apology for the practice we have been condemning, we are apt to suspect there is more in it than is intended to meet the ear of the uninitiated. Let it not be said, this is a groundless, and harsh surmise. Those who in any way make use of the peculiar instruments of superstition lay themselves open to even severer charges than are here made. The inspired writer makes a difference betwixt the image and the mark of the Beast. Some may not be chargeable with the former who are not altogether free from the latter, Rev. xv. 2. Alas, we fear that every Protestant denomination has less or more of this mark.

The Scottish reformers were in the right, when they declared, that truth was exposed to great danger while any of the things remained which had contributed so much to the growth of superstition.

These men of God entered the sanctuary with the word of God in their hand, and whatever they found there, that is found written in the sacred volume, they held sacred: upon them they laid no violent hands: but every thing found in the house of God, not found in the book of God, they cast to the moles and the bats. It was thus that the mass-books, holy vestments, crosses, and relics perished in Scotland. The reformation in that country was truly a Bible reformation, and therefore thorough. The consequences have been extremely beneficial. Before the reformation, Scotland was covered with thick darkness, and all ranks of the people were given up to the grossest vices, while the lower orders were exposed to constant oppression and the severest poverty. It is true, in our native land there is still much poverty and much vice. But take it all in all, where shall we find its like? What intelligence, what piety, what comfort and social order are there! The reformers—or rather we should say, the pure word of God in the hands of those men, formed the foundation, and gives beauty and stability to this delightful order of things. Scottish glory, as far as it is worthy of a thought, or feeling, is just Bible truth made visible.

It has long been the fashion, nevertheless, with sentimental tourists, infidels, papists, and high-churchmen, to speak of the Scottish reformers as mere savages; because in the accomplishment of their great work they destroyed crosses, statues, and altar-pieces, which, it is said, were exquisite specimens of the fine arts. And then we are referred to England, and told that nothing of the sort happened there. No. And the church of England is to this day but a half-reformed church. It requires an intimate acquaintance with human nature, as well as divine truth, and an extensive knowledge of the moral history of our race, to be able to form accurate conceptions of the extent to which truth may be corrupted by means of those things which were consigned to the flames during the reformation in our native land. Our Scottish reformers were not only pious men, but also in the fullest sense profound metaphysicians.

They fully understood the principle in theory to which we have referred. Its disastrous results they had the best opportunity of witnessing. Now suppose the extinction of crosses, paintings, and statues, how excellent soever as works of art, was essential to accomplish the reformation, who will say that these men did not act wisely in what they did? The things which they destroyed—and the value of many of them has been grossly overrated—had been long the instruments of superstition. Indeed it may with propriety be affirmed that superstition, in a great measure, leaned on them for its support. What were paintings and statues in the eyes of men who sought the glory of God and the good of souls? Were they destitute of all taste then? So it has often been affirmed. We do not believe it. We believe them to have been men of good taste and of exquisite sensibility. But they thought, and thought rightly, that better, if so it must be, that the finest works of art should be destroyed, than that one soul should be lost. They feared their God too much to trifle with his divine authority, and they loved the souls of men too ardently to put their eternal interests in competition for a moment with the mere matters of taste.—*Canadian Examiner*.

ART. IV.—*Letter from the Rev. Thomas S. Kendall, addressed to the Editor of the Religious Monitor.*

MR. EDITOR.—To correct misrepresentation, and to expose the bloody spirit of slavery, I deem it necessary to publish to the world an occurrence which took place a short time ago, in South Carolina.

You are aware that in June last I was appointed by the Associate Synod, then in session, to visit the churches under their inspection, in the bounds of the Carolina Presbytery; and there to officiate during three months, in preaching the gospel, and dispensing ordinances. Many interesting incidents occurred during my mission in Virginia, and North Carolina, which, for the sake of brevity, I pass unnoticed. On the second Sabbath of August last, I preached at the Associate Church, called Smyrna, in Chester district, South Carolina. Late in the afternoon, shortly before I had concluded my second discourse, the congregation suddenly gave signs of deep excitement, and much uneasiness. Shortly afterwards I saw, in that direction in which the attention of the congregation was turned, a considerable body of men approaching. They came up, looked in at the door and windows; some came in, and again went out of the house. It was easy to discover, from the fierceness and wrath depicted in their faces, and flashing from their fiery eyes, which had been reddened with wine and maddened with rage, that mischief of no ordinary kind was intended. After concluding my sermon, and dispensing the ordinance of baptism, I took out of my pocket "A letter addressed by the Associate Synod, to the congregations and people under their inspection in the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas." This letter, which exhibits the Synod's sentiments on the subject of slavery, and which I had been in the habit of reading, and explaining, and enforcing at the end of the Sabbath's exercises, may be seen on the 29th, 30th, 31st and 32d pages of the June number of the Religious Monitor, for the year 1840. I proposed as usual to read it; but all was tumult, when Mr. W. Miller, a worthy elder of the Smyrna congregation, came up the stairs, and said that I had better not read the letter, as all was confusion, and these men were determined to take me away, and punish me. Being debarred from this privilege, I went on, at some length, to state my sentiments on the subject of slavery, the object of my mission, and the rights to which we as a church were entitled by the constitution of the United States, and the constitutions of the particular states, South Carolina not excepted. When I came out of the pulpit, Mr. Miller requested me to remain for some time in the meeting house, as it belonged to him, and they had no right to enter it. On hearing this, they rushed in; and, amidst a storm of unbridled passion, denounced me as an incendiary, an outlaw, as throwing firebrands among the slaves, to arouse them to butcher their masters. I denied all these charges, admitted that I had taught the doctrine contained in the Synod's letter, claimed the right of a citizen of the United States, reprimanded their breach of the Sabbath, disturbance of public worship, and demanded their authority for what they were doing. If I had violated the laws of the state, I was perfectly willing to confront its tribunals, be tried by a jury of its citizens, and submit to its decisions. But without warrant, without authority, without right,

save that of might, my saddle-bags were seized, and myself violently taken out of the church.

After riding several miles in the midst of profane merriment, our Fairfield mob called a halt, paraded their men in a circle, examined the contents of my saddle-bags, item by item, took all my papers, and finally refused to return them. But here, as Providence had ordered it, they found nothing out of which they could decipher much. The Synod's letter was then read aloud, and the scene which followed beggars all description. Wrath, indescribable, settled in every face, curses of — old abolitionist, incendiary, devil, infamous wretch, cowskin him, hang him up, accompanied with fearful oaths, and imprecations, marked this transaction, which language utterly fails to describe. A darker scene of deep depravity, and awful impiety cannot be conceived. Assured that my life was now at stake, and yet convinced of the integrity of my purpose, and the justice of my cause, I rushed into the middle of the ring, with an appeal to their sense of honour, knowing this to be the only way by which such men can be reached. "Gentlemen, you will surely not condemn a man unheard. You have me in your power, resistance on my part would be worse than useless; but if you possess the high-minded honourable feelings which many of my southern friends possess, you are too magnanimous to condemn and execute me without permitting me to say at least a few words in my own defence." Several voices answered, "We want to hear nothing from a — abolitionist." One man, however, said "Boys, give him a chance, don't condemn him unheard." This truly was an animating voice. It was an intimation that God Almighty was presiding over the scene, and setting bounds to man's wrath. I was permitted to speak at some length, during which time my feeble powers were doubtless exerted to their extent, in vindicating the Synod's appointment, in sustaining their pastoral letter, in repelling the false charge of endeavouring to arouse the slaves to cut their masters' throats, in contending for the right of preaching the whole word of God, *every where*, and in claiming the privilege of a fair, and legal trial, as I had violated no law of South Carolina, or any other state. This seemed to have been the means of intimidating them, lest they might bring themselves into difficulty, so far that they desisted for the present from violence. But it was the last time they permitted me to speak for myself among them.

Night had now closed around us, a fit emblem of the scene of moral darkness that was being acted under covert of its deep shades. Fatigued by the labours of the day, and exhausted for want of food, I was hurried on twenty-two miles from the church, to the house of John Cockrell, eight miles north of Winnsborough, in Fairfield district. There I received some refreshment, and some time after midnight was safely lodged in a little back room, which was bolted and barred, and guarded through the night by sentinels at arms. Judging by the terrors of their own guilty consciences, they thought, perhaps, I would attempt to escape. But I felt too strongly armed in honesty, to dread such vile worms, and too strong a sense of justice in the cause of human liberty, to retreat from the place which God had assigned me. "I laid me down, and slept; I awaked, for the Lord sustained me."

The sun was rapidly ascending the heavens when I was aroused,



by the noise of unbolting my door, from a refreshing sleep. About the hour of eleven o'clock A. M. the petty little tyrants of Wateree came flocking in, great and small, master and overseer, from hill and dale, rivulet and brook, like so many vultures, thirsting for the blood of the victim. After long consultation among themselves, they introduced me to lawyer Woodard, of Winnsborough. It inspired me with fresh ardour to see the face of a lawyer; because I expected to meet a man of at least some reason and intelligence: as yet I had seen little else than a pack of infatuated, blinded, fierce, block-heads. The lawyer said he had examined the Synod's letter, and *although it contained one equivocal expression, yet it did not stand opposed to the laws of South Carolina.* This legal opinion is sustained by that of other distinguished individuals of North Carolina, who said that the Synod's letter contained no other sentiments than such as were held by many of the leading men of our nation—opinions which all republicans have a right to hold, and to publish.

Might it not have been expected after such a glorious triumph of principle among unprincipled men, after a verdict of not guilty had been returned by a jurist of their own choosing, that they would at least have set me free, and as gentlemen have apologized for their unchristian, ungentlemanly, mobocratic deeds already done? Instead of this, they hurried me away to a deep bottom, shaded with heavy timber, and secluded from the highway by a dense undergrowth; and there covered my upper regions with a coat of tar, overlaid with an abundance of feathers. Poor wretches! a sense of guilt disfigured their faces, for they looked like *men under the gallows*, and their hands *trembled like aspen leaves*, while perpetrating the infamous deed. Their number I supposed to be between thirty and forty, the names of some of them only I learned, and I wish them to be known throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. John Cockrell, John L. Young, Thomas M'Clintick, Dwight, Debousk, Bell, Sterling, the son of an old seceder, and, according to Murel's phraseology, their *striker*, Archibald Whyte, formerly a minister of the Associate church, now thrown overboard in disgrace. Whyte was not in company with these ruffians, but they showed me a letter bearing his own signature, which he had sent into that region, some time before I had gone down, in which he stated that I was to preach in Fairfield on the second Sabbath of August, was preaching doctrines contrary to the laws of South Carolina, and *ought to be stopped*; all of which were positive lies. This arch Judas had only a few days before invited me to make his house my home while I remained in that region. Enraged at the Associate Synod, for the unbending course of honesty which they had been pursuing, he endeavoured to vent his vengeance on their missionary. Poor man! he has drowned the voice of conscience amid the lashes of oppression, and has sunk himself from the high dignity of a minister of Jesus Christ to become the mere tool of haughty, petty tyrants, who now despise and curse him in their hearts. But is it so, as I have been informed, that he left his congregation in Baltimore, because they could no longer endure his drunkenness? Did one of his elders state to me the truth, when he said they had dealt with him at Steel Creek for drunkenness? Did a respectable minister of the gospel in Carolina inform me correctly, when he said that his drunkenness

was notorious, and many respectable citizens, not Whyte's enemies, but his friends, would vouch for the truth of it? The statements of such men I cannot doubt. Here is the source of this mischief, and here is the man that some honest but mistaken seceders are following, I fear, to their own destruction. Such persons I would solemnly entreat to pause, and reflect, and retrace their steps. Can you follow and justify such a reckless spirit? Can you associate with men who would encourage, or would act out such scenes of dark villany? Here too is a just picture of the bloody features of the infernal system of slavery. The question is not merely whether slavery is right or wrong, or whether men violate law or not, but whether the church of God, and all others who oppose slavery, shall, without law, be brought to such punishment as lawless men may choose to inflict? The arm of persecution is raised, and we must either submit to the haughty dictates of the infamous slaveholder, or be crushed by his power. Let the Christian, the philanthropist, the moralist, unite their energies, and this monster must wither beneath the scorching beams of light and truth; if not, it must still rear its giant form unawed, trampling our liberties in the dust, blighting our free institutions, and overspreading our happy land with moral pestilence and death.

T. S. KENDALL.

*Monroe County, E. T. September 7, 1840.*

---

ART. V.—*Reflections on 1 Thess. iv. 7.*

“God hath called ~~us~~ unto holiness.”

Holiness consists in moral purity, or a moral nature conformable in some measure to the holiness of God, together with an outward deportment corresponding to the requirements of God's law. Of this kind of holiness comparatively few have any accurate knowledge; yet all confess the beauty and even necessity of some kind of holiness. Every man has some standard of right and wrong, by which he judges the conduct of others, and approves or condemns; though most men neglect to apply their standard to their own conduct. Consequently, nothing is more common than to hear persons condemn, in terms of unmeasured severity, in others, those things which they allow in themselves. “Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?” Rom. ii. 23. To this common foible of human nature may be traced much of the uncharitable censures and denunciations which men pronounce upon each other; and many of those calumnies, quarrels, and wars which afflict this guilty world. “From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?” James iv. 1.

If we take a survey of the political world, we behold hostile parties arrayed against each other in fierce and desperate conflict for power, with the weapons not of reason and argument, but mutual crimination and recrimination. And, in general, many of the hard things they say of each other are doubtless true. Both parties require integrity in their opponents: both disregard moral obligation in themselves.

If we look into the visible church, the prospect is but little im-

proved. Who can tell how much of the religious controversy, carried on in the world, may proceed from the same principle, which impels and nerves the mere politician? How much railing accusation is palmed off upon the church under the garb of zeal for holiness! How much greater ingenuity is displayed in attempting to fix a stigma upon the moral character of an opponent than to correct his errors! How much more easily can the great mass of the community be moved by an expert calumniator, than by the most conclusive arguments drawn from the inspired volume! Crafty men, perceiving this morbid disposition, are ever ready to contribute to its gratification, at the expense of all that is lovely and ennobling. The consequence of which is, the world is full of error, immorality, and spiritual death. The enjoyments of social intercourse are poisoned, friendships severed, the bonds of brotherhood rudely sundered, and those who are bound together by a joint profession of our common Christianity, a tie which should be indissoluble, are mutually exasperated to "bite and devour one another;" so that the earth itself, groaning under the guilt and pollution of its inhabitants, is daily disgorging its hundreds into the bottomless pit, that it may not sink under this intolerable burden of human depravity.

To deny these facts, would be to shut our eyes against the light. We may burn our bibles, demolish our churches, slay the ministers of religion, proclaim ourselves a world of atheists, or admit the appalling truth, that multitudes constantly throng the broad road to destruction—to endless perdition. But that we may escape this fearful doom, "God has called us unto holiness." Passing for the present the manner in which persons are called to holiness, it is only proposed to consider briefly, its *nature* and *necessity*. And,

I. Respecting the *nature* of holiness, the following observations are offered.

1. *It is a work of the Holy Spirit.* It is indeed ascribed to the Father and the Son. 1 Thess. v. 23: "The very God of peace *sanctify* you wholly." Tit. ii. 13, 14: "The great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all *iniquity*," &c. But it is the direct or immediate work of the Spirit. Or, it may be said, that our holiness proceeds from the Father, through the Son, and by the Spirit. That the holy Spirit is the author of holiness, is evident from the consideration that regeneration, which is initial holiness, is ascribed to him. Hence the Scriptures speak of the renovation and sanctification of the Spirit. It is through sanctification of the Spirit that we become God's obedient children, 1 Pet. i. 2. This holiness has many counterfeits in the world and in the church. An *unblemished deportment* is frequently relied upon as a passport to heaven. This is the rock on which moralists make shipwreck of faith. *Mortification of the body*, is another counterfeit most prevalent in former times among the Roman Catholics. An austere and rigid regard to the externals of religion, is another counterfeit which distinguished the Pharisees. But all these kinds of holiness lie within the scope of unsanctified nature; all have been attained by the heathen, and perhaps by the Stoics, who were bitter enemies of the true religion, Acts xvii. 18. But in the language of Scripture, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"

2. *As it is the work of the Holy Spirit, so it is an internal*

*work, carried on secretly in the soul.* "In the hidden part," says the psalmist, "thou shalt make me to know wisdom." "A new heart will I give you." It is true, that where this work is carried on, it will manifest itself by outward marks; yet it is difficult, and frequently impossible to distinguish these from the numerous counterfeits which are so exceedingly prevalent. Consequently, the necessity of charity and forbearance may be easily discovered. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." The world judges men by the amount of their professions, but God looks upon the heart. The world judges according to appearances, God judges righteous judgment. The carnal professor esteems that church most excellent, which exerts most influence in the world; but God regards only truth and holiness. Carnal professors connect the splendours of the world, with their forms of worship, but God seeks a spiritual worship. Carnal professors are most known to the world, because most ostentatious, but God's people are hidden, Ps. lxxxiii. 30.

3. *Holiness extends subjectively to the whole man.* The leaven which the woman hid in the meal leavened the whole lump. The understanding is spiritualized, so that the mind views spiritual things with spiritual eyes, in a way unknown to the highest possible degree of mere speculative knowledge. Accordingly, we find the apostle praying in behalf of the Ephesians, that "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, would give to them the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, that *the eyes of their understanding might be enlightened.*" Eph. i. 17, 18. The will is subdued to an obedience, at once voluntary and delightful. This submission of will extends both to the word and providence of God. And although absolute submission, from choice of the will, is not attainable in this world, yet it becomes predominant and habitual, so that the views, desires, and pursuits are regulated by the will of God. "I esteem all thy precepts to be right." "Blessed be the name of the Lord." The affections also accompany, or rather regulate the will. The choice of the soul proceeds from love. "The love of Christ constraineth us." "O how love I thy law!" Furthermore, the body is made a partaker of this blessed work. It is not indeed, strictly speaking, the subject of sin or holiness in itself considered; but, as it is united to the soul and the organ of its operations, it is subject to sin or holiness. Hence the members of the body are said to be instruments both of righteousness and unrighteousness. Accordingly, the apostle prays in behalf of the Thessalonians, that they might be sanctified "in body:" 1 Thess. v. 23. And the bodies of the saints are called "temples of the Holy Ghost:" 1 Cor. vi. 19.

4. *Holiness extends objectively to all the requirements of the moral law.* The holy person delights in the whole law, and would not desire a single precept blotted out, or neglected. Small duties are beautiful as they contribute to a perfect system. The Pharisees are no where condemned because they "tithed rue, and mint, and annise and cummin," but because they neglected the weightier matters of the law. "These things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone." Many fatal mistakes are made on this point. How often do the best of men, occasionally at least, permit one duty to supersede another, and not unfrequently to supply the place of many others! The ministers of religion having

a burden of public duties connected with great care and anxiety, may neglect their own hearts. The cares of the world drive men from the closet, if not the public ordinances; and an outward respect for religion supplies the place of holiness. But gracious souls find no relief while a single unmortified lust exerts over them a controlling influence. If they offend in one point, they regard themselves as guilty of breaking the whole law, which gives them self-loathing views that are inexpressible. "O, that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes!" Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to *all* thy commandments."

5. *Holiness is a progressive work.* "Grow in grace." This of course supposes imperfection, not of kind, but of degree. The doctrine of "perfectionists," is not taught in the word of God; consequently those who imagine themselves perfect are not holy persons; and we may add, not Christians. For "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us:" 1 John i. 8. That perfection is required cannot be denied: Gen. xvii. 1. Matt. v. 48. This perfection will be ultimately attained in a glorified state, and then no room will be left for their growth "in grace." Consequently, a distinction between the requirements of the law, and the actual state of believers on earth must be observed. When the saints are said to be "perfect," as Noah, (Gen. vi. 9, Job i. 1,) uprightness, integrity, or sincerity, must be understood, according to the analogy of faith, and other portions of Scripture. Hence we find that Noah and Job sinned after it had been said of them that they were "perfect." But in the course of this progressive holiness, faith and repentance are made perfect, love burns with a purer and brighter flame, and patience has her perfect work.

6. As closely allied to the preceding observation, it should be remarked that *holiness is a permanent, abiding principle.* It is said of a holy person, "his seed remaineth in him." Again, "The anointing ye have received abideth in you." This characteristic of holiness should be observed with diligent attention, as it distinguishes true holiness from its several counterfeits. The carnal professor is now all life, anon all spiritual death; now all joy, anon all despondency; now his zeal overleaps all the bounds of moderation, anon he walks no more with Jesus. His penitence is regulated by earthly calamities; his joy by earthly enjoyments. His whole character is controlled by artificial stimulants, and his holiness quickly disappears like "the morning cloud and early dew." But how different the case of one born of God! "His seed remaineth in him." You may as easily arrest the planets in their course as divert such a one, for any considerable length of time, from his course towards heaven; which he regards as his home, and towards which he presses with all his faculties, in the diligent use of appointed means. He shakes off sloth, lays aside every weight, surmounts every obstacle, and avoids the company of profane persons, while all his delight is with the excellent of the earth.

7. *Holiness is necessarily accompanied with hatred of sin.* Sin being its opposite, is excluded. The same soul cannot love and cherish at the same time two principles so diametrically opposite. Consequently, the character given us of the saints, is, that they hate every false way. "Shouldst thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord?" "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil." "I hate

the work of them that turn aside." "I hate vain thoughts." "I hate and abhor lying." "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? yea, I hate them with a perfect hatred."

II. It was proposed to consider the *necessity* of holiness. And,

1. It is necessary in the nature of things, or rather *on account of the immaculate purity of the Divine Essence*. The holiness of God, is his beauty, excellency, glory; and his glory will he "not give to another." "Glorious in holiness." It is this perfection which imparts an ineffable lustre not only to the laws and government, but all the perfections of Jehovah. God is then by a necessity of nature a consuming fire to the unholy, for he cannot deny himself. Hence the exhortation "be ye holy, for I am holy." It is therefore manifest, that God can as soon cease to exist, as to cease the punishment of sin wherever it may be found. It must be punished when found only by imputation, in the person of his only and well beloved Son. In this view of the divine character, how delusive the hopes, how fearful the doom of unpardoned, impenitent sinners! O, that men would flee from the wrath to come, that they would learn, not to provoke one another to wrath, but to love and good works. For whatever may be the glosses put upon God's revealed will, by a guilty world, sin most certainly stands opposed to the being of God. Here, then, God and the sinner are perfectly at issue; totally at variance, at war. Can the result be doubtful? Hast thou an arm that is full of power like the Almighty?

2. Holiness is necessary *because it is commanded*. "God hath called us unto holiness." Has called, in his word and by his providence, all who hear the gospel, "unto holiness." In the case of his own people, to this outward call, has been superadded the effectual call of his Spirit. "He hath called you with a holy calling," says another apostle. And says Peter, "who hath called us to glory and virtue," that is, "holiness." This effectual call is simply the execution of an eternal purpose: Eph. i. 4. And therefore cannot be frustrated. We have no call to the indulgence of pride, envy, malice, revenge, uncleanness, or conformity to the world, but to "holiness." We may be tempted to the commission of sin in ten thousand ways, but we have no call from God to engage in the commission of any sin. "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is the command of our God, whose thunder shakes the heavens, and terrifies the earth. And will it not increase the everlasting suffering of impenitent sinners, dying under a gospel dispensation, that God once called them to holiness?

3. *Holiness is necessary to test the reality of faith, and consequently our title to the heavenly inheritance*. "You see," in the history of Abraham "how faith wrought by his works." Works are here put both for the *effect* and *instrument* of faith. Holy works were things produced by faith, by which it operated, and was made perfect, that is, demonstrated to be unfeigned. Forty years after Abraham believed, (compare Gen. xv. 6, with xxii. 12,) a remarkable act of self-denial and holy obedience is required in order to test the sincerity of his faith. To the same effect is the description every where given of the people of God. They are holy persons, they have the Spirit of God, and are led by that Spirit. If any man make a will, he describes the legatees; so our blessed Lord, for our comfort and support in this barren land, has described in his last

will and testament his legatees. They are holy persons, in possession of the Spirit of Christ, and led by his Spirit. How egregious the folly and presumption to claim under a will, while destitute of those characteristics by which the legatees are designated!

4. *Holiness is necessary for the right performance of duty.* "Unto them that are defiled is nothing pure." All their duties are sin. Every thing is defiled by their polluting touch. Do they pray? they receive no answer. Do they give alms? they receive no reward. Do they contribute to the support of the gospel? it is a polluted offering. Do they dedicate their offspring to God in baptism? they only lie to him with their false tongues. Do they partake of the holy supper? they only eat and drink judgment to themselves. Under the law, the man that was unclean and carried holy flesh, that is, flesh offered in sacrifice, was not purified, but the flesh was polluted: Hag. ii. 11, 14: so, if an unholy man engage *now* in the observance of holy ordinances, they do him no good, but he pollutes them; and this adds greatly to his stock of guilt. Fearful consideration, that men should aggravate their guilt and misery, by those things which God has mercifully provided for their salvation!

5. *Holiness is necessary for the enjoyment of heaven.* "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Impenitent sinners shall indeed see God as an enemy, but not as a friend. They shall behold the flaming sword of his justice, but not the bow of his mercy. They that are admitted into the gracious presence of God, and permitted to behold his face in peace, must be like him; and "we shall be like him." Therefore the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance, because they are like God, while the name of the wicked shall rot, because they are not like him. This honour which awaits the righteous is from God. And as his majesty is above principalities and powers, thrones and dominions, so the honour which he confers infinitely transcends the swelling titles and glittering honours of this world. Here, the saints are made black in the eyes of the world, by persecution and affliction; buried in sad obscurity,—the drunkard's song, the scorn and contempt of "hypocritical mockers," and "worldly men, whose hearts are fat as grease." Paul was regarded as "the offscouring of the earth." That "light which is sown for the righteous," is concealed from common observation. The world hath not known it—the righteous scarcely perceive it. For there is a veil between us and the glory of heaven, which was typically shadowed forth by the veil that concealed the holy of holies from the view of ancient worshippers. In this arrangement we behold the wisdom of God. By it our faith is tried, we learn to rest on the naked promise of God without any discovery or sensible enjoyment of the things promised. Our love also goes forth to the embrace of an unseen Saviour, and our satisfaction becomes unspeakable and full of glory by mere anticipation. This wise arrangement is also admirably adapted to our present weak, imperfect state. Were the beams of future glory to descend upon us in their bright effulgence, we should be struck with blindness, like Paul at the appearing of Christ to him. That "eternal weight of glory" would overwhelm us. Our weak faculties, while in the flesh, cannot sustain the presence of God, who has declared that no man can see his face and live. But although it doth not yet ap-

pear what we shall be, yet are we the sons of God; we have been adopted into the family of Heaven, our names are inscribed on the records of eternity, we have already the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of future glory, the seal of God's love to us, while our full participation in the reward of the righteous is reserved to the unseen future. "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

In conclusion we may discover,—

1. *The great difficulty of being a real Christian.* It is nothing to talk of religion—to make a profession—to attend regularly upon outward ordinances, though many would be thought Christians who do not go even this length. But to be a holy person surpasses the power of nature; it is an attainment which belongs not to flesh and blood. And this need not surprise us if we consider the beauty and excellency of holiness. "It is nothing less," says one, "than entire submission to the will of God—a continual offering up of the soul in flames of love as a whole burnt-offering to Christ." Alas! how many are strangers to this great work upon the soul! But let not the righteous despair on account of the greatness and difficulty of this work. For notwithstanding the obstacles that lie in the way, and their own weakness and infirmity, they can adopt the language of the pious Newton—"I am not what I *ought* to be—I am not what I *wish* to be—I am not what I *hope* to be, yet I can truly say I am not what I *once was*—a slave to sin and Satan; and I can heartily join with the apostle, and acknowledge 'by the grace of God, I am what I am.'"

2. *Why so few persons are holy.* It is an attainment beyond their reach. This is evident from the whole tenor of scripture. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" The bodily eye cannot look upon the sun, it dazzles and blinds. Much more difficult is it for the eye of a carnal mind covered with the film of pollution, to look upon the Sun of righteousness. So that the holiness which ravishes the hearts of the righteous dazzles and blinds the world. "The rest were blinded." That which is not perceived can exert no influence over the mind. Consequently the unholy can have no holy affections, no spiritual joys. Again, as the rewards of holiness are future, while the objects of sense are present, so the latter easily obtain the preference. Present gratification is all they desire, all they seek; and the vanities of this world, in the judgment of a carnal soul, outweigh the most glorious futurity. And of all worldly persons, carnal professors are the most injurious to the growth of holiness among a Christian people, in a great variety of ways. They are a dead weight upon the energies of the church, and the most malignant and vindictive of persecutors. They slander that holiness to which they are strangers, and trample under their feet that humility and Christian meekness which they possess not. In their estimation, soundness in the faith is bigotry; Christian zeal, and faithfulness to our covenant God, fanaticism; warning the wicked man to flee from his wickedness, censoriousness. They wish for nothing but sweet promises made indiscriminately to the righteous and the wicked. To "hear of men's sins" is with them beyond all endurance.

3. *And last place, behold the excellency and blessedness of the saints!* Holiness is the most beautiful ornament that ever adorned



any of the creatures of God. In allusion to this holiness it is said, God will beautify the meek with salvation. The holiness of the church is her glory. "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." The believer's holiness is the connecting link, which binds him to the throne of God—secures the ministry of holy angels—the protecting power of the Almighty, and makes him an heir of glory. Nay, more, the believer's holiness ravishes the heart of Christ, and kindles his love into a most vehement flame. "Thou art beautiful, O my love, as Tirzah! How beautiful are thy feet with shoes, O prince's daughter!" Shoes denote holiness—"shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," which is holiness. Blessed, yea, thrice blessed are these holy ones. They are in the possession of a treasure which shall survive the earth, the visible heavens, and every created object. They are dead to all that natural "love, and hatred, and envy," of which Solomon speaks. They live above the world. It cannot disappoint them, because they expect nothing from it. The flattery of the world cannot gratify them, because they know it is a lie. The envy of the world cannot terrify them, because they know it shall perish. Death cannot surprise them, because they daily look for it. It is enough for them to know that they shall soon be like Christ. Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen.

C. W.

#### ART. VI.—*Promiscuous or Indiscriminate Hearing.*

Mr. Editor—The subject of what is commonly called Occasional Hearing appears to be occupying to a considerable extent at present the attention of your correspondents. Besides occasional touches from others, no fewer than three appear to have engaged in the regular discussion of the subject—The ruling elder or R—Quero, and Pilgrim. This is in my opinion unquestionably a good sign of the present time. It may, however, be only an isolated oasis in the wide-spread dreary waste. It is always a good sign when people begin to inquire after truth.

At present it is not my design to interfere with the course of argument adopted by any of your correspondents already enlisted in the controversy, but as the subject is now before your readers, I think it reasonable to show also my opinion. The question as I understand it, is, what is the mind of God as revealed to us in his word on the subject? What does the Bible teach us respecting those whom we should hear as official and authoritative teachers of the religion of Jesus Christ? This is what should bind the conscience and influence the practice. The Bible teaches us to take heed *how* we hear. (Luke viii. 18,) and also to take heed *what* we hear, (Mark. iv. 24,) the subject of *hearing* then as a religious duty or act of worship is made matter of divine revelation. And if the Bible be a perfect rule of practice, which must be admitted, unless the inspiration of the scriptures be denied, it is a necessary sequence that it must also teach us *whom* we should hear. Let us then see what the Bible says respecting those whom we should hear. We shall attend first to the answer negatively.

1. We must not hear every one that may make pretensions to preach the gospel. Many men, and women too, have assumed to themselves the office of preaching the gospel. We must discrimi-

nate among those who profess to preach, if we must not hear all, we should not hear any who could not give some credible evidence that they have a right to preach to us. The church of Ephesus is commended because they tried those who said they were apostles, and were not, and found them liars, (Rev. ii. 2.) For the reason many undertake to preach who are unauthorized, the church is enjoined to try them. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, for many false prophets are gone out into the world, (John iv. 1.)

2. We should *not hear those who are not sent* by Christ. "How can they preach except they be sent? (Rom. x. 15.) They cannot preach as ambassadors of Christ, because he has not sent them as such. Among men an individual may not assume to himself the office of an ambassador. The government in whose name he would presume to act would not be bound by his own acts. It is so in the church of God: no man taketh this honour to himself, (Heb. iv. 5.) That is, it is not lawful for any man to do it. If this were lawful, or possible, self-sent men might frustrate the ordinance of God: for he *gave some* [not *all*] apostles, pastors, teachers, &c. (Eph. iv. 2, and 1 Cor. xii. 28.) Again, we may not hear *those who are not sent* by Christ; because it would be useless, such cannot profit those who do hear them, so says God's word. "I sent them not, nor commanded them, therefore they shall not profit this people at all," saith Jehovah, (Jer. xxiii. 32.) But it would be worse than useless to hear such,—it would be ruinous: it would be the means of causing the people to err, Jer. xxiii. 32, first clause; it would provoke God to forsake them, (ver. 33;) yea, it would provoke God to punish them, (ver. 34.) We conclude then, that it is the mind of God, taking the Bible as our rule, that we ought not to hear any who are not sent by Christ, [For a scriptural view of those who are sent, see R. Monitor, vol. xvi. No. 10.] To hear or attend on the ministrations of such would be contrary to the mind of God, a profanation of the ordinance of hearing the word, a useless spending of precious time, injurious to those we should hear, ruinous to ourselves, by provoking God's punitive anger. Let the reader carefully consult the above passages of scripture.

3. We ought not to hear those whose *instruction would tend to lead us into error*. "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge," (Prov. xix. 27.) This is an express command of God. Throughout the book of Proverbs, Christ, the personal wisdom of God, is the speaker. His design in that book is to show, how true and saving knowledge is to be obtained. See chap. i. 2, 7. And the directions to the attainment of this end are all practical and ought to be received by us as the rule of our practice, in the matters to which they refer. Now both the letter and Spirit of this direction, require us "*to cease to hear*" any person so soon as he begins to teach any doctrine or any practice, that would have a tendency to lead us away from that knowledge, the beginning of which is the fear of the LORD, (Prov. i. 7.) This knowledge is saving in its nature and tendency, while its opposite error, whether in doctrine or practice, is damning in its nature. It will be no excuse for the neglect of this command, that the person whom we hear was once sent of Christ, that it had once been lawful for us to hear him. Our text seems to refer to persons whom it was once lawful to hear: (it was once lawful to hear Judas Iscariot) this seems implied in the words, "*cease to hear.*" But the moment the person

begins to give instruction which causes to err, in the true spirit and meaning of our text, we are to cease to hear him, were he the apostle Paul, or an angel from heaven, (Gal. i. 8.)

4. We ought not to hear those who are offending against the unity of the church. The unity of the church is exceedingly precious in the sight of God. Christ died that he might gather together into one the children of God, that are scattered abroad, (John xi. 52, and Eph. i. 10.) To see the importance which the Holy Spirit attaches to the unity of the church, let the reader consult the following passages of God's word, Song vi. 9, where Christ asserts the unity of his church. "My dove, my undefiled, is but one," Jer. xxxii. 39:) where unity is very specially promised. "I will give them one heart and one way," saith Jehovah. The same promise is repeated, Ezek. xi. 19; John xvii. 21, where Christ, in his last intercessory prayer on earth, before his crucifixion, prays for the unity of his church. The apostle Paul solemnly enjoins it, 1 Cor. i. 10; Rom. xv. 5, 6; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 2—6; Phil. ii. 2. On the day of Pentecost the church at Jerusalem enjoyed this unity, Acts iv. 32. "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul. And even much later, a very great degree of unity was attained to by the church in Great Britain and Ireland, when the standards of doctrine and practice agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines, which met at Westminster, on the 1st day of July, 1643, were ratified and adopted by the church, in those three kingdoms. Now to offend against the unity of the church, by teaching doctrines or pursuing a course of practice that tends to destroy or impair it, is manifestly a great sin, and grievous in the sight of God. Let us then see whether it is the mind of God, that we should hear such as do so, or not.

In Romans xvi. 17, we are enjoined by apostolical authority, to "mark them who cause divisions and offences in the church and to avoid them." Language, I think, cannot express more plainly or more unequivocally than this does, that it is the mind of the Holy Spirit that we ought not to hear such, because that would not be avoiding them—but the opposite—it would be following and cleaving to them. And as those who are causing divisions and scattering the church, are endeavouring to frustrate one great end of Christ's death, (John xi. 52,)—so we cannot hear them without disobeying the words and authority of God, besides making ourselves guilty of their sin, (2 John ver. 11.)

5. We ought not to hear those who are disobedient to the lawful authority of the church. That the church of Christ is invested with authority from Christ, her Lawgiver and Head, to exclude from the fellowship of the visible church, obstinate and impenitent offenders and transgressors, is evident from many passages of scripture, particularly Matt. xviii. 17, 18; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. Or, she has authority to suspend or depose such from the office of the ministry. Such it would be unlawful to hear, because it is contrary to the mind of God revealed to us in his word. "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed," (2 Thess. iii. 14.) Surely, then, we could not hear such a person without manifestly violating both the letter and spirit of this passage of God's word, and also making ourselves guilty

of their sin, who refuse obedience both to the word and authority of Christ, exercised through his constituted organ. For Christ has expressly said that "where two or three are met together in his name, [as a court of his house, or judicially,] there he is in the midst of them," (Matt. xviii. 18, 20.)

6. We should not hear those who do not declare the whole counsel of God. The apostle Paul declared that he kept back nothing that was profitable to the Ephesians: that he shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God, and that it was thus that he kept himself pure from the blood of all men, (Acts xx. 20, 26, 27.) This is what is meant by preaching *faithfully*, and wherever *faithfulness* in preaching is wanting we can neither hear in safety nor yet lawfully. If any man should come and offer to preach to us, but did not give us sufficient evidence that he brought the doctrine of Christ, that is, the whole doctrine of Christ, we should not "receive him nor bid him "Godspeed," by countenancing him. This seems to be the divine rule, 2 John ver. 10; God's rule marks both ways. If it would be wrong for us to receive such a one, if he would come to us, it would certainly be as wrong for us to go to him, and we would as certainly involve ourselves in his sin; with this difference, in the latter case, that it would be more deliberate. Christ's commission to all *whom he sends*, is, to teach all his commands—"teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," (Matt. xxviii. 20.) If any man then neglect or refuse to teach *all the commands*, or the whole counsel of God, we cannot in safety to our own souls *hear him*.

I have now, Mr. Editor, specified six rules or directions concerning whom we should NOT HEAR; every one of them found in the word of God. And if, which is not the case, the subordinate standards of the Associate Church were silent on the subject, the Bible appears so plain, that "he that runs, may read." But the subordinate standards of the Associate Church recognise the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the supreme rule in practice, as well as faith. I think then there can be, or at least there need be no question, whether our standards are silent on the subject or not. And another thing also, I think, follows, as a necessary consequence, that every person who has been admitted to membership in the Associate Church, according to the act concerning the admission of church members, appended to the Testimony, or who has engaged, according to the formula of ordination vows, has given his assent to these principles. If any have not done so intelligently, it should be for a lamentation. These rules appear to me so plain and of so easy and general application, that I shall, for the present, rest the question on them. But if any of your correspondents should think them not scriptural or not found in the Bible, or if they should find any practical case, to which none of them are applicable, I hope they will point out the defect. It is thus truth is to be sought.

But before I close this communication, permit one remark more. Most persons whom I have heard vindicating the practice under consideration, seem to take it for granted that different denominations or divisions of professing Christians may lawfully or warrantably exist; and some of your late correspondents, though they do not expressly admit this idea, yet much of their reasoning seems founded on it. The question respecting promiscuous, or as more commonly but incorrectly called, occasional hearing, might easily and fairly be re-

solved into this: are different and opposing divisions of the Church of Christ warrantable, or right, according to the rule of God's word? This would indeed be the more legitimate form of the question. And if the affirmative of it could be proved, then might it be right to cause, countenance, and keep them up in all their abundance at the present day, by promiscuous or indiscriminate hearing of all, and all other means of favouring and encouraging them. But if the negative be the side that can be maintained in truth and righteousness, then it is right and an imperious duty on all Christians to discountenance and discourage them, by showing their disapprobation of them, by testifying against them, by all lawful endeavours to prevent their increase, by endeavouring to heal those already existing, by searching out and removing their causes, by pleading earnestly with God in prayer, that he would "give his people one heart and one way," according to his promise. Then would soon appear that glorious sight, "Zion's watchmen lifting up the voice, with the voice together singing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion." (Isa. vii. 8.) Then shall it soon appear, "How good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." (Ps. cxxxiii. 1.) J. P. M.

---

#### ART. VII.—*The Book of Life.*

THE expression, "the Book of Life," occurs about eight times in the Holy Scriptures. There are a few passages where the phrase is to be found, in which, as a primary meaning, reference is made to the roll that contained an enumeration of the names of those who returned from the seventy years' captivity in Babylon. On this point, however, we do not dwell, but shall proceed directly to make a few remarks on the grand idea contained in the words—"the Book of Life." And it may be said, in general, that the very expression has something in it awfully sublime. Our minds are led from the transactions of mortal men, up to the all-wise and omnipotent God. In this expression, as in many others, the Spirit has been pleased to condescend to our weak and limited understandings; he has brought a subject of infinite importance down to the level of the meanest capacity; and has afforded a *stimulus* to excite hearers of the gospel to examine their evidences with greater carefulness, and to aspire with increased diligence after that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Is there any heart so callous as not to tremble at the very thought of his name being excluded from the Book of Life? or rejoice so as not to beat insensibly when induced to believe, on good grounds, that his name has been therein recorded from eternity?

Although we are forbid, both by reason and scripture, to believe that there is in the courts of heaven, an actual roll in which the names of men and events are recorded, yet, we cannot fail to discover in the figure, much of the wisdom and love of God. The mind rests upon it with more ease than on an abstract truth; and although the one mode or the other equally conveys God's eternal purpose, with respect to the creatures of his hand, the expression, "elect, according to the foreknowledge of God," does not strike with equal force, as the language contained in Phil. iv. 3,—"*whose names are in the Book of Life.*"

The general meaning of this latter expression, is *God's purpose of election*. "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, (*after*

*the beast*) whose names are not written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world." Rev. xvii. 8. There it is manifest, that all whose names are not in the Book shall be allowed to worship the beast; and, hence too it will be perceived, that the ultimate cause of distinction between one man and another, is his name being or not being in the Book of Life. Every good gift comes down from God. There can be no reason assigned why God chooses one part of a guilty race, and passes by the other portion of it. Why was it that the Lord made choice of Mount Zion as his dwelling-place? Was it, that it was the loftiest, the most fertile, or the most beauteous of all the hills of the promised land? No. But "the Lord *hath* chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest for ever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it." Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14.

The Book of Life is also called the *Lamb's Book of Life*. It is the Book of the Lamb, inasmuch as the elect were chosen in Christ, and given to him to be redeemed. The saints are not written in the Book of Life in the day of believing, because they have been written therein from the foundation of the world. Their names are not inscribed on account of any foreseen acts of obedience, for how could there be acts of obedience without the name being in the Book, when it is said with infallible certainty, that ALL shall worship the beast, whose names are not written in the Lamb's Book of Life from the foundation of the world?

But again, and that which we chiefly aim at; the names once written in the Book of Life, never can be erased from it. The purpose of God according to election *must* stand. No change can take place with regard to any of his designs, for he is without variableness or shadow of turning.

It is objected to this view of the subject, that God threatens to take away the part of certain characters out of "the Book of Life, and out of the holy city." (Rev. xxii. 19.) It might be sufficient to reply, that the meaning of these passages cannot be, that God will cast off any of his elect children, there being sufficient proof from other portions of scripture that such will not be the case. (See Ps. lxxxix. 30—33. But, it is not said that God will blot the name out of the Book of Life:—it is, "*God shall take away his part* out of the Book of Life." In Matt. xiii. 12, it is thus written—"for whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." This is explained in Luke viii. 18. "And whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that he *seemeth* to have." So, here, God shall take away the part of that person who shall wilfully pervert and mutilate the word of truth; that is, he shall make manifest to angels and men, that such a one never had any part in the Book of Life, nor in the holy city.

But some one may say—we are taking too much freedom with the passage under consideration:—well then, let us examine it a little more minutely. It is clear we think, from the admission of all Christians, that no sincere follower of the Lamb could be guilty of such wicked conduct as that of taking away from the word and law of Jehovah. On the contrary, the law of the Lord is the delight of every saint; he meditates on it by day and by night, and it is sweeter to his taste than honey from the comb. Hence then, in the very nature of the case, such a judgment cannot, we repeat it—such an awful judgment cannot fall upon a sincere believer.

Lastly, it is said, "God shall take away his part out of the holy city." But is it possible for such a person as a corrupter of the word of God, to have any part in the holy city? No; for it is written—"There shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie." (Rev. xxi. 27.)

There is another passage, worthy of consideration, contained in Exodus xxxii. 32: "Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sins; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." Be it remarked on this passage, that no argument against the perseverance of the saints can be adduced from it; because, in the first place, the words, "blot me out of thy book," constitute a part of the prayer of Moses, and not a declaration of God, with regard to him. Take what view of the book we please, God did not say, that he would blot out the name of his distinguished servant from its pages. Let us read the character of Moses, as given by the Spirit of God in Hebrews xi. 24—26. Could there be a more excellent character given to any mere man? He was a believer;—"by faith Moses:" he was remarkably self-denied; "he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;"—he was willing to endure affliction; "choosing rather to suffer affliction:" he was also the meekest of men, and after his death he was buried by the hand of the Almighty, while his soul ascended to glory. And Moses was one of those who appeared with our Lord on the mount of transfiguration. Moses, therefore, was not lost, was not cast into hell:—but what is the character of those who shall be cast into that place of torment? "And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life, was cast into the lake of fire." (Rev. xx. 15.) Moses' name, therefore, was written, in the Book of Life, even before the foundation of the world, and hence too it is clear to a demonstration, that his name, or rather himself, could not be blotted out of God's Book in the sense supposed by the objector.

But some one may say, that Moses was desirous of having his name blotted out of God's Book, in the highest sense of the expression. Well, granting for a moment, that such was his intention, might not Moses, like Job, have uttered words rashly with his lips? But we would ask in few terms, how could that man be an Arminian, who, by the inspiration of God's Spirit, uttered that sublime sentiment contained in Deut. vii. 7, 8? "The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the Lord loved you, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, from the hand of Pharaoh King of Egypt." What then was the book mentioned in the prayer of Moses, and again repeated in the answer of God? The cause of Moses' grief, and God's displeasure was that Aaron, at the instigation of the children of Israel, had made a golden calf. Moses was ashamed of the conduct of his brother, and of all the Israelites; he was indignant at their sin, and desired to be separated from the people, who so often grieved his meek spirit; or, perhaps he wished to be cut off, not only from the commonwealth of Israel, but even from the land of the living. Almost all who study the Bible are aware, that in the Old Testament, the terms "cutting off," and "blotting out," often signify excommunication from the society of the Israelitish church and commonwealth. The uncircumcised man-child was to be cut off from his people, and that soul, also, who should be guilty of eating leavened bread, from the first to the seventh day at the feast of the passover, was to be "cut off" in this sense of the

word. In Deut. ix. 14, the expression can only signify a blotting out from the land of the living: "Let me alone, that I may destroy them, and blot out their names from under heaven." Thus God did actually blot out a whole generation of stiff-necked Israelites, and caused their dead carcasses to be cast out and disregarded in the vast howling wilderness!

But even admitting that the book in the passage under consideration does mean "the Book of Life,"—yea, "the Lamb's Book of Life,"—what will the admission make for the objector? Does not God often speak in the language of men? Does he not speak of repenting and changing his purpose? Is it not said in Ezekiel that he who sinneth shall die? when it is not intended, that all who commit sin shall be cast into hell; but, that those who obstinately remain in sin shall suffer its awful consequences. So here, "whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book."—What is the meaning of this expression? One would almost imagine that Aaron was aimed at. Was Aaron a castaway? We have no such evidence. But did not all the children of Israel sin, as well as Aaron? and did they not sin on other occasions, as well as on the occasion of making the golden calf? And did not Adam, Abel, Enoch, Abraham, all sin? then must we conclude with the ruthless objector, that there is no Adam, the first of men, no believing Abel, no meek and humble Enoch, no faithful and self-denied Abraham, in the true bowers of Eden, in the heavenly paradise of God? Must we thus conclude, because men in their bold and determined audacity will deny that those whom the Father hath given to Christ, shall endure to the end? What kind of sin is it then, that causes God to blot names out of "the Book of Life?" It must be sin wilfully followed out, and eagerly persevered in till the end of life. But, those who are thus guilty have no part in the commonwealth of the Israel of God. The very assumption, however, that the Lamb's Book of Life, or in other words, the eternal purpose of God, is referred to in this passage, leads almost to blasphemy. It goes to say, that God did not know the character of those whom he recorded in his book at first, or knowing them, that he was not able to retain them; but afterwards having changed his opinion, or his power being defeated he was compelled to blot them out! The truth is, that Jehovah in this passage, speaks after the manner of men. The purport of this expression is, "he that sinneth shall die:" whether we view the punishment as excommunication from the church, temporal punishment, death, or eternal damnation; on which latter supposition our ideas must be restricted, according to the analogy of Scripture, to the fact of God's manifesting to angels and men, that those who shall experience such awful misery, never had any part in the Book of Life.

We cannot then accord with the supposition put forth by some writers, that Moses prayed to be cast off from God's presence for ever and ever. The supposition appears to us, to say the least of it, absurd. God's countenance is life, and his loving-kindness is better than life: and is it then to be supposed for one moment, that he who willingly forsook all the grandeur and royalty of Egypt, who chose affliction with the people of God, and who had respect to the *recompense of reward*, should, or could express a desire to be excluded from all participation in the glorious rewards that await the sons and daughters of God in the world to come?—*Belfast Covenanter.*



**ART. VIII.—*Engagement in Defence of the Liberties of the Church and People of Scotland.***

Whereas it is the bounden duty of those who are intrusted by the Lord Jesus with the ruling of his house, to have a supreme regard in all their actings to the glory of God the Father, the authority of his beloved Son, the only King in Zion, and the spiritual liberty and prosperity of the Church which he hath purchased with his own blood:

Whereas, also, it is their right and privilege, and is especially incumbent upon them, in trying times, as well for their own mutual encouragement and support, as for the greater assurance of the Church at large, to unite and bind themselves together, by a public profession of their principles, and a solemn pledge of adherence to the same, as in like circumstances our ancestors were wont to do:

And whereas, God, in his Providence, has been pleased to bring the Church of Scotland into a position of great difficulty and danger, in which, by acting according to the dictates of conscience and of the word of God, imminent hazard of most serious evils, personal as well as public, is incurred:

In these circumstances, it being above all things desirable that, in the face of all contrary declarations and representations, our determination to stand by one another, and by our principles, should be publicly avowed; and, by the most solemn sanctions and securities, before God and the country, confirmed and sealed:

We, the undersigned, ministers and elders, humbling ourselves under the mighty hand of our God, acknowledging his righteousness in all his ways, confessing our iniquities, and the iniquities of our fathers, mourning over the defections and short-comings which have most justly provoked his holy displeasure against this Church; adoring at the same time his long-suffering, patience, and tender mercy, and giving thanks for the undeserved grace and loving-kindness with which he has visited his people and revived his cause; under a deep sense of our own insufficiency, and relying on the countenance and blessing of the great God and our Saviour; do deliberately publish and declare our purpose and resolution to maintain in all our actings, and at all hazards to defend, those fundamental principles relative to the government of Christ's house, his Church on earth, for which the Church of Scotland is now called to contend; principles which we conscientiously believe to be founded on the word of God, recognised by the standards of that Church, essential to her integrity as a Church of Christ, and inherent in her constitution as the Established Church of this land.

The principles now referred to, as they have been repeatedly declared by this Church, are the two following, viz: 1. "That the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate." 2. "That no minister shall be intruded into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation."

To these principles we declare our unalterable adherence; and confining them to the present position and the present duty of the Church, we think it right to state still more explicitly what we believe to be implied in them.

1. We regard the doctrine—"That the Lord Jesus is the only King and Head of his Church, and that he hath therein appointed a government, in the hand of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate"—this sacred and glorious doctrine we regard as a barrier in the Church of God against all encroachments and innovations inconsistent with the free exercise of all the spiritual functions which the Lord Jesus has devolved either upon its rulers or upon its ordinary members.—While, therefore, we abhor and renounce the Popish doctrine, that the government appointed by the Lord Jesus in his Church has jurisdiction over the civil magistrate in the exercise of his functions, or excludes his jurisdiction in any other matter, we strenuously assert that it is independent of the civil magistrate, and that it has a jurisdiction of its own in all ecclesiastical matters, with which the civil magistrate may not lawfully interfere, either to prevent or to obstruct its exercise.

2. In particular, we maintain, that all questions relating to the presentation and admission of ministers, or to the exercise of discipline and the infliction or removal of ecclesiastical censures, lie within the province of the Church's spiritual jurisdiction, and all such questions must be decided by the Church officers, in whose hands the government is appointed, according to the mind and will of Christ, revealed in his word, not according to the opinions or sanctions of any secular authority whatsoever. We are very far, indeed, from insisting that the judgments of the competent spiritual officers, in such questions, can of themselves carry out the consequences, or necessarily rule the determination of all those points that may arise out of them. In regard to these, and in regard to all temporal matters, we fully acknowledge the civil magistrate to be the sole and supreme judge—bound, indeed, to pay respect to the word of God, and the liberties of Christ's Church, yet always entitled to act independently, on his own conviction of what is right. But in regard to all spiritual consequences, and especially in regard to the spiritual standing of members of the Church, and their spiritual privileges and obligations, the judgments of the church officers are the only judgments which are recognised by us as competent and authoritative. And if ever the civil magistrate pronounce judgments by which it is lawful to control, or supersede, or impede the sentences of the church officers, in these spiritual matters, and in their spiritual functions and effects, we must feel ourselves compelled to exercise our own conscientious interpretation of the will of God in disregarding these judgments as invalid, and protesting against them as oppressive.

3. As the Lord Jesus has appointed a government in his church composed of church officers, so we believe at the same time that he has invested the ordinary members of his church with important civil privileges, and has called them to exercise, on their own responsibility, important spiritual functions. In particular, we are persuaded that their consent, either formally given, or inferred, from the absence of dissent, ought to be regarded by the church officers as an indispensable condition in forming the pastoral relation; and that the act of the congregation, agreeing either expressly or tacitly, or declining to receive any pastor proposed to them, ought to be free and voluntary, proceeding upon their own conscientious convictions, and not to be set aside by the church officers—the latter, however, al-

ways retaining inviolate their constitutional powers of government and superintendence over the people. We hold it, accordingly, to be contrary to the very nature of the pastoral relation, and the end of the pastoral office—altogether inconsistent with the usefulness of the church, and hostile to the success of the gospel ministry—an act of oppression on the part of whatever authority enforces it, and a cause of grievous and just offence to the people of God—that a minister should be settled in any congregation in opposition to the solemn dissent of the communicants. We deliberately pledge ourselves, therefore, to one another, and to the Church, that we will, by the help of God, continue to defend the people against the intrusion of unacceptable ministers, and that we will consent to no plan for adjusting the present difficulties of the Church, which does not afford the means of effectually securing to the members of every congregation a decisive voice in the forming of the pastoral tie.

4. And, farther, with reference to the question respecting civil establishments of religion, which we believe to be deeply and vitally concerned in the present contentings of the Church, we feel ourselves called upon to bear this testimony: that, holding sacred the principle of establishments, as sanctioned both by reason and by the word of God, recognising the obligation of civil rulers to support and endow the Church, and the lawfulness and expediency of the Church receiving countenance and assistance from the State, we at the same time hold no less strongly that the principles which we have laid down regarding the government of Christ's Church, and the standing of his people, cannot be surrendered or compromised for the sake of any temporal advantages, or any secular arrangements whatsoever; that it is both unwise and unrighteous in the civil magistrate to impose upon the Church any condition incompatible with these principles; and that no consideration of policy, and no alleged prospect of increased means of usefulness, can justify the Church in acceding to such a condition. We emphatically protest against the doctrine, that, in establishing the Church, the civil magistrate is entitled to impose any restrictions on the authority of her office-bearers or the liberties of her members. On the contrary, we strenuously assert, that it is his sacred duty, as it is his interest, to give positive encouragement and support to the Church in the exercise of all her spiritual functions—for thus only can God, from whom he receives his power, be fully glorified, or the prosperity and greatness of any people be effectually promoted. We admit, indeed, that, as supreme in all civil matters, the civil magistrate has always command over the temporalities bestowed upon the Church, and has power to withdraw them. But he does so under a serious responsibility. And, at all events, the Church, while protesting against the wrong, must be prepared to submit to their being withdrawn, rather than allow him to encroach upon that province which the Lord Jesus has marked out as sacred from his interference.

5. While we consider the Church's course of duty to be plain, if such an emergency as we have supposed should arise, we have hitherto believed, and notwithstanding the recent adverse decisions of the civil courts, we still believe, that the constitution of the Established Church of Scotland, as ratified by the State at the eras of the Revolution and the Union, when, after many long struggles, her

liberty was finally achieved, effectually secured that Church against this grievous evil. The only quarter from whence danger to her freedom ever could, since these eras, be reasonably apprehended, is the system of patronage; against which, when it was restored in 1711, the Church strenuously protested, and of which, as we have much satisfaction, especially after recent events, in reflecting, she has never approved. The restoration of that system we hold to have been a breach of the Revolutionary Settlement, and the Treaty of Union, contrary to the faith of nations. Even under it, indeed, we have maintained, and will contend to the uttermost, that the Constitution of the Church and country gives no warrant for the recent encroachments of the civil courts upon the ecclesiastical province: that in the terms of that constitution, the Church has still wholly in her hands the power of examination and admission, and, in the exercise of that power, is free to attach what weight she judges proper to any element whatever, that she feels it to be necessary to take into account as affecting the fitness of the presentee, or the expediency of his settlement; and that, unquestionably, in whatever way the Church may deal with the question of admission, the civil courts have no right to interfere, except as to the disposal of the temporalities. But while we have taken this ground, and will continue to maintain it to be lawful, constitutional and impregnable, even under the restored system of patronage, we avow our opposition to the system itself, as a root of evil in the Church which ought to be removed; the cause, in former times, of wide-spread spiritual desolation in the land, as well as of more than one secession of many godly men from the Church, and the source, in these our own days, of our present difficulties and embarrassments. We look upon the recent decisions of the civil courts as illustrating the real character of that system of patronage which they attempt so rigidly to enforce; making it clear, that it does impose a burden upon the Church and people of Scotland greatly more grievous than it was ever before believed to do. We consider it to be impossible for the Church, so long as this matter continues on its present footing, fully to vindicate or effectually to apply her inherent and fundamental principles; and it is now more than ever our firm persuasion, that the Church ought to be wholly delivered from the interference of any secular or worldly right at all, with her deliberations relative to the settlement of ministers. We declare, therefore, our determination to seek the removal of this yoke, which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear; believing that it was imposed in violation of a sacred national engagement, and that its removal will, more effectually than any other measure, clear the way for a satisfactory and permanent adjustment of all the questions and controversies in which we are now involved.

Having thus set forth the principles on which we are united, being deeply impressed with a sense of their sacredness and magnitude; having our minds filled with solemn awe as we contemplate the crisis to which God, in his holy providence, has brought this Church and kingdom; a crisis of immediate urgency and of momentous issues, in which great principles must be tested, and interests of vast extent may be affected; and desiring to deliberate and act with a single eye to the Divine glory, and a simple regard to the Divine will—



We, the undersigned ministers and elders, do solemnly, as in a holy covenant with God, and with one another, engage to stand by one another, and by the Church which God's own right hand has planted amongst us; promising and declaring, that, by the grace and help of Almighty God, we will adhere to the two great principles which we have avowed, and in all our actings as office-bearers in the Church, will do our utmost, at all hazards, to carry them into effect; and that we will consent to no surrender or compromise of the same, but will faithfully and zealously prosecute our endeavours to obtain a settlement of the present question in entire accordance therewith.

And considering, that, in this struggle in which the Church is engaged, it is most necessary that we should be assured of the concurrence and co-operation of the Christian people, on whose sympathy and prayers, we, in the discharge of our functions as rulers, greatly lean, and by whose influence and assistance we can best hope effectually to press upon the governors of this great nation the just claims of the Church—

We do, most earnestly and affectionately, invite our friends and brethren, members of the Church of our fathers, to come to our help, and to the help of the Lord; to declare their concurrence in the great principles for which we are called to contend, and their determination to do all in their power, in their station, and according to their means and opportunities, to aid us in maintaining and defending these principles; so that they, as well as we, shall consider themselves pledged to uphold the Church in her present struggle, and, in particular, to use the powers and privileges which, as the citizens of a free country, they have received from God, and for the exercise of which they are responsible to him, for this, above all other ends, that the determination of the Legislature of this great nation, whenever this subject shall come before them, may be in accordance with those principles, which all of us hold to be essential to the purity of the Church and the prosperity of the people.

We, in an especial manner, invite them to raise a united and solemn protest against the system of patronage, which, unjust and obnoxious as it was in its first enactment, the decisions of the civil courts are now riveting more firmly than ever on the reclaiming Church of their fathers. The entire removal of that system they have the fullest warrant, as Scotsmen, and as Presbyterians, to claim, on the ground of their ancient constitution, and the solemn guarantees by which their national freedom and their religious faith have been secured.

And finally, recognising the hand of God in our present troubles, depending wholly on his interposition for a happy issue out of them, and remembering what our fathers have told us—what work the Lord did in their days and in the times of old; we call upon the Christian people to unite with us in a solemn engagement to bear the case of our beloved Church upon our hearts, in prayer and supplication at the throne of God, beseeching him to turn the hearts of those who are against us, and to guide us in the right way, so that, under his overruling providence, and by the operation of his Almighty Spirit, the cause of truth and righteousness may be advanced, and the work of righteousness may be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever.

ART. IX.—*Church of Scotland.*

The Scotch Church is proceeding in her contest with the civil courts with a determination and vigour strongly characteristic of the national character, while there is also exhibited by her a moderation, and reluctance unnecessarily to proceed to extremities, which is probably justly to be traced to the high Christian principles which distinguish the able and good men by whom her steps are at present directed.

The Church has just taken an important step in advance. And we perceive that instead of the majority which carry her forward in her course becoming weaker, it waxes stronger and stronger. The majority in the Assembly which carried the motion of the Rev. Dr. Chalmers to stand fast by her statute privileges and to oppose Lord Aberdeen's Bill was eighty-four, while in the recent vote in *the commission* the majority was one hundred and fourteen: the numbers being 180 and 66. The opponents of the Church have been fond of tracing this ecclesiastical dispute to the *clerical* ambition of the Church. But it is a remarkable fact, that the number of lay elders in the majority exceeded the whole minority, lay and clerical put together. The numbers constituting the majority amounted, as stated above, to 180. Of this number 107 were clergymen, and 73 lay elders, and among the latter were the chief magistrates of the first two cities in Scotland: namely, the Lords Provost of Edinburg and Glasgow.

Dr. Chalmers, in his splendid speech on the occasion, referred to the ground on which the Church was placed by statute law, ratified by the Act of Union in the following terms:—

“If ever a religious establishment in any nation was based, not on a tacit, but on an articulate and declared principle, it is that of the Church of Scotland, on the principle of her own separate and entire jurisdiction in things ecclesiastical. This is no fiction drawn up from the viewless depths of unknown antiquity, but the article of many a successive league—the watchword of many a persecuted congregation—the testimony of many a dying confessor, and which if he had recalled when brought to the stake or the scaffold, would have saved him from his martyrdom. It is not a thing which we have to conjure up or to fancy, but of which we read in the broad daylight of history. . . . . If ever Acts of Parliament can be illumined or interpreted by the events and the circumstances which gave them birth—then is the full recognition there of our spiritual independence made clear as with a sunbeam. But even of this light from without we stand in no need, when we have the light from within of our own Confession engrossed by the Legislature, and now made part and parcel of their Statute Book. There we read, not as *ordained*, but as *recognised* by the law of the land, that “the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, *distinct* from the civil magistrate.” We now contend, not for any peculiar privilege, as an anomaly that belongs to our Church alone, and not to any other of the Protestant Churches in Christendom. Each will profess that there is a distinct government over things sacred; and though they may fix the line variously, each will zealously affirm that there is a line of demarcation somewhere between the civil and ecclesiastical—a department which the one claims as altogether its own, and on which the other may not enter.”

This extract gives a glance to our readers of the statute privileges ceded to the Church; and that the majority of the Lords of the Court of Session are, under evil counsel, trampling on these privileges no unprejudiced man of ordinary understanding can by any possibility doubt. Indeed, we know it on the best authority, that Lord Aberdeen expressed great concern and regret at those proceedings of the Court of Session, in opposition to which the Church, in the persons of her most favoured and honoured sons, are now deliberately acting.

What are these operations of the Court of Session to which we refer?

The Church suspended from the exercise of the sacred office seven contumacious ministers. The Court of Session removed the suspension!

These clergymen being suspended from the sacred office by the authority which had imparted it to them, and, therefore, legally disqualified from entering the pulpit, or administering the sacraments, the general Assembly made provision, as in duty bound, for the administration of the bread of life to the people of those parishes during the suspension of their ministers, that suspension being imposed by the only authority that could suspend them from the exercise of the ministry. The court of Session *interdicted* any clergyman appointed by the Church for the fulfilment of those sacred duties, even from entering the parishes in question!!

Under these illegal and most unconstitutional proceedings of the civil court, the Church has acted with a spirit worthy of their forefathers. Seven of the most distinguished, honoured, and exemplary clergymen of the Church, among whom was the Rev. Dr. Gordon, proceeded, under the instructions of the Church, and in the face of this most disgraceful and unconstitutional interdict, to preach the Gospel and administer the other ordinances of Christianity in the parishes of the suspended ministers: and this duty continues, and will continue, to be regularly performed.

This, however, was not the subject which occupied the attention of the Commission. The Commission, our readers may remember, is a Court composed of all the members of the previous General Assembly; and the Commission met, under the instructions of the last Assembly, to take the preliminary steps for the *deposition* of the seven ministers, if they should continue to resist the authority of the Church, which they had solemnly engaged to respect and obey. They continued contumacious. And the charges against them, under the majority noted above, were regularly introduced, constituting what is technically called a libel, and under which unquestionably these erring men, who appear to us merely the tools in the hands of the virulent opponents of the Church, will ere long meet a most deserved doom.

This contest is unquestionably extremely to be lamented, and yet it has come forward in a manner unforeseen; and its prolongation, by whomsoever deplored, is far more lamented by Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Gordon, and the other leaders of the Church, who yet considered themselves conscientiously bound, under the most sacred obligations, to contend even to bonds and imprisonment, for the spiritual independence of their Church.

We perceived that the Lord Advocate of Scotland, in the House

of Commons, some time before the prorogation of Parliament, publicly repudiated the common saying of the opponents of the Church, that she was, in these matters, acting illegally. He, as well as Mr. Fox Maule, clearly distinguished between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions in Scotland; there are in that country clearly two concurrent authorities, and it is manifestly illegal in one of them to encroach on the province of the other. We have no doubt whatever, that the Court of Session is on this occasion the evil doer—the unjust assailant of rights not their own, and in truth the persecutors of the Church of Christ.

It is well to consider in this case, who constitute the majority in the Church which resists the civil courts, and who the minority who chime in with their oppressive proceedings.

Generally speaking, the approvers in the Church of the civil courts are the drones of the Church—the successors and representatives of the men who during the greater part of the last century kept her asleep; expelled from her bosom some of her most valuable members; originated and perfected the mass of the dissent which is now spread over the land; frowned upon missionary, and other similar operations, and were, in fact, men, for the most part, of the earth, earthy. It is the successors and representatives of these men who, generally speaking, are the approvers, or perhaps, rather the backers, of the Court of Session in their present proceedings.

And who are they who stand up for the spiritual independence of the Church, and resist with deliberate resolution the unjust encroachments of the civil power? They are your men of godliness and spirituality, of devotedness of heart and soul, and of the most abundant labours in the work of the ministry. They are the men, who the very first year after their emancipation from the night-mare pressure of their present opponents, began to build as many churches as the others had done in the previous century: this is a literal fact. They are the men who are now extending churches all over Scotland—dividing unwieldy parishes—sending forth missionaries to assist overburdened parish ministers, and labouring with vast energy and great success in the work of the Lord. They are the men who, not absorbed with their own immediate concerns, have engaged the Church in foreign missionary operations of various kinds, and are giving, in short, full proof of their ministry.

*Much fuller proof than comports with the worldly tastes and perceptions of a multitude of their most noted and virulent opponents!* We believe, if the true key is wanted which has opened, perhaps, the deepest and most determined opposition to the Church of Scotland in the Northern division of the island, it is to be found in the cause which we have now touched.—*London Patriot*.

---

#### ART. X.—*Reasons for the Perpetual Moral Obligation of the British Covenants.*

(Extracted from "Patrick Wellwood.")

ARE *promises* binding, whether personal or national? then are the Covenants binding, for they are national promises. Are *vows* binding? The Covenants are binding, for they are national vows. Are *oaths* binding? Did Joseph take an oath of the children of Is-



rael to carry his bones with them into the land of Canaan? Did the spies swear to preserve Rahab alive, and her house, in the siege and sacking of Jericho? Did Moses swear unto Caleb that he would give him a particular inheritance in the promised land? And were these oaths held to be of binding force, and as such observed? the national Covenants of Scotland are binding, for they are national oaths. Are *laws* binding? the Covenants are binding, for they are national laws, having been solemnly ratified by the Parliament, and registered among the fundamental laws of the kingdom. Are *contracts* binding? if a nation contracts a debt with another nation, or with individuals, is it bound by this contract till the debt is paid? and if the contract is broken, does it involve a breach of national honour and national faith? then are the Covenants binding, for they are national contracts,—contracts with the God of nations, in which this nation avows and avouches itself to be the Lord's, and promises to keep his statutes, promote his interests, and walk in his ways; all which, as a nation, it was bound to do so before by the law of God, but now by its own contract and covenant.

But though binding on them that subscribed and sware it, is the Covenant, you will ask, binding on us who did not? Is its obligation hereditary and descending? That it is so, appears from the following considerations:—

It was sworn by the *nation*. We form a part of the nation, therefore, it was sworn by us; it is binding on us, and will bind the nation so long as it exists.

It was sworn *for us*: hence that clause in the Covenant, “we, and our posterity after us.” In this respect it resembles the national covenant of the Israelites, at the taking of which Moses addressed the tribes in these words: “Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day; that he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath; but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day: (for ye know how we have dwelt in the land of Egypt, and how we came through the nations which ye passed by: and ye have seen their abominations, and their idols, wood and stone, silver and gold, which were among them:) lest there should be among you man, or woman, or family, or tribe, whose heart turneth away this day from the Lord our God, to go and serve the gods of these nations; lest there should be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood: and it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of mine heart, to add drunkenness to thirst: the Lord will not spare him; but then, the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall lie upon him, and the Lord shall blot out his name from under heaven.”

It was sworn for the good of the Kingdom; for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from utter ruin and destruction.

In its *form, end, and matter*, it is *moral*, and therefore binding. Could it be shown, indeed, that in any of these respects it was not *moral*, it would not be of binding force, either on those who subscribed it, or on us whom they represented, for we can neither bind, nor be bound to evil; but if this cannot be shown; if, on the other hand, as I have stated, it is in all respects moral, then so long as there is binding force in morality, in promises, in vows, in oaths, in contracts, personal or national—so long must we be bound by these great national deeds, which it was the glory of these lands to have entered into; but from which, to the astonishment of heaven and earth, they are now seeking to resile.

What applies to the National Covenant, with equal truth and force applies to the Solemn League and Covenant. That Presbytery is founded on, and agreeable to the Word of God, said he, I have taken some pains with you to prove. I may now add, that in Scotland, this form of church government is no novelty—that its existence was co-eval with the introduction of Christianity itself. The first who attempted to introduce prelacy was Palladius, who came to Scotland in the fifth century. The ministers of Christ were then simple presbyters or elders, none having rule over another, but each ruling his own flock—having been set over it by the laying on of the hands of the brethren united into a presbytery.

The model of prelacy which Palladius brought with him, the nation refused to receive—holding strenuously that the apostolic and primitive church admitted no subordination of ministers, and that ordination did not reside in one, but in all, who had perfect equality. When certain prelates came from Rome in this century, the presbyters of Scotland would not so much as admit them into their presence—for which they were censured by a synod of France; which, among other things, affirmed of our Scottish presbyters, that they “ordained elders and deacons without license of lords or superiors.”

In the ninth century, popery had established itself in substance and in form in England, which now sought to subjugate our church, as it had done to subjugate our nation. In a council held in this century, at Cealhythe, Scotsmen were forbidden to exercise any clerical ministry, “because they had no order of metropolitans, and because they gave not honour to others,” which shows that up to this period, there were none in the Scottish church who held higher rank than that of presbyter or bishop. The speech of a young minister, Gilbert Murray by name, in the council of Northampton, wherein attempts were made to impose prelacy on the Scottish church, has been preserved, and is of great worth and of singular beauty. “It is true,” said he, “English nation, thou mightest have been noble, and more noble than many other nations, if thou hadst not craftily turned the power of thy nobility, and the strength of thy fearful might into the presumption of tyranny, and thy knowledge of liberal science into the shifting glosses of sophistry; but thou disposest not thy purposes as if thou wert led by reason, but being puffed up with thy strong armies, and trusting in thy great wealth, thou attemptest, in thy lust of domineering, to bring under thy jurisdiction the neighbour provinces and nations, more noble,

I will not say in multitude or power, but in lineage and antiquity; unto whom, if thou wilt consider ancient records, thou shouldst rather have been humble, obedient, or, at least laying aside thy rancour, have reigned together in perpetual love. And now, with all wickedness of pride that thou showest, without any reason or law, but in thy ambitious power, thou seekest to oppress thy mother, the Church of Scotland, which from the beginning has been catholic and free, and which brought thee, when thou wast straying in the wilderness of heathenism, into the safeguard of the true faith and way unto life, even unto Christ Jesus, the anchor of eternal rest. She did wash thy kings, thy princes, and people in the laver of holy baptism; she taught thee the ten commandments of God, and instructed thee in moral duties: she did accept many of thy nobles, and others of meaner rank, when they were desirous to learn to read, and gladly gave them entertainment without price; books also to read, and instruction freely. And now, I pray, what recompense renderest thou unto her that hath bestowed so many benefits on thee? Is it bondage? Is it evil for good? It seemeth no other thing. Thou unkind vine, how art thou turned into bitterness; we looked for grapes, and thou bringest forth wild grapes; for judgment, and behold iniquity and a cry. But to the end that I weary not others with my words, albeit I have no charge to speak for the liberty of the Church of Scotland, and albeit all the clergy of Scotland would think otherwise, yet I dissent from subjecting her; and if it were needful for me to die in the cause, here I am, ready to lay down my neck unto the sword; nor do I think it expedient to advise any more with my lords the prelates, nor if they will do otherwise do I consent unto them."

The reply of King Alexander the Second to the pope's legate, when, in 1237, he desired leave to enter Scotland to redress, as he said, the affairs of the church, is also memorable: "I remember not," said the Scottish king, "that ever a legate was in my land; neither have I need of one, thanks be to God; neither was any in my father's time, nor in the times of my ancestors; neither will I suffer any, as long as I may." The independence of the Scottish Church was, it is true, at last destroyed. She who never bent her neck to Rome-pagan, bowed to Rome-papal. At the blessed and glorious era of the Reformation, this yoke was broken in pieces, and the church was once more settled after the ancient model, and became the same free Presbyterian Kirk, that, till the invasion of the papacy, it had always been. To preserve the Kirk thus modelled and thus settled, the National Covenant, as you already know, was renewed in 1638. While the National Covenant was renewed with this design in 1638, in 1643 with the same design—to countervail the treacherous and bloody plots and practices of the enemies of the reformed religion—to rear up a bastion on which the waves of popish rage might not only dash in vain, but dash themselves in pieces, and to bring the churches in the three kingdoms to a conformity, after the same primitive and apostolic pattern, according to the approved practice of these kingdoms, and the example of God's people in other countries, the Solemn League and Covenant was entered into, and sworn by the king, parliament, and people. This Covenant, for the equity of its matter, the formality of its manner,

and the importance of its object, equally lawful, and laudable, and binding with its National Covenant—has, as you are aware, in common with it, been lately rescinded, and is now not only derided and reviled, but the denial of its obligation is required as a test of loyalty, and a qualification for office. Though rescinded, however, on earth, it is registered, it is ratified in heaven—which has witnessed, and on king and people will yet punish this nefarious deed, which, however little thought of now, is, and in after ages, I doubt not, will come to be regarded and bewailed as a deep and deliberate PERJURY OF THE NATION'S SOUL. And I as little doubt but that the time will come when the principles contained in these rescinded Covenants, now hewn into a thousand pieces, and scattered with scorn to the winds, shall be gathered up with pious care, like “the torn body of a martyred saint.” Yea, when these Covenants themselves, now rescinded and reviled, as they were once Scotland's glory, shall become the means of her reformation and revival—a reformation more glorious than any she has yet seen. To contribute to such an end it were worth while to live, yea even to die.

---

ART. XI.—THE PLEA OF PRESBYTERY, *on behalf of the Ordination, Government, Discipline, and Worship of the Christian Church; as opposed to the Unscriptural Character and Claims of Prelacy; in a Reply to the Rev. Archibald Boyd, A. M., on Episcopacy.* By Ministers of the General Synod of Ulster. 12mo. pp. 612. William Collins, Glasgow; M'Comb, Belfast. 1840.

THIS second work of the ministers of Derry, in defence of Presbyterian Church Government, in reply to Boyd on Episcopacy, far excels its predecessor, “*Presbyterianism Defended*,” of which we have already spoken in terms of commendation. It is a very full and masterly production, and any notice which our limited space allows us to give of its contents, must convey a very inadequate idea of its excellence. The esteemed authors have approved themselves to be masters in Israel, in defending the bulwarks of our Presbyterian Zion. They have brought to the task an extent of research, a clearness and accuracy of discrimination, and a conclusiveness of reasoning which are rarely to be met with in modern controversial works. In acquaintance with the testimony of Scripture, and in the knowledge of the records of Christian antiquity, and of the writings of eminent Divines, both on the Episcopal and Presbyterian side, they have shown themselves more than a match for the champions of Prelacy, whether they are the followers of Pusey, or those in this country, who plead for the Divine right of Diocesan Episcopacy, and who would unchurch all that cannot find a Scriptural warrant for the whim of Apostolical Succession, or for self-invented ceremonies. The volume is, indeed, an arsenal of well-prepared arms for the defence of the Scriptural order of the Sanctuary; and it is worthy to be taken as a text-book by those who are to be intrusted with the defence of the battlements of the Church. The abettors of Episcopacy may evade the argument, or resort to the writings of the fourth or fifth century, when the mystery of iniquity had begun to work extensively in the church; or, make plausible appeals to a sentimental charity, which cannot distinguish be-

tween truth and error; but it will be long before they will fairly grapple with the statements and reasonings of the "*Plea of Presbytery*," and from the hands of its distinguished authors, they may calculate on certain defeat in their attempts to thrust upon the community the exclusive and intolerant claims of Prelacy.—*Belfast Cov.*

Could not the editor of the *Covenanter* transmit a copy of this work to us, by some person emigrating to America?—Edit. Mon.

#### ART. XII.—*Scripture elucidated.*

The Death of Shimei, 1 Kings, ii. 5—9.

The conduct of David in his expiring moments has been often branded by the enemies of the Bible as blood-thirsty and revengeful, and utterly at variance with that spirit of kindness and charity which religion enjoins and inspires; and not a few of the firm believers in revelation have felt themselves incapable of reconciling his charge to Solomon, respecting Shimei, with the principles of integrity, honour, and truth: "And, behold, thou hast with thee Shimei the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, which cursed me with a grievous curse in the day when I went to Mahanaim: but he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I swore to him by the Lord, saying, I will not put thee to death with the sword. Now therefore hold him not guiltless; for thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him; but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood." The plain meaning of this, it has been said, is, "I swear that I would not put him to death; but be sure you do not let him escape;" thus, prevarication and blood-thirstiness reign in the breast of "the man after God's own heart," even on the eve of dissolution; and what is, if possible, still worse, the inspired narrative relates this charge, and records its execution with approbation.

Happily, however, the sacred text furnishes ample materials for rescuing, at once, the dying monarch, and that Spirit which spake by him, from the vile imputation.

It is not uncommon, as Dr. Kennicott long since remarked, and every Hebrew scholar knows, to omit the negative particle translated *not*, in the second part of a sentence, and consider it as *understood*, when it has been *expressed* in the first. Accordingly, our translators have often supplied the particle, though not expressed in the Hebrew, because the sense required it. Thus, Isa. xxiii. 4: "I travail *not*, and I bring *not* forth children, and I do *not* nourish young men, and I do *not* bring up virgins." The particle answering to *not*, is *not expressed* in the Hebrew, but *understood*, and rightly *supplied* by our translators, in the *last member* of the sentence. In Psalm i. 5: "Therefore the ungodly shall *not stand* in the judgment, and sinners in the congregation of the righteous;" the negative particle with the verb, "*SHALL NOT STAND*," must be supplied to complete the sense; thus: "And sinners shall not stand in the congregation of the righteous." Our translators have used the word *nor* as equivalent to this. So in Psalm ix. 18. "For the needy shall *not* always be forgotten; the expectation of the poor shall perish for ever." Our translators have necessarily *supplied*

the particle **NOT** in the second member of the sentence, though not *expressed* in the Hebrew, and have put it in *Italics*. And not to multiply examples, in Proverbs xxiv. 12, this is *twice* done. "Doth *not* he that pondereth the heart, consider it? And he that keepeth thy soul, doth *not* he know it? And shall he *not* render unto every man according to his works?" The negative particle rendered **NOT**, is *expressed* but *once* in the Hebrew in this passage, but is properly and necessarily supplied in the following members of the sentence. It would be easy to multiply instances, but it is unnecessary: see Judges v. 30. Job xxiii. 1, 7.—Psalms xxviii. 1, &c. &c. By supplying the negative particle, in the same way, in David's charge concerning Shimei, it will read, "But his hoar head bring thou *not* down to the grave with blood."

As the construction of the original requires this meaning, so it is supported by *the facts of the case*. Shimei had been an enemy to David; but he had made submission, and received the King's solemn oath that he should not be put to death. David therefore commands Solomon to keep the pledge sacred which had been given; but as he had been a troublesome man, and was a man of influence, he bids him "hold him not guiltless," that is, treat him not as an innocent person, who had never created disturbance, or evinced dissatisfaction with the government: "For thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him," adds the King; as if he had said, You will easily find means to keep him from doing mischief, and yet preserve my oath inviolate.

Accordingly, Solomon acted upon this judicious advice. He did not suffer Shimei to go at large; he sent for him, commanded him to reside constantly in Jerusalem, and added, that if he should, on any account, cross the brook Kidron, it should be taken as an evidence of some seditious scheme, and he should die, and his blood be upon his own head. To these terms, as better than he deserved, Shimei gladly consented, and took an oath to observe them, as appears v. 43; but at the end of three years, he broke through them, and went to Gath. Upon this he was brought before the king; and while Solomon reminded him of his former wickedness, he pronounces sentence upon him; *not for that former wickedness*, but for *the violation of his solemn engagement*. See verses 36—46. All this shows that Solomon understood his father's commandment as above explained.

A comparison of the case of Shimei with that of Joab, *corroborates this view*. In the case of Joab, David recounts the murders of which he had been guilty; and on the ground of these, according to the command of God, directs Solomon to execute justice upon him, v. 5, 6. This Solomon does forthwith. But Shimei had *not* committed murder; and besides he had received the king's oath that he should be safe, as far as his past conduct was concerned; and had he not violated his own solemn compact, and Solomon's injunction, "his hoar head would *not* have descended to the grave with blood."

In all this David is to be *considered*, not as a *private man* giving advice to his children, but as a sovereign sustaining a public character, and giving a charge to his successor as to the due administration of justice.—*Dublin Christian Magazine*.

# THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

DECEMBER, 1840.

---

## ART. I.—*Indiscriminate Hearing.*

MR. EDITOR.—On reflecting farther on the subject of *indiscriminate hearing*, or rather on my former communication to you on that subject, I have concluded that my former paper would perhaps have been more complete, if I had added another specification of public religious teachers, whom we should not hear—namely, *such as drop any truth already attained*. I am aware that all that is strictly included in this particular, might have been noticed under some of the particulars already mentioned; such as that referring to those who do not bring *all* the doctrine of Christ. Because such as drop any truth already attained by the church, or already imbodyed in her public profession, do not bring the doctrine of Christ in such a way as would warrant us to receive them into our houses as *our* teachers, (2 John 10,) or as stewards of the mysteries of God; for the part or portion thus kept back by them, might be the very part which we most needed to have set before us. Another view of the work and character of the public teacher of the religion of Jesus Christ, will lead also to the same conclusion according to the commission, (Mat. xxviii. 20.) They are to “teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever” Christ “has commanded.” Now the teacher that refuses or neglects to teach one of the things which Christ has commanded is not acting according either to the spirit or letter of his commission. And a course of this kind, or persisting in the omission, would justly forfeit his commission or his right to preach under it. Such a one must then be properly classed with *those whom Christ has not sent*.

But, again, the public teachers of religion sustain not merely the character of witnesses for Christ, in common with other professors, whose duty it is to witness for Christ, by an exemplary Christian deportment; but they are bound to sustain this character in a special sense, by *witnessing* in their public teaching for *all* the doctrines or commands of Christ: (see Acts i. 8,) compared with Matth. xxviii. 20. The former passage shows that to witness for Christ is a solemn and important Christian duty, and the latter shows *what* we are to witness for Christ—namely, the truth and practical importance of all his commands.

Again; a witness should not practically contradict his own testimony. If he intends that his testimony should have weight with others, he must show that he believes it himself. His practice must not be inconsistent with his profession, or the one will destroy the

influence of the other. And it would be difficult in such a case to predict which would prevail. Actions speak louder than words. Paul lays it down as a general principle, that if he "built again the things which he had destroyed, he made himself a transgressor," (Gal. ii. 18.) Thus, the person, (or any number of persons would not alter the case,) who had laboured to destroy by his testimony any particular error in doctrine, or sin in practice, and would by his practice endeavour to build, countenance, or support the same, would, according to the mind of the Holy Spirit, as expressed by Paul, make himself a transgressor, and consequently guilty.

But the particular thing intended by the remark at the commencement of this paper is the dropping of some truth in doctrine, or in practice; or, in other words, some command of Christ, which has been already professed by the church, according to the direction in Philip. iii. 16: "Whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule; let us mind the same things." And then follow the reasons of his direction, verses 17, 18, 19; all which let the reader consider.

Backsliding from attainments already made, is a sin very prominently marked out and condemned in the word of God. The preacher or public teacher of religion, whose teaching or instruction would have a tendency to lead us to forget any of God's truths, by dropping or keeping them out of view, and thus lead us into the sin of backsliding, ought not to be heard. We should incur great danger by hearing them.

J. P. M.

#### ART. II.—*Biblical Criticism.*

"Hear, ye deaf,—and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Who is blind but my servant? or deaf as my messenger that I sent? Who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the Lord's servant? Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not: The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable. But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison-houses; they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore."—*Isaiah* xlii. 18—22.

The common exposition of this passage, which applies the 19th verse to the Jewish nation, has always appeared objectionable, on two accounts. First, though the characters 'blind,' and 'deaf,' and 'not observing,' and 'not hearing,' might apply to that people; yet the terms 'the servant of God,' his 'messenger,' 'the perfect one,' &c. could not apply to them, and are inconsistent with the former; and to say the nation is spoken of, not as to what they were, but what they thought themselves, is to pervert, not to interpret the Word of God. And secondly, the 21st verse is supposed, and with great propriety, to refer to Christ; but the 'servant,' the 'messenger,' the 'perfect one,' mentioned in the 19th and 20th verses, is the person for whose righteousness' sake Jehovah is well pleased, and who will magnify the law, and make it honourable. Therefore, if the latter apply to Christ, the former must apply to him also; and to refer the one to the Jewish nation, and the other to our Lord, destroys the connexion of the passage, and renders it inconsistent with itself. And, in all probability, no one would ever have thought of the Jewish nation, had it not been supposed impossible for the inspired prophet to call our Lord blind and deaf—to say of him, 'Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but thou hearest not.'



But is it not possible to apply the *whole* passage to our Lord, in perfect consistency with the scope of the chapter, and with the other parts of the Word of God, where the Messiah is spoken of?

The chapter commences with the call of Jehovah to contemplate the Messiah, his incarnate Son; compare verses 1—4 with Matthew xii. 16—21. The same glorious personage is spoken of throughout the chapter. In the 5th, 6th, and 7th verses, Jehovah addresses him, promises him support, and proclaims the great design of his mission. In the following verses, 8—17, Jehovah proclaims himself the only God; the nations of the earth are called upon to worship, and serve, and praise him; the overthrow of every false system is predicted; and the gathering together of his elect from the four winds of heaven is declared.

The 18th verse contains an address to the ignorant and obdurate Jews, to ponder these wondrous events—the displays of Jehovah's mercy—the advent of his Son in human nature—and the gathering in of the depraved and deluded heathen to partake in the blessedness of his grace. "Hear, ye deaf, and look, ye blind, that ye may see." The 19th and 20th verses point out the wondrous object of attentive consideration; Messiah, meek and submissive, patient and resigned, amid the tremendous and unparalleled sufferings to which he was exposed. "Who is blind but my servant, or deaf as my messenger that I sent?"—namely, "the servant—the elect one," spoken of in the beginning of the chapter; "the messenger," spoken of in the 6th and 7th verses, sent forth to be "a light of the Gentiles." "Who is blind?" Jehovah again asks, "as he that is perfect, and blind as the Lord's servant?" The nature of this blindness and deafness is described in the next words: "Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not." In the execution of the work given him to do, there were many things to which he was "blind and deaf,"—many sufferings and insults, of which he was regardless—many reproaches, to which he gave not heed. This is beautifully illustrated by a passage in Psalm xxxviii. 11—15: "*My lovers and my friends stand aloof from me; and they that seek my hurt, speak mischievous things, and imagine deceits all the day long, But I as a deaf man heard not; and I was as a dumb man that openeth not his mouth. Thus I was as a man that heareth not, and in whose mouth are no reproofs: FOR IN THEE, O LORD, DO I HOPE; THOU WILT HEAR, O LORD, MY GOD.*" No language could more beautifully express deep submission, springing from confidence in God; and this is precisely the view which the passage under consideration gives of the state of mind, and of the whole character and conduct of HIM who "was oppressed and was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth;" who was "brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth." Isaiah liii. 7.

The 21st verse describes the glorious effects of these sufferings, thus meekly borne by Jehovah's Servant—the perfect One; sufferings, the patient endurance of which was one essential part of his perfection: "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable." He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; in this he was the substitute of his people—the sufferings were endured in their room; by his obedience and sufferings, the justice of God was satisfied, and a way opened for the exercise of mercy, in consistency with truth

and holiness. Thus Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; and, in the obedience to the law of Him, who, though made of a woman, and made under the law, is yet "The true God," The "Law-giver;" the law is not only fulfilled, but magnified, and made honourable: its precepts obeyed, its curse borne away, and its honour, as a perfect transcript of Jehovah's will, as holy, and just, and good, abundantly maintained.

The chapter then concludes with a description of the deplorable condition, and overwhelming ruin of the Jewish nation, for their impentence and unbelief—in having refused to 'hear' and to 'look;' to consider and believe on him to the saving of the soul.

Reader, take heed, lest there be in you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. Beware, lest thou fall after the same example of self-righteousness and unbelief. See that thou refusest not Him that speaketh in his Gospel; for if they escaped not, who refused to hear him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from Him that speaketh from heaven.

---

### ART. III.—*The Book of Death; or, a Statement of the Doctrine of Reprobation.*

IN a former paper we presented a few critical remarks on the Scriptural expression, *The book of Life*, and by way of sequel, we now dwell for a moment on another, not indeed to be found verbally in the Scriptures, but by lawful conclusion deducible from them.

For instance, it is said in Jude, verse fourth, "for there are certain men crept in unawares, who were *before of old ordained to this condemnation*," on the import of which latter clause, we found the expression with which our paper has been commenced, namely: *the book of death*.

The doctrine we are taught by these words, above quoted from Jude's epistle, is of a sublime and humbling nature, and it well becomes mortal, fallible, and foolish man to draw near to it with the greatest submission and holy awe. Young, the poet, has said,

"Not deeply to discern, not much to know,  
Mankind was born to wonder and adore."

The word in the original Greek here translated ordained is, *προκαταρτισθαι*, which literally imports, "to mark out or write previously;" as apostate rebels on earth sometimes are by the arm of authority doomed as victims to the justice of the state. Hence, on the expression "before of old ordained to this condemnation," we found the following proposition, namely: that *God from all eternity, viewing man as fallen, degraded, sinful, and guilty, did pass by a certain portion of the human family;—and not only so, but, on account of their sins, did actually appoint them unto wrath and eternal destruction.*

This has been called by divines the doctrine of *reprobation*, but this word, as it is too often understood, does not properly express the Scripture doctrine. The word rendered "reprobate," is *αδοκιμος*, which literally signifies, "not approved." It was used with reference to various objects. For instance, it was employed to designate metals that did not stand the test of the refiner, as we learn from Jeremiah vi. 30—"reprobate," or "refuse silver shall men call thee, because the Lord hath rejected thee." It was used also

in reference to those persons who contended, unsuccessfully or otherwise, in the Greek or Roman games. He who strove lawfully and conquered, was called *δοκιμος*, or "approved;" and the Apostle Paul in another place says, "lest when I have preached to others, I myself should be a *cast away*," which, literally, would be "a not approved." The same word is used with respect to the mind in Romans, i. 28, where a "reprobate mind" is spoken of, which simply intends a mind so blinded by sin as not to be able to discover wickedness, nor to approve that which is good.

Nothing, therefore, can be deduced from the word "reprobate," concerning the purpose or the decrees of the Most High. The word is not used in Scripture as an active, transitive verb; it is not said that God "reprobated any one, but, on the contrary, it has always a reference to a state of mind superinduced by habits of sin arising from a deeply depraved nature. Reprobation, therefore, is an effect rather than a cause. Of what then is it an effect? It is the effect of being of old "ordained to this condemnation." But what is it to be of old ordained to this condemnation? The original word translated "ordained of old," would induce us to believe that God not only inscribed the names of the righteous in the book of Life, but that he also recorded the names of the wicked in a book of death; and to this mode of expression we have no objection, provided correct views be entertained with regard to its meaning. The Most High did not, to speak as to the order of his dealing, write one portion of Adam's family in the book of Life, and the other part in a book of death—which supposition would be exactly the notion entertained by those who are called *supralapsarians*; but viewing all mankind as sinners, he did from all eternity, out of his sovereign pleasure, write by a decree of election his chosen people in a book of salvation, and the rest of mankind he was pleased to pass by, and, not only so, but for their sins appointed them to eternal condemnation. The Lord, out of a hell-deserving race, unconditionally chose some to everlasting bliss, and this through inconceivable sovereign love and mercy:—he passed by others equally as sinful, which was doing them no injustice; those whom he passed by, on account of their sins, he foreordained to woe, and this was according to strict justice. But why, it may be asked, did God unconditionally choose the elect to final salvation, and did not thus appoint the wicked to their doom of future misery? \* This question arises from a wrong view of the subject. Had all mankind been righteous, God, to speak with reverence, could not, in accordance with his nature, have consigned any of them to death. It is evident that Jehovah did not *absolutely* ordain men to future misery, that is, without viewing them as sinners, for this clear reason that the terms "elect," or "election," are used in the Scriptures. Would it not be absurd to speak of "election" at all, if Adam had maintained his original integrity? On such a supposition God could not have elected any to life, because in the very fact of Adam's standing, he and all his posterity would have been entitled. God did not make

\* The choice of the elect to salvation, and the passing by of the *non-elect*, must be regarded as an act of gracious sovereignty, according to the declaration made to Moses, "I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy." But the reprobation of the non-elect or wicked, proceeds upon *justice*. They being wicked, were "children of wrath." "The wicked is snared in the work of his own hands." *Edit. Rel. Mon.*

his decree of election after man's fall. Hence, then, finding the word "election" in the Bible is a clear proof that the Almighty, at that period when he made the choice, had respect to man as guilty, and in so far we utterly repudiate the views of the *supralapsarians*.\*

But it is said by writers who take this view of God's decree that it comes to the same thing, whether we consider God as having appointed man to wrath unconditionally, or as having created him fallible, and with a certain foresight of his fate, consigned him to his doom of degradation. We answer, no:—we do not arrive at the same conclusion from either view of the subject. We grant there are difficulties connected with the whole doctrine, but why in opposition to reason, Scripture, and the very nature of God, propose a view, which, without gaining any advantage, makes the subject still more difficult? And after all, difficulties cannot be said so properly to belong to the doctrine of God's decree, as to the mysterious fact of the admission of sin into our world. This is a subject which we have always found vast and powerfully absorbing, because, from it arises all the difficulties in the moral universe;—but, amidst all our cogitations with respect to it, we would still, and put to shame every unlawful rising of nature, with the pointed and soothing question—"Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"—*Belfast Covenanter*.

#### ART. IV.—*Tappan's Review of Edwards on the Will.*

WE hope the time is near at hand, when some champion of the truth will be ready to repel the attack of Tappan against Edwards on the Will. It is an alarming fact, that the dangerous principles of this reviewer of Edwards, are rapidly gaining ground in our country, and are threatening the subversion of Calvinism. Every lover of truth, therefore, must look with impatience for a refutation of Tappan's work.

It is not our purpose at present, to notice many of his fallacies, but we will attempt to point out one instance in which he is not only sadly deficient in his reasoning, but makes a misstatement of Edwards. Of course it can only be interesting to those who are somewhat familiar with this work of Edwards. We have reference in particular to the third part of Tappan's book, in which he undertakes an examination of Edwards' argument against a self-determining will.

After stating the well-known argument of Edwards against a self-determining will, he says, that this reasoning "depends mainly on the assumption that if the will determines itself, it must determine itself by an act of choice; that is, inasmuch as those acts of the will, or the soul considered in its power of willing, or in its personal activity by which effects are produced out of the activity or will itself, are produced by acts of choice; for example, walking and talking, rising up and sitting down; therefore if the soul in the power of willing cause volitions, it must cause them by volitions. The causative act by which the soul causes volitions, must itself be a

\* *Supralapsarians*, are those who believe that in the decree of election God had respect to man as *created and fallen*; *supralapsarians*, are those who are of opinion that in that decree, the Most High viewed man as *to be created and to fall*."

volition. This assumption Edwards does not even attempt to sustain, but takes it for granted that it is of unquestionable validity."

Here we are told that Edwards' reasoning in his argument against a self-determining will, depends on the *assumption* that if the will determines its volitions, it determines them by acts of will. Concerning this we have two remarks to make.

1. Admitting that this is an *assumption* of Edwards, it would be made with perfect propriety, for it is not conceivable that a cause would produce an effect without an act of that cause. What is an act? Why, it is a principle in exercise. But can a principle produce an effect without being in exercise? No. Then the will cannot cause a volition without being in exercise, or without an act of the will. But,

2. In stating that Edwards assumes this, Tappan *misstates*; for Edwards does not assume it. Did Mr. Tappan ever thoroughly read "Edwards on the Will, Part II. Sec. 11?" Edwards there says, "If to evade the force of what has been observed, it should be said, that when the Arminians speak of the will's determining its own acts, they do not mean, that the will determines its acts by any preceding act, or that one act of the will determines another; but only that the faculty or power of will, or the soul in the use of that power, determines its own volitions; and that it does it without any act going before the act determined: Such an evasion would be full of the most gross absurdity." And he then proceeds to give several demonstrations to prove the absurdity of that notion, that the will can determine its volitions, without an act of the will. We will give two of these arguments of Edwards, and the first one shall be in his own words.

"If the faculty or power of the will determines an act of volition, or the soul in the *use or exercise* of that power determines it, that is the same thing as for the soul to determine volition by an act of will. For an *exercise* of the power of will, and an *act* of that power are the same thing." The other argument of Edwards is as follows.

If the will determines its volitions, then the will is either active in determining them, or it is not. If it is active in it, then the determination is an act of the will. If it is not active in it, then it does not exercise any liberty in it. Therefore, if the will determines its volitions, it determines them by acts of will.

We have thus shown that what Tappan calls an assumption of Edwards: namely, that "if the soul in the power of willing, cause volitions, it must cause them by volitions," is not an assumption, but is regularly proved. Now mark Tappan's words. "If the assumption be of unquestionable validity, then his (Edwards) position, is impregnable; for nothing can be more palpably absurd than the will determining volitions, by volitions, in an interminable series." Thus, by Tappan's own admission, Edwards' doctrine is true, and his own doctrine is false. What could we ask more?

T. L. K.

---

#### ART. V.—*The Election.*

WE went to the election ground. Thousands of our citizens had assembled, and were patiently waiting until they could reach the

crowded polls, and give in their votes. In various places we saw small coteries anxiously engaged in discussing the merits of their favourite candidates, and in calculating the prospect of their success. Most were eager, some were excited, none appeared indifferent. From early morn until late night, as we understand, the same dense multitudes crowded the stands. The scene was calculated to awaken reflection. We thought, how eager is this great multitude for the election of a particular candidate, and how cheerfully do they labour for his success, although probably personally unknown to them, and not expecting from his elevation any particular emolument; and yet, perhaps, the majority of them have never made their own "calling and election sure," which is a point of infinitely greater moment to each of them, and upon securing which, their eternal destiny is suspended.

We thought, too, how anxious must the candidates themselves be about the result, eager to hear every report, and alternately elevated and depressed, as their success seems to be more or less doubtful; and yet, perhaps, these very candidates have never thought of the importance of being "elect according to the foreknowledge of God," anticipating an elevation to a civil office for a season with more intense anxiety, than a glorious exaltation at the right hand of God.

We thought, too, here is a vast multitude divided in political opinion, and regarding each other with jealous feeling, and may it not be, that there will be a great and ever-enduring difference between them in the last great day? If, as may be supposed, some are the friends, and some the enemies of God, they differ morally and spiritually, more than they do politically, and this difference will be increased and perpetuated in eternity.

We observed, too, how closely the qualifications of each voter were scanned, and it forcibly called to mind the scrutiny which will be instituted in the last day into the character of every one who may endeavour to make out a title to a seat in the heavenly kingdom. The scrutiny in the first case may be evaded, in the last, it will be unerring.

We discovered that some became impatient, and would not wait their turn to cast their vote, and finally lost their opportunity; alas! how often do poor sinners, in a concern of infinitely greater moment, through impatience and want of perseverance, lose the favourable season of making their peace with God, and saving their own souls.

The crowd on an election ground, is a motley and mixed assemblage—virtuous, religious, profane, impious, intemperate; but oh! how glorious will it be to stand amidst the general assembly which shall compose the heavenly church, from which shall be excluded every thing which defileth, and where holiness shall be the characteristic of all!—*Presbyterian*.

---

#### ART. VI.—*History of the Apocrypha.*

THE Council of Trent, (1546,) Session IV. passed the following decree: "The sacred, œcumenical, and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, the three legates of the Apostolic See presiding in it; having this object perpetually in view, that

errors being removed, the real purity of the Gospel may be preserved in the Church; which, promised aforetime by the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated by his own mouth, and afterwards ordained to be preached to every creature by his Apostles, as being a fountain of all saving truth and instruction of manners; knowing, moreover, that this truth and instruction is contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions, which, taken from the mouth of Christ himself by the Apostles, or handed down, as it were, by the Apostles themselves under the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have been transmitted to us; *receives and venerates, with sentiments of equal piety and reverence*, all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, *since one God was the Author of them both*, and also the Traditions relating as well to faith as to morals, as dictated either by the mouth of Christ, or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved by an uninterrupted succession. Moreover it has determined to annex to this decree an index to the Sacred Books; lest a doubt should arise to any one which they be, that are received by this Synod." Then follows a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, *with the Apocryphal books intermingled*, so that after Nehemiah, follow Tobit and Judith; after Esther, the apocryphal work entitled The Rest of Esther; after the Song of Solomon, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; after Lamentations, Baruch; in the middle of the third chapter of Daniel is inserted the Song of the Three Children; and after the twelfth chapter of Daniel, the Story of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon; and after Malachi, the Macabees. Next is given a catalogue of the Books of the New Testament, the same as in the Protestant Canon; and the whole concludes with these words: "But if any one shall not receive, for sacred and canonical, *all those books with all their parts*, as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and are set forth in the old Vulgate Latin edition, and knowingly and advisedly shall condemn the aforesaid Traditions, let him be accursed." Thus by this decree the Church of Rome enrols the Apocryphal books among the lively Oracles; and so amalgamates them by her arrangement, as to identify them therewith; and pronounces an anathema against all who do not receive and reverence them, and all the parts of them, with equal piety and veneration, as the other books of Holy Scripture. This decree, as well as all others enacted by the Council of Trent, is binding on all Roman Catholics; and accordingly it has been recognised by the Douay translators in 1610; by Bossuet a century afterwards, though his favourite scheme of reuniting the Protestants with the Church of Rome failed chiefly on this ground; and last of all by Bishop Doyle in his letters on the state of Ireland.

It is necessary, therefore, to ascertain on what grounds the Apocryphal books are excluded by Protestants from forming a portion of Holy Scripture. An excellent summary may be found in Dick on Inspiration, p. 67—80, and Horne's Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, vol. i. 677—704. But there are many things of great importance to be known, particularly in the present day, which the nature of these works did not lead their authors to communicate.

It is universally admitted that the Apocryphal books were not recognised by the Jewish Church, as a part of the Canonical Scriptures; and to that Church the oracles of God were committed. This is fully admitted by the Editors of the Douay version in 1610.

"Who seeth not," say they, "that the Canon of the Church of Christ (meaning the Romish Church,) is of more authority with all true Christians, than the Canon of the Jews." Jehovah, who had determined "at sundry times and in divers manners," to communicate his will to the Jewish Fathers, gave the plainest directions for ascertaining the divine mission of those who assumed the character of his ambassadors; and from Moses to Malachi a succession of prophets was raised up, through whom the Word of God was distinguished from all spurious productions, while the failure of the predictions of pretended prophets, and the inflictions of signal judgments on them, secured the people from their deceptions. The books which compose the Old Testament without the Apocrypha, were received, and alone received in the Jewish Church, as written under the direction of the Holy Spirit. Josephus assures us of this; and adds, "During so many ages, no one dared to add any thing to these books, or to take any thing from them, or to alter any thing in them; for it is implanted in the nature of all Jews, immediately from their birth to consider these books as the Oracles of God; to adhere to them, and if occasion should require, cheerfully to die for them." And, finally, neither our Lord nor any of the Apostles, while they acknowledged the Old Testament and appealed to it, ever insinuated a charge of unfaithfulness against the Jews, on the ground of rejecting any sacred writings, any more than of adding to or corrupting the Holy Scripture. Thus previously to the rejection of the Jewish people, the Son of God stamped with his authority that part of revelation which had been committed to them.

It is not easy to ascertain the precise period at which the Apocryphal books became interspersed among the Canonical Scriptures, nor by whom, or by what authority this was done. Certain it is, that they are not mentioned in the catalogue of inspired writings, made in the second century by Melito Bishop of Sardis, who travelled into the East for the purpose of investigating the authenticity of the Sacred Writings; nor in those of Origen in the third century; of Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerome, Ruffinus and others of the fourth century; nor in the catalogue of Canonical books recognised by the Council of Laodicea held in the same century, whose canons were received by the Catholic Church; so that, as Bishop Burnet well observes, we have the concurring sense of the whole Church of God in rejecting the Apocrypha.

The earliest account we have of these books occupying a place among the inspired records is given by Jerome, who tells us they were read for example of life and instruction of manners, but were not employed to establish any doctrine: and when the same learned person, near the close of the fourth century, formed the translation known by the name of the Vulgate, he prefixed to each book a short notice, in which the reader was informed of its character, *and, with respect to the Apocryphal books, distinctly warned, that they were not in the canon of Scripture.* Before the Reformation, the Vulgate contained these prefaces annexed to the title of each book. Besides these, Jerome wrote a preface of a more general character, entitled 'Prologus Galeatus,' or 'the helmeted preface,' for the purpose, as he says, of defending the inspired writings, and showing that all the others are to be ranked among the Apocrypha. In this prologue he distinctly states that these Apocryphal books 'are not



in the canon.' And as some of the Apocryphal writings are so blended with the inspired, as that the distinction might not be obvious to the more ignorant, as in the additions to Esther, and Daniel, Jerome says, that while, to meet the prejudices of the ignorant, he retained these 'fables,' which were widely dispersed, yet according to his custom he had marked them with a spit or dagger placed horizontally, for the purpose of stabbing these intruders. Thus at whatever period the Apocryphal became blended with the sacred records, the care taken by Jerome to distinguish them, and the epithets he applies to them, make it evident that they were not looked upon as inspired or canonical.

In the fifth century, according to Augustine, when these books were publicly read in the Church, they were given to inferior readers, who read them from a place lower than that occupied by the bishops and presbyters, while reading the Canonical Scriptures.

A similar care was exercised in succeeding times. A short running Commentary, entitled the Ordinary Gloss, was placed in the margin of the Bible about the ninth century, in the preface to which the inspiration of the Apocryphal books is carefully denied; while in a note at the head of each of these books, it is expressly asserted that it is not in the canon; a distinction, says Cosin, in his history of the Canon, written as with a pen of iron that it might never be forgotten.

It was not till the Council of Trent, that these fables, as Jerome calls them, were intermingled with the inspired Oracles. Luther and his coadjutors in the work of Reformation had set the example of making the Word of God the only infallible test of doctrine and practice. Some of the leading tenets of the Church of Rome have no foundation in the Word of God; and Roman Catholics themselves appealed to tradition; but tradition the Reformers rejected as uncertain and liable to corruption, and the minds of the intelligent and pious went along with them. The Church was in danger; and the Council was convened to meet the tremendous crisis. This Bossuet himself, unwittingly but fully admits to have been the cause of summoning the Council. "The conduct of the Protestants," says he, in his correspondence with Leibnitz, while treating of this subject the Canon of the Scripture, "was intolerable; it was time to put an end to discussion by an eternal anathema."

Thus did the Council of Trent, by an arbitrary decree, in opposition to the testimony of the Jewish Church, the early Fathers, and the practice of the Church for sixteen centuries, pronounce uninspired books worthy of being received with equal piety and reverence as the Oracles of God; and yet this church claims to be infallible!

It was one of the noblest achievements of the Reformation to break the seals which the presumptuous wickedness of man had put on the Word of God, and to send it forth in all its simplicity and power as able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. In the Hebrew manuscripts and the Catalogue of the Fathers, and particularly in Jerome's prefaces, they found unimpeachable evidence that the Apocryphal writings had no claim to a place among the inspired books. Accordingly Wickliffe,—the Morning Star of the Reformation—inserted in his Bible, (1380) a prologue, even more decided in its language than the prefaces of

Jerome. Having enumerated all the canonical books, he added, "Whatever book is in the Old Testament, without these twenty-five aforesaid, shall be set among Apocrypha, that is without authority of belief." In 1395, Purvey, one of his disciples, prefixed to each Apocryphal book this notice:—"This be no book of belief."—Luther determined to separate these from the inspired books altogether, when he commenced his version of the Old Testament in 1523, the whole of which was not published till 1534; but as this was published in parts it was not the earliest edition in which the separation appears. Lonicerus, a Lutheran, was the first who actually made the distinction, in his edition of the Greek Septuagint printed at Strasburg by Cephaleus, in the preface to which he says:—"In the partition and series of these books we have followed Martin Luther, that single and celebrated Phoenix of Sacred Letters, who in his German version of the Bible, observed that order which you here see; hence we have collected in one bundle, at the end, those books which are called Apocrypha."

When Luther's edition of the whole Bible appeared in 1534, these books were placed between the Old and New Testament with this title: "Apocrypha; that is Books which are not to be considered as equal to Holy Scripture, and yet are useful and good to read." This title they still occupy in all Lutheran editions of the Bible. This was universally followed by the Protestant versions; by Olivetan's French version in 1535; Miles Coverdale's English Bible in the same year; and by the following editions of Rogers the Protomartyr in the persecution under Queen Mary, 1537; Cranmer's, 1539; and succeeding impressions.

This brief sketch is sufficient to show that the Apocryphal books are destitute of external evidence, to warrant us to give them a place among the inspired records. The grounds of their rejection are equally strong from an examination of the contents of the books themselves. This shall be shown in our next number.—*Dublin Chris. Mag.*

#### ART. VII.—*Biblical Criticism.*

The Spirits in Prison.—1 Pet. iii. 18—21.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison; which some time were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure, whereunto even baptism doth now also save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ; who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels and authorities, and powers being subject unto him."

Few are ignorant how variously these verses have been interpreted: and how gross and dangerous the errors they have been "wrested" to countenance.

The Church of Rome founds upon this passage her doctrine of a "Limbus Patrum,"—a place in which the souls of the ancient patriarchs were kept, to which Christ descended, and from which he carried them in triumph to heaven. Bishop Horsely, in his discourse on the passage subjoined to his translation of Hosea, has an opinion not very greatly different. He conceives that somewhere

about the centre of the earth, is a place appointed as the receptacle of departed spirits; where, in separated apartments, the souls of the righteous and wicked are kept till the day of judgment; and that our Lord's human soul descended thither, and announced to the antediluvians—most of whom, he thinks, were converted by the preaching of Noah, and by means of the awful catastrophe of the deluge—that the deliverance they had hoped for, had now been accomplished. The only difference between this and the opinion of the Roman Catholic Church is, that the latter fancies, that in this receptacle the souls are undergoing the refinings of a purgatorial fire; while the former supposes them to enjoy happiness, though not so perfect as will be conferred in heaven.

It was the opinion of Calvin, that our Lord descended to the place of torment, and there actually endured the pains of the damned; an opinion which he supposed to be countenanced by this passage.

It will not be necessary to confute any, or all of these notions by any elaborate reasoning; they are all alike unfounded in Scripture, and unsupported by this passage: as will appear by a plain exposition of it.

The Apostle urges the Christians to whom he wrote, to patience and fortitude under their sufferings, by the example of Christ; and warns them of the necessity of being possessed not only of the means of grace, but of pure, spiritual, vital religion: "For Christ," says he, "also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." He who was perfectly holy died to expiate the sins of those who were unholy, that he might reconcile them to God, reinstate them in his favour, which they had forfeited, and raise them to acceptance with, and access to him. "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," the Apostle adds. His human body was put to death; but quickened—raised again by the Holy Ghost.\* The resurrection of our Lord is sometimes ascribed to the Father, sometimes to the Son himself, and sometimes to the Holy Spirit; because "These three are one," and because the resurrection of our Lord is the evidence of his Son-ship, and therefore it is properly ascribed to the Spirit, whose peculiar work it is to testify of Christ, and who raised him, by the Father's appointment.

The Apostle proceeds, "By which (Spirit,) he went and preached to the spirits in prison." Here observe, (1.) "Christ preached to the Antediluvians." The phrase "he went and preached," or "going, he preached," is a common *pleonasm* for "he preached;" though much stress has been laid on this phrase as proof of Christ's *personal* going and preaching to the spirits in prison. See Elsner's observations, who produces many examples from the New Testament, and from profane writers; one may suffice: Eph. ii. 14, 17. "For he is our peace, &c. &c., and came and preached (*εἰς τὰς νύμφας*) peace to you who are afar off, and to them who are nigh." It is certain our Lord, after his resurrection, did not go *personally* to the Gentiles to preach peace to them. He preached to them by his Apostles only. But if Christ is said by Paul to go and do, what he did by his Apostles, he may with great propriety be said by Peter to go and

\*The words may be translated, "Put to death by flesh," that is wicked men, "but quickened by the Spirit," that is, his own Divine nature. The advantage of this rendering is, that it maintains *uniformity* in the clauses respectively.

do, what he did by his prophet Noah. (2.) Christ preached to the Antediluvians, "by his Spirit—the same Spirit by whom he was raised from the dead. The Spirit who spake by the ancient Prophets was the Spirit of Christ, as the apostle Peter elsewhere declares, 1 Pet. i. 11, 12; and this Spirit employed the instrumentality of Noah, who is called a preacher of righteousness, 2 Pet. ii. 6; see also Gen. vi. 3; Heb. xi. 7. (3.) Those to whom the Spirit of Christ, speaking by Noah, preached, "were sometime (or formerly,) disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." The long-suffering of God waited 120 years; the building of the ark, and the addresses of Noah warned men of their guilt and danger; but blindness, obduracy, unbelief, and impenitence, rendered all ineffectual; and they perished—not only temporally by the flood, but spiritually and eternally by the righteous sentence of God. For (4,) they are now "Spirits in prison:" the term (*οὐαι*) *being*, by a common ellipsis, must be supplied.\* They are shut up under chains of darkness, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

The remainder of the passage is supposed to teach errors not less dangerous, and to be encumbered with difficulties not less needing elucidation; and therefore shall be considered in the next number. But how instructive is the passage now explained! The long-suffering of God waited; Noah preached; the Spirit spake by Noah; his actions spoke louder than even his words, of the impending danger; yet men disbelieved the testimony, disobeyed the warning voice, despised the faithful and merciful admonition; and ruin, alike inevitable and dreadful, was the consequence! And is it not so still? Is not God still "long-suffering and slow to anger?" Does he not "wait to be gracious?" Does he not cause the warning voice of his word to be heard? Does not his Providence often enforce it? And what is the consequence? A few, the monuments of the power and sovereignty of the grace of God, "believe and obey the gospel:" but how many remain in unbelief and insensibility: unawakened and unalarmed; unattracted and unmelted; saying, "Peace and safety, till sudden destruction cometh upon them!" And is not their guilt greater, their sin more inexcusable, and their misery more intolerable than that of the Antediluvians? "See that ye refuse not him who speaketh; for if they escaped not, who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him who speaketh from heaven." Prov. i.; Rom. ii.; Heb. x. 26—29. Δ

\* By the spirits in prison, however, *Τοις εν φυλαχει πνευμασι*, some understand the Apostle to describe, not their *present* state, but their state *when Noah preached to them*. They were imprisoned: so all men in a state of unbelief are said to be. See Isaiah xlii. 7. lxii. 1. Luke iv. 1, 18. John viii. 36. Acts xxvi. 18. 2 Tim. ii. 26. Heb. ii. 14. Nor is it a valid objection, that "spirits" must mean souls, in a disembodied state. Numb. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16.

"They that dream of the descent of Christ's soul into hell, think this place sounds somewhat that way; but, being examined, it proves no way suitable, nor can, by the strongest wrestling, be drawn to fit that purpose. For, 1, That it was to preach he went thither, they are not willing to avow; though the end they assign is as groundless and imaginary as this. 2, They would have his business to be with the spirits of the faithful deceased before his coming, but here we see it is with the disobedient. And 3, His spirit here is the same with the sense of the foregoing words, which mean, not his soul, but his eternal deity. 4, Nor is it the spirits that were in prison, as they read it, but the spirits *now* in prison, which by the opposition of their former condition, *sometime or formerly disobedient*, doth clearly bespeak their *present* condition, as the just consequence and fruit of their disobedience."

LEIGHTON.

ART. VIII.—*The Measuring Reed applied to the Temple of God, the Altar and the Worshipers.*

“And there was given me a reed like unto a rod, and the Angel stood, saying, Rise and measure the Temple of God, and the Altar, and them that worship therein.”—REVELATION xi. 1.

THE command addressed to the beloved Apostle in the opening of the eleventh chapter of the book of Revelation is, in many respects, remarkable, and deserving of solemn attention. It was uttered by the Angel Jehovah—the exalted Mediator, who came down from heaven, holding in his hand, the “*Little Book*,” and as emblematical of his sovereign and uncontrollable authority over the communities of men, whether commoved and turbulent, or peaceful and prosperous; he is represented as standing with “his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth.” It is delivered as introductory to the opening of the little book, which contains a view of the character, contentings, and ultimate triumph of Christ’s faithful witnesses for the period of 1260 years, and of the complicated wickedness, and final subversion of Antichrist—the great system of iniquity by which the saints are oppressed. Spoken to the venerable Apostle when he was an exile in Patmos, “for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ,” it was evidently designed to be a directory not for himself alone, but to express a peculiar and standing duty of his proper successors—the faithful ministers of the Gospel, and those who are his brethren and companions “in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ.” During the time that Antichrist reigns, and his unhallowed leaven corrupts the state, and pollutes the church, and faithful witnesses are in constant warfare with this dreadful system of evil, this great duty is especially incumbent. Purposes the most important and salutary are subserved by taking the measuring reed, and in obedience to the Angel’s command, rising to measure the temple of God, the altar, and them that worship therein.

In various passages of Holy Writ, we read of an instrument similar to that spoken of in this verse, employed by Him that builds up Jerusalem, or by his chosen servants. Thus at the memorable era of building the second temple, Zechariah, the son of Berachiah, beheld “a man with a measuring line in his hand,” who, in reply to the prophet’s inquiry, said he went to “measure Jerusalem, to see what is the breadth thereof;”<sup>\*</sup> and afterwards as the buildings progressed, the faithful in Israel are represented as forgetting the day of small things, and as rejoicing when they see the “*Plummet*,” or measuring reed in the hand of Zerubbabel with those seven; they are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth.”<sup>†</sup> Thus, too, when, in the visions of God,” the prophet Ezekiel beheld the future glory of the church, he saw a man “whose appearance was like the appearance of brass, with a line of flax in his hand, and a measuring reed.”<sup>‡</sup> And when the Apostle John had a prospective view of the surpassing glory of the church in the latter day, he saw a similar preparation for ascertaining the enlarged dimensions—“He that talked with me had a golden reed to

<sup>\*</sup> Zech. ii. 2.

<sup>†</sup> Zech. iv. 10.

<sup>‡</sup> Ezek. xi. 3.

measure the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall thereof." In all these cases, the reed is employed as an instrument of measurement. The Church is represented as a spiritual building, reared up of costly materials, by the hand of a glorious and Omnipotent Architect, and to separate her from other communities—to regulate her order, and determine her advancement, the measuring line is applied.

This Reed, "like unto a rod," is without doubt, the word of God, contained in the Scriptures of truth. This is the grand rule of ad-measurement, and by it all that pertain to the Sanctuary and its worship—to principles and persons, must be tried. Concerning every other rule that men impiously exalt to equality with the inspired word, or that is used to displace it, the indignant challenge may be put—"What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord!" This is the law proclaimed from heaven, claiming on the part of its glorious Author universal homage. On all that is connected with the Church and its institutions, there must be stamped "Thus saith the Lord," else it has no proper claim to be adopted or retained. This rule alone is *perfect and invariable*, and therefore it is worthy to be received for the measurement of a building whose design was sketched in the Divine mind from all eternity, whose foundation was laid on the Rock of ages, and whose completion shall be amidst the eternal hosannahs of holy angels, and shoutings of "Grace, grace unto it." This rule was not intended to be brought down to the sinner, but it invariably aims to bring up the sinner to it, and by producing a change in his moral nature, to conform him to the likeness of its glorious Author. Rather than this holy rule should change or deflect from perfect rectitude, the great Lawgiver stooped down to offer obedience to his own law, and he declared that heaven and earth should sooner pass away, than one jot or tittle should pass from the law, till all should be fulfilled. The measuring reed, it is true, sometimes appears in different aspects. In a "day of small things," when the interests of Zion are low, and her cause and testimony are despised, it appears as a "*line of flux*," whereas, in the day of the Church's abundant prosperity, when she shall be as the New Jerusalem, coming down from heaven having the glory of God, it will be like a "*golden reed*"—costly, durable and precious. Still this is only in relation to its outward manifestations, and to the estimate in which it is held—in itself it is morally unalterable, the perfect, unchangeable and all-sufficient rule of rectitude. This rule is, moreover, to be *faithfully applied*. Experience goes to show that men will readily admit the most valuable general principles, while they have no intention of reducing them to practice. This, however, is altogether contrary to the Divine Word, as a law proclaimed to the children of men. The very idea of a measuring rule implies that it is given to be applied. It is not intended for mere speculation, nor offered alone as a law to be recorded in the Statute-Book, but never to be brought to bear upon men's principles or practice. It is given to the servants of God for the express purpose of general, constant and minute application. When the command is issued—"Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples," it is added, to declare the necessity of particular application to all persons, principles and systems—"To the law, and to the

testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”\*

The design of the admeasurement may be threefold.—1. *To distinguish between the professors of religion*, not only between those who remain in the outer court, and those who are in the interior of the temple, but also between those in the church, who have only a name to live, and those who are really written among the living in Jerusalem.—2. *To set apart to the Lord his approved people*, who, in reference to their being measured, are called *the rod and the lot of his inheritance*.—And 3. *To mark the faithful, in trying times, as objects of special divine care*. During the lengthened and trying period in which Antichrist reigns, the Lord graciously separates a people from among the nations: he gives them the internal seal of the Spirit, and calls them to visible holiness; he puts a special mark upon them in his providence, in times of public danger or calamity; he singles them out as witnesses for his truth, and honoured instruments of advancing his cause; and about themselves and all that pertains to them, he manifests unceasing care and jealous concern. They are measured and sealed, that they may be preserved. They are kept as the apple of the divine eye. Angels are charged to minister to them; gracious providences watch over and protect them; and the Lord himself is a “sanctuary” to them, “As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people from henceforth, even for ever.” Concerning his Zion—the measured temple, and altar and worshippers, he declares—“I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her.” “He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye.”† The principal subjects of consideration in the passage are the *objects* to be measured, and the command respecting them. These are the *Temple*, the *Altar* and the *Worshippers*. The phraseology contains an obvious allusion to the ancient temple, which was sometimes spoken of as divided into three courts.‡—1. The holy of holies, or most holy place.—2. The court of the priests, or holy place.—And 3. The great court, or court of the people. The comparison, as applied to the condition of the faithful followers of the Lamb, throughout Christendom, is strikingly applicable and beautiful. The inner court was small, as compared with the outer; the former was for the priests, the ministers of the Lord of hosts, while, at solemn seasons, the greater court was thronged with worshippers. Thus the limits of the visible church are large in comparison with those of the invisible; and the number of real Christians, who are “kings and priests to God and the Lamb,” is very small when compared with the vast multitudes of mere nominal professors. Hidden as are the saints, and undistinguishable to outward observation, as they may oftentimes be, from others who are corrupt or hypocritical, or removed as they are from public notice, they are yet peculiarly favoured above others. While the great mass are rejected and left without any special care of the Lord of the temple, or enjoy only common blessings, in virtue of divine long-suffering, and their connexion with the righteous, the Lord sets apart the godly for himself—employs his servants to measure them—and constituting them vessels of mercy, depositories and witnesses

\* Isaiah viii. 16, 20.

† Zech. ii. 5, 8.

‡ See 2 Chron. iv. 9.

for his truth, in the darkest times, he distinguishes their lot above all others in the world, as he brings them at length to his glorious kingdom.

By the *Temple* is intended "the Church of God in her regular New Testament organization," comprehending her foundation, doctrine, government, discipline, extension, and, in fact, every thing that pertains to her constitution and continuance as a spiritual, distinct, and independent society. The *Altar*, being the place on which offerings were presented, and at which immediate intercourse was realized with the glorious King who dwells between the cherubim, is a fit symbol of divine worship. And the *Worshippers* are the persons who professedly draw near to God, through the institutions which he has devised and made known: they are measured in their professions, character, and conduct—in all their spirit and behaviour in the house of God, and in their deportment in civil society. The judicious Faber\* properly remarks, that "*Measuring the servants of God* is equivalent to *sealing* them. The *unmeasured tenants* of the outer court, and the *unsealed men* throughout the Roman empire, are alike the *votaries of the apostacy*: while *they that were measured, and they that were sealed, are the saints who refused to be partakers of its abominations.*"

We may consider, in order, the objects specified in the verse, in connexion with the command, to rise and measure them.

1. The admeasurement of "*the Temple of God*" respects the application of the Divine Word to every part of the building of mercy—the church upon earth. It is unnecessary to plead for this as a solemn and unalterable duty. Men are the materials of which the superstructure of the church is composed, as well as the appointed instruments for carrying on the building. The God of Zion is a holy and jealous God; his glory on earth is manifested in connexion with his church; and all that pertains to his house is with him matter of peculiar concern. Hence it is, that in the volume of revelation, while the account of the creation of the heavens and earth is given in one chapter, the construction of the tabernacle, and its utensils, occupies a large portion of the Old Testament Scriptures, and is frequently referred to in those of the New Testament. The tabernacle foreshadowed the spotless humanity of the Redeemer, and is frequently used as an emblem of the church, his mystical body. Material nature appears insignificant when compared with the grand mystery of redemption; and creation, with all its wonders, is regarded in the divine purpose declared to men, as only subservient to the grand design of raising up, out of the ruins of the Fall, a glorious spiritual building, which shall be a subject of wonder and admiration to redeemed men, and holy angels, throughout eternity. The oft-repeated command of God to Moses, when the tabernacle was to be erected in the wilderness, was—"See that thou make all things according to the pattern shown on the mount." A similar injunction was laid upon David, and conveyed through him to Solomon, his son, when the ancient temple was to be built. And when Ezekiel, in the visions of God, was favoured with prospects of the church's glory in New Testament times, he was shown on the mount of divine manifestation, the frame-work of a magnificent city, and an exalted personage employed in measuring its dimensions.† This reiterated

\* Vol. ii. p. 49.

† Ezekiel xl. xli. xlii. xliii.



representation evidently declares a special divine intention that there should be minute conformity in every thing about the church to the model sketched in the Word of God; and that, to ascertain and produce this conformity, this measuring reed should be frequently applied to the temple of God. Obligatory as is this duty, at all times, we cannot doubt that the King of Zion has been loudly declaring it to be specially incumbent at the present day. In the singular movements of his providence, within the last thirty years, the Bible has been spreading to an astonishing extent, and with unexampled rapidity, throughout the nations; and agency, good and bad, has been laid under contribution, to facilitate its universal diffusion and triumph. It is undeniable, as it is matter of frequent lamentation, that the circulation of the Bible is not yet accompanied in any remarkable measure by an application of its precepts to civil or ecclesiastical communities, or by the exemplification of its purifying truths on individual character. Still it is a cheering indication of the speedy approach of a day of universal light and love, that a Scriptural *test*—the true measuring reed, is put by the Mediatorial Angel into the hands of men of all ranks and stations. As we cannot, for a moment, doubt that the Scriptures will, despite of every opposing obstacle, in every succeeding year, continue to command a more enlarged diffusion—so, we anticipate, with confidence, the application of this test, in the actual admeasurement of all systems, principles and practices, until the thrones of despots, denounced in the Bible, shall be crumbled to atoms, civil government shall be established on a Scriptural model throughout the nations—and the Church in all its materials and policy shall be purged from corruption, and shall appear in its true character—a stately and fair spiritual fabric, the joy and delight of all the earth.

The measurement of the temple of God, according to the Divine direction, furthermore respects its *government or order*. The Scriptures expressly declare Zion's Head of power and living influence to be *one—exalted above all—everlasting and unchangeable*. He is assuredly not the Pope, as a spiritual Sovereign, nor the King or Queen of England, as an ecclesiastical Head,\* nor any earthly potentate however exalted. This honour pertains exclusively to him who obtained it by a right to which no other can advance the shadow of a claim—by the purchase of his own blood, and who, as a Divine person, can alone sustain the all-important relation. Concerning him it is said, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." "He (The Father) hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church."† Rejected of the builders, and still despised and rejected of men, he has, notwithstanding, become "Head-stone of the corner,"‡ and is the centre and Head, not of doctrine only, but of government and discipline too. In all things, Jesus, the King of Zion, has the pre-eminence, and the glory of this exalted sovereign should be reflected from every part of the Temple of God.

\* On what ground it can be affirmed that they who hold that the supreme Civil Ruler in these lands has authority to appoint or dismiss Bishops, and admit the royal supremacy in prescribing the church's creed, her form of government, the order of worship, the precise form of prayer to be used, and even the apparel of her ministers—yet maintain the Mediator's true and exclusive head-ship over the Church, we are utterly at a loss to determine.

† 1 Cor. iii. 2; Eph. i. 22.

‡ Ps. cxviii. 22.

The government of the Church is not left to chance or the will of men, nor to be settled by mere maxims of human expediency. It rests upon Immanuel's shoulders. He walks with jealous care and unceasing concern amid the golden candlesticks, and settles with minuteness the comely order of his house. The measuring reed of the word contains a prescribed form of ecclesiastical rule—which alone is of *Divine right*, designed to remain unaltered till the end of time. This cannot be *Diocesan Episcopacy*, for we search in vain in the records of the New Testament for such a figment; and one of the Oxford Tract writers is compelled to acknowledge that the system of Diocesan Bishops is but "*obscurely hinted* at in the Scriptures." It is not *Independency* which breaks the church's unity, destroys the liberty equally of ministers and people, and introduces anarchy and confusion. On the other hand, the outlines of Presbytery are clearly traced in the Word, as alone securing the glory of the Church's Head, and the edification and comfort of his mystical body. Keeping the eye upon the Divine measuring reed, this system, and this only stands approved, and all its parts accord with the pattern shown on the mount.

Again, the admeasurement of the Temple, has regard to the *discipline* of the house of God. Prelacy has no discipline, but what is arbitrary and despotic;—Independency, from its very nature, can make no effectual provision for the proper exercise of ecclesiastical authority; and in our own day, even under a purer system, there is a mournful indisposition apparent to apply a scriptural standard for the purification of the sanctuary. And yet, here the command of the Angel of the Covenant applies with peculiar force. The wall of the city is fourfold—its doctrine, worship, government and discipline being of equal extent. The Discipline of the Church is the *hedge* set divinely around the vineyard, without which the plants must be unprotected, and the church itself, instead of appearing in its true character as a "garden enclosed," is left like a waste common, to be trodden down by the foot of every traveller. Well might the illustrious Knox say concerning scriptural discipline—"without it, even the blessed Evangel itself cannot long stand." If we would apply the measuring reed aright in this article, there must be office-bearers duly qualified and properly appointed—they must take diligent oversight of the flock committed to their care, guard with jealous care the ordinances of the sanctuary, and especially put a difference between the clean and the unclean, in admitting to and excluding from the seals of the Covenant. Without this, there is no fidelity on the part of those who are intrusted with the keys of ecclesiastical authority—without it there can be no real and lasting prosperity in the church.

And not to insist farther at present, the measuring reed is to be applied to the *manner* of advancing the building. The glorious Architect is among the builders with the "*plummet*" in his hand for carrying forward the building according to the divine model. As in the erection of Solomon's temple, the costly materials were prepared beforehand, and the structure rose in silent grandeur and magnificence, so in efforts to build up or extend the church, there should be a watchful care to bring into membership only such as give evidence of being in reality the precious sons of Zion. When the promotion of the interests of party has a prominent place in schemes of church extension—and numbers and re-

spectability are taken as tests of a flourishing church; when *union* is proposed or effected on the sacrifice of valuable principle, we are sure that the abundant blessing of Heaven can never rest on such undertakings. On all these matters we have a clear and defined rule—we must not compromise truth, or hold it in abeyance for the sake of any imaginary advantages—we must constantly bring into application the measuring reed of the Divine law and testimony—and waiting God's time, and depending on his assured promise, we must stand aloof from all schemes that abide not this test, and promote only those that accord with this admeasurement.

## II. *The Institutions of Worship are to be measured.*

The command is, to rise and measure the altar, as well as the temple and worshippers. In allusion to the ancient ritual, by the *altar* we are often to understand the Redeemer's *atonement* and *intercession*, but in this, as in other passages, it obviously denotes the ordinances and institutions of worship. God is particularly concerned about his worship. The fire of jealousy burns hot near his altar; and all neglect, innovation, or corruption, are stamped with his marked disapprobation. Concerning divine worship, in general, it may be said, that it should be rendered to God in the name of Christ. The glorious Object of worship dwells in light that is inaccessible and full of glory; but his throne is surrounded with the rainbow of the covenant, in sight like an emerald; and it is approachable by "the sea of glass like unto crystal," the emblem of the shed blood of the Mediator. God is revealed as in Christ reconciling the world unto himself—not imputing to men their trespasses. The Mediator is the grand way of entrance into the holiest of all, and the channel for conveying every blessing that descends from the throne of God. He is the Great High Priest that presides over the house of God. The praises and prayers of the saints are to be brought to him, that they may be perfumed with the sweet incense of his mediation, and presented before the mercy-seat. Whatever we ask, whatever we do, in solemn worship, we are to ask and do it in his all-prevailing name, assured that thus alone we can be accepted of the Father—that thus only we can enjoy the benefits that we need.

In the institutions of divine worship, there should be the constant and particular application of the measuring reed of the sanctuary. Every part ought to be conformed to the divine model; nothing being added—nought diminished. No pretence of recommending or setting off the ordinances of worship can justify the decorations of the altar, whether they come from the hands of the mother of harlots, or from the King or Queen in Council. It has ever been found easy for men, disinclined to spiritual worship, to effect what an obsequious hireling priest accomplished for the idolatrous king of Israel, when he set up, in the Lord's house, an altar after the pattern of that at Damascus; and similar consequences may be expected to follow in all ages. God's altar will be forsaken, and men, influenced by the example of men in power, and a worldly priesthood, will speedily lose all relish for true and spiritual worship. But all this is the mere frippery of superstition, or the unwarranted invention of will-worship; and the Lord, who is a holy and jealous God, may justly say, in searching rebuke, to those that thus pollute his sanctuary—"Who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts?"

—"Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new-moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting."\* Our own is a day when God's altar is deplorably contemned. Some have digged it down—many neglect and forsake it; while by others it is grievously profaned; and the altars that are frequented by many nominally Christian worshippers are very far from conformity to the model of the Divine word. Praise is corrupted by hymns of human composition; prayer is perverted by set forms, which are not only without scriptural warrant, but which, in the very nature of the case, are unfit to express the diversified feelings, and ever-varying wants of true worshippers. Sealing ordinances are desecrated by being indiscriminately dispensed to all, irrespective of approved character or qualifications; and even the solemn act of worship, the appeal to God by oath, is profaned by a superstitious and idolatrous mode of observance. While we should carefully measure the altar, we should stand aloof from all these abominations. God's altar needs not man's fancied improvements. When unadorned, it is adorned the most. If men who are the dupes of superstition, and who are misled by a pompous ritual, blame a scriptural worship for its naked forms, we have only to say, that it is God's prerogative, with which man may not dare to interfere, to prescribe the manner of acceptable service; and that God's altar, even when exposed to the external elements, or dilapidated by ruthless hands, is still to be greatly preferred to the altar of superstition with all its splendour, because it is the appointed place of accepted worship and hallowed communion. The measuring reed applied to the altar, moreover, exhibits the proper *manner* of divine worship. To be accepted, worship must be the homage of the heart—spiritual and sincere. "The true worshippers worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."† Men should beware of offering "strange fire" of human passion or false zeal upon the altar; they should remember the signal judgment that overtook the sons of Aaron, when they were slain before the Lord, and their censers were nailed on the covering of the sanctuary, to be a perpetual warning against all presumptuous sinners. The command of Heaven is indeed express—"The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out."‡ Holy love and zeal should mix with every act of worship, whether presented upon the altar, in the closet, the family, or the public assembly. There should be brought calm, fixed, solemn, and yet elevated affections, to the worship of God; and the fire enkindled by the Spirit within the heart, should meet the fire that descends from above to consume the sacrifice. It is not, assuredly, by carrying with us a sleepy, careless frame into the worship of God, that we can be said to have the fire burning upon the altar. All that is within us should be stirred up in God's worship; and, with the whole heart and mind, and strength, we should be employed in his service. Again, the *purity* of the altar is a characteristic prominently displayed in the Word of God. Those who minister at the altar should be "holiness to the Lord." Every offering presented upon it must be *washed* and *salted*, in token of purity internal

\* Isaiah i. 13.

† John iv. 23, 24.

‡ Leviticus vi. 13.

and external; and all the service should appear as a holy, consecrated service. The sins of the altar are especially offensive to God, and provoke his judgments. Hence, when the Mediator executes vengeance upon Antichrist, he is said to fill his censer with "the fire of the altar," and scatter it on the earth;\* and when the abominations in God's house are to be avenged, the command to the instruments of wrath is—"Begin at my sanctuary."† Would we be found at the altar which abides the admeasurement of the divine reed, we must resolutely and constantly oppose all neglect or pollution of the altar; and maintain pure and entire the ordinances of worship as God hath appointed them, rejecting human inventions, and cherishing habitually a holy, reverential, and elevated spirit. We must stand by the altar of God that others have forsaken, and rear again that which impious hands have digged down; and, looking to Christ, the great Altar, we should willingly surrender ourselves to him, binding, with the cords of faith and love, and solemn vows, to the horns of the altar, our every sacrifice.

### *III. The Worshipers are likewise to be measured.*

There must be the faithful application of a scriptural test, as well to them that worship in the temple, and at the altar, as to the temple and to the altar themselves. This is confessedly a difficult part of the work, and many that even have in their hands the measuring reed of the word, seek to be excused altogether from attending to this part of the command. Few apply a scriptural test closely to themselves, and, in general, men disrelish its application to them by others, should it even be by the accredited ministers of the sanctuary. To measure the worshippers, so as to make difference between the clean and the unclean, and to exclude the unworthy from the fellowship or sealing ordinances of the sanctuary, is not the way to be popular; and, therefore, the duty is either altogether neglected, or attended to in a superficial and perfunctory manner. Neither the church in its present lukewarm and degenerate state, nor the world may be expected to like such an application; and, wherever a faithful servant of God searchingly applies the word as a rule of character or conduct, he may calculate on the reception which an honoured Prophet once met from a wicked monarch: "I hate him, for he never speaks good of me, but evil." Yet is this part of the duty most important, and in the day of the trials of the witnesses under Antichrist, specially needed. While all should measure themselves by the perfect unerring rule of the sacred Scripture, ministers and elders, bearing office in the church, and having intrusted to them the measuring reed, are particularly required to apply this test to the character and conduct of men, whether they are within the church, or without its pale; whether in low or elevated stations in society. It is their solemn duty to measure by this rule the whole character of the church members—the doctrine which they hold, their profession and walk. They ought never to adopt as their rule the customs of society; the deceitful and ever-shifting standard of public opinion; or, the estimate in which men hold themselves, or fellow-members in a declining church. The solemn question with them should still be:—Does the character comport with the word of truth? and the utmost

\* Rev. viii. 5.

† Ezek. ix.

care should be employed to guard Divine ordinances from profanation by preventing the admission of unworthy persons. The measuring reed should be applied in preaching by discriminating characters, and by searching appeals to the conscience; and the discipline of the house of God is to be exercised for this purpose, that the privileges of the sanctuary may be withheld from those who have no proper right to their enjoyment. A faithful word pointedly spoken, and closely applied, will find men out; and the rule of admeasurement, when honestly used, will serve to cleanse the floor of the chaff that lies mingled with the precious grain. How many in our day neglect this solemn duty, and thereby delude persons who are in imminent danger, to think all is well, and thus do incalculable injury to the church! Those intrusted with the keys of authority in state churches, to a fearful extent neglect to measure the worshippers; they employ not a scriptural discipline to preserve the purity of ecclesiastical fellowship; and, thus they furnish the enemies of establishments with one of their principal weapons against them. And in other connexions too, when the great concern appears to be, to have numbers and respectability as the distinguishing properties of church-membership, there is a strong temptation not to apply the measuring reed closely to them that worship in the temple or at the altar. If they would apply it honestly, well do they know that their fellowship would be thinned, and that they might be called to see their members reduced nearer to a level, in point of numbers, with those of the faithful witnesses whom they condemn or reproach. Too many, also, who are in office in the church could not bear the application of the measuring reed to their own character and conduct; and it is vain to expect that they will bring a scriptural test closely to apply to others. The measuring reed must be in clean hands, else it will never be faithfully applied to the worshippers in the temple, nor can its application be expected to be followed with a blessing.

The *profession* of the worshippers should be measured. To stand approved, their profession should be scriptural, intelligent, full and solemnly made. As a profession of entire subjection to Christ, and of the whole truth, it should be ratified with solemn vows, and held fast, without wavering, notwithstanding all opposition. The worshippers should be *separate* from the world, as redeemed out of it, overcoming it by faith, and constituted a holy nation and a peculiar people. The measuring reed applied to their *temper* and *spirits* requires them to be distinguished by the meekness of Christ; to be clothed with humility, and to be possessed of that charity, "which thinketh no evil," and which is the "bond of perfection." The *unity* and *fellowship* of the worshippers, too, should be tested, by the measuring reed of the Word. Theirs should be "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace:" they should, as united to one glorious Head, act like members of the same body, and be members each one of another; and they should be distinguished for a holy fellowship. In short, the whole *practice* of the worshippers should be subjected to this admeasurement. The test is to be applied to the great outlines of the conduct, and even the minute parts of the walk and conversation should accord with it. The reality and power of internal religion is often seen in the faithful discharge of *relative duties*; and in every station, the worshipper at the altar should exhibit an eminent character, as the light of the world. Sincerity and consis-

tency should characterize the follower of the Lamb. His walk should be like the shining and advancing light; and the profession of the truth should be accompanied with a holy and attractive influence. The person who ministers at God's altar should cultivate a holy singularity; and in many of the common usages of society he can take no part, if he would walk worthy of his holy vocation. The drinking customs of the day—sinful amusements; and many of the practices common in business are unbecoming him who is, by profession, numbered in a holy priesthood. The Christian's conversation should, in all things, be such as becometh the Gospel. He should be an example to others—go before them in every good work, and always act so that the world may take knowledge of him, that he has been with Jesus. While we plead for the application of the measuring reed to others, we should never fail to apply it diligently to ourselves; and remembering that it is given for a universal and complete test, whatsoever things are true, or honest, or just, or lovely, or of good report; if there be any virtue, or if there be any praise, we should continually think on, and practise, these things.\*

Lastly,—These objects are to be measured by *way of special distinction and separation from others*. The court which is without the temple is commanded to be left out unmeasured; "for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread underfoot forty and two months." This is the predestined period of Antichrist's reign. Without waiting for a more specific exposition, by the "outer court" is intended the great body of the population of Christendom, considered as an outcast, apostate church. Applied to the Papacy, it is a striking representation of the degraded, miserable condition of those who are in connexion with it, during the time of the domination of the Man of Sin. The servants of God are commanded to "cast them out;" the original word carrying the idea of complete exclusion. They are not to be measured at all, as rejected from any part in the Divine special care; and they are given to be "trodden down"—to be polluted, degraded, and trampled upon by the Gentiles. These are not the literal Heathen, for they are not capable of possessing the visible church, or of partaking of its name; but they are, as it were, baptized Pagans; and from their defection, superstition, and idolatry, they are to be accounted rather Pagans than Christians. It is not those alone who are the professed votaries of Antichrist, that are thus excluded. They who contentedly live out of the pale of the visible church—who refuse to make a public confession of Christ before men—or to seal their profession at the Lord's table—expose themselves to manifold danger. Voluntarily absenting themselves from the temple, and not coming to the altar, they remove themselves from the particular gracious care that is extended to the measured worshippers; and they are liable to become the ready prey of errors, and the victims of immorality. The baptized youth of the church should take warning: their condition, while they continue in the outer court, and refuse to wear Christ's yoke, or to be publicly known as his followers, is far from safety. And all who are unconcerned about the temple and altar that are according to the divine model, or who adopt systems that are leavened with Antichristian error, or in which a scriptural test is not applied

\* Phil. iv. 8.

to the worship of the sanctuary and the persons who are connected with it, have reason to fear this melancholy rejection. We do not affirm, that all those individuals, or sections of the church, that undervalue a scriptural test, or that countenance some corruptions, are excluded wholly from the Divine special care; but the inspired command, on which we are commenting, we conceive, warrants us to maintain that they are in a dangerous state when the measuring reed is in any particular neglected; and that full protection and privilege can only be realized by those who, in simplicity, and godly sincerity, both in reference to themselves and others, rise and measure the temple and the altar, and them that worship therein.

In adverting to the *obligation* and *importance* of the duty of applying the measuring reed, it may be observed that it is especially incumbent upon *Ministers, Elders, and Public witnesses* for the truth. The Redeemer alone, by the Spirit, fully and efficaciously measures the Temple, the Altar, and the Worshipers. He has the measuring line in his hand; he is among the Builders for their support, direction, and encouragement, and while with eyes like a flame of fire, he inspects every part of the building, he marks with disapprobation that which is built with unhewn stones and untempered mortar. The ministers of the Church are instrumentally and officially to measure the temple and the worshippers. To them are committed the lively oracles of God, the supreme and infallible standard; and the King of Zion has enjoined them, in terms of the commission which he has given them—to teach whatsoever he has commanded. They are to study the word with minute and prayerful attention—they should esteem it precious—they should frequently measure themselves by it, and bring it to test their frame of mind, the temper of their spirits, their duties and their whole conduct. Called to be *standard-bearers*, and acting under a solemn responsibility, they should discard ease and considerations of worldly expediency, and faithfully hold forth and apply the Divine rule of admeasurement. This is the only course in which they may expect the blessing; let them overlook or neglect the application in any part, and though they may have been building upon the good foundation, their works shall be destroyed, while they themselves shall be saved, yet so as by fire. The work of the witnesses during the reign of Antichrist chiefly lies in the application of a scriptural standard, whether to civil or ecclesiastical systems, or to men possessed of official power throughout the nations. The *Two Witnesses* do incalculable good by pursuing this course during days of darkness and degeneracy. It is impossible fully to declare the benefits to the world of the self-denying labours of one faithful witness—and when the whole company shall have finished their testimony, and the millennial morning shall break upon the Church, all kindreds of the nations shall then confess that the proper application of scriptural principles is the true source and foundation of all their order and prosperity. This is the peculiar work and office of the witnesses now before the Churches. Others will occasionally assert important scriptural principles of social order—they may admit the doctrine of Messiah's Headship, the duty of Covenanting, and a scriptural institution of civil rulers; they may argue in favour of a right discipline in the Church, and for the purity and integrity of the or-



dinances of religious worship; but it is the part of faithful witnesses alone, to plead for the proper application of these principles, and to refuse connexion with all systems that compromise them. How can they do otherwise, and be true to their character, and faithful to the great trust reposed in them? Standing before the God of the earth, as the two "*torch-bearers*," and the two "*Anointed ones*," they must bring the light of Divine truth to bear upon all institutions in Church and State—and as consecrated priests to God, they are to guard the altar with holy jealousy, and to protect it from all contamination. Shining as lights in the world, they should constantly labour that others may be translated out of darkness into God's marvellous light.

The duty is *incumbent upon the members of the Church*. Office-bearers will not long continue to apply the measuring reed of the sanctuary, when the people become indifferent. Need we say that the members of the Covenanted Church have a peculiar interest in attending to this great duty? They should rise and measure the temple and the altar, and them that worship thereat. This was the way of our fathers, and we should delight still to walk in it. We believe that it has been the honesty, simplicity, and prayerfulness of our people that have secured for the Church a faithful ministry, and purity of ordinances. How did they labour in past times, to effect these valuable ends, while they held fast the word of their testimony? Assuredly not by lending an ear to the cavils which men of a time-serving spirit bring against valuable principles, nor by jumping into measures of reform or union, that were not framed upon a scriptural basis, nor by shrinking from the avowal of truth through the fear of man. They rose and measured the temple, and the altar, and the worshippers. They were careful to conform themselves and their families to this Divine model. Being "*very jealous for the Lord God of Israel*," they could not suffer sin on their brother, but reproved it with all fidelity. In *Societies*, it is incalculable what good *one* venerable man or woman has often done by the frequent and close application of the measuring reed. There may be some asperity in the manner, there may be something of rudeness in the application of the word for correction, reproof, or instruction in righteousness, and persons may be ready to blame the faithful reprovcr for rudeness and censoriousness, but such persons are in reality the sinews and the life-preservers of the Church. While they bring themselves daily to the Divine rule, and mourn in secret over their numerous deviations from it, their great concern is to see others walking in the light of the living, and to have all within the church conformed to the pattern shown upon the mount. And, throughout the community at large, those individuals are of immense utility who, themselves living as the salt of the earth, carry with them the measuring reed of truth, and point out its application to all systems or persons that affect the interests of Zion. The members of the Church should aim to be distinguished in this particular. Those who are really worthy, who may be the objects of censure, will afterwards love their faithful reprovers, though at first they may have been offended, and when they are gone the fruits of their honest counsels may spring forth and appear rich and plentiful.

The command, we remark farther, enjoins a work of *activity* and *difficulty*. We are bid to rise and measure. Would we act as approved witnesses, and be instrumental in advancing the cause of truth and righteousness by applying a scriptural standard? We must shake off sloth, gird up our loins, and betake ourselves to the work of measuring the altar. Occasions will be constantly presenting themselves when, if we would judge rightly, or be in safety ourselves, or do good in the Church, we must have recourse to the measuring reed. The enemy will tempt us to sit still; our own hearts will readily suggest considerations of ease, or profit, or pleasure, in declining the duty; there will be opposition both within the church and without, and we must always calculate on difficulty and reproach, more or less, in its performance. Yet, as it has been well said, "Divine commands are enablings." If we honestly betake ourselves to the duty, we shall be supported and strengthened. The promise guarantees supernatural power to uphold and to give ultimate and assured success. The occurrence of difficulties will, mean while, nerve to more vigorous and persevering exertions; the cause itself will sustain and ennoble all who are vitally connected with it—and when it shall finally triumph, the very remembrance of past trials and difficulties will mightily enhance the victory.

While the duty of applying the measuring reed is to be attended to during the whole period of the Anti-Christian apostacy, it is specially incumbent in the last days of the Man of Sin. Previously to Babylon's downfall, we have reason to fear that the governments of the earth will become more corrupt than before, and that the churches will recede more and more from a scriptural standard. The voice of a faithful testimony against prevailing evils will become more indistinct—perilous times will come, and the love of many will wax cold. Instead of relaxing their efforts or laying aside their standard, under the delusion that some fancied reforms in the State, or that some improvements in the church are accomplishing all that the friends of the truth could desire, they should apply the measuring reed more closely, and bring to the clear test of Holy Scripture every change, and every institution in civil or ecclesiastical society. The state of affairs throughout the churches, and civil society in our own day, proclaims aloud the necessity for such a course. Our fathers of a former age diligently attended to the duty of applying a scriptural standard. There are temptations manifold to their descendants, to neglect it—but the truth is, there never was a period in the history of the church, when the duty was more called for or important than at present. There has been a vast increase of infidelity in late years,—there is a growing indifference to the great scriptural principles of social order, and a relaxed sense of moral obligation is painfully observable through all classes of society. Plans of reform or union are adopted, in which valuable attainments of a former day are overlooked, and in which there is the unblushing violation of solemn vows. A principal part of the last trial of the witnesses may arise from this very cause. A gradual, but general apostacy may overspread the churches: an "hour of temptation" shall come upon the whole world; and a public testimony against open defection shall be silenced throughout Christendom, while error and wickedness shall predominate. Against all defection of this kind faithful witnesses are to bear distinct testimony. It is better at any time to suffer than to sin. The

application of the Divine measuring reed will for a time stay the tide of apostacy—and when it may prevail so as to sweep away all barriers, still they who keep the word of the Redeemer's patience are safe. They are kept in the King's pavilion in the evil day—they triumph when they fall—and in a little space, the measuring line which they hold will come into universal application. A scriptural standard will be applied to things civil and political, as well as to the temple and the altar—men shall be blessed in the Redeemer, and all nations shall call him blessed.

We only wait to remark, that the measuring of the temple, the altar, and the worshippers, is an eminent means of *reformation* and *revival* in the church. Many boast of reform and talk loud of revival, who leave the measuring reed wholly neglected, or who apply it to some part—such as doctrine, while there is little concern about the purity of the discipline and the worship of the Sanctuary. All such partial application of the law and testimony is displeasing to Him who walks amid the golden candlesticks, and whose name is Jealous. In every distinguished era of revival mentioned in the Scriptures, the measuring reed is brought into early notice. When the Second Temple was to be built, the man with the measuring line went forth to “measure Jerusalem,”\* accurately and minutely to determine the dimensions of the restored city—and when to the admiring eye of the prophet Ezekiel was presented, in vision, times of remarkable revival under the New Testament, he saw once and again the instrument of measurement brought into application.† In two of the most eminent seasons of revival that have ever been in the Church—in the Apostolic age—and at the era of the Reformation, there was a most careful application of a scriptural standard. The master-builders at these times brought the Sacred Word to bear upon every thing connected with the house of God. They applied it to the foundation—the doctrine, the materials, the order of the church, and those who worshipped within the temple. Through the good hand of their God upon them, they built and prospered. We must go and do likewise, if we would see “Jerusalem as a city compactly built together;” and if we would behold the tribes of spiritual worshippers repairing thither, and her palaces enjoying abundant prosperity, we must ourselves seek higher conformity to the unerring rule of faith and practice; and in steadfastness, diligence, and holy activity, rise and measure the temple, the altar, and them that worship therein.—*Belfust Covenanter*.

---

ART. IX.—NEW PUBLICATION. *The Works of W. Chillingworth, M. A. containing his book, entitled, The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation, together with his Sermons, Letters, Discourses, Controversies, &c. First American Edition, Philadelphia, 1840, 764 pages, 8vo.*

This author was born in the city of Oxford, England, 1602, and died at Chichester 1643, or 4. He was educated in the Episcopal church; embraced Popery, which he soon renounced, and declared in favour of the Arians, but subsequently subscribed the thirty-nine

\* Zech. ii.

† Ezek. xl. xlii.

articles of the church of England, on his admission to the chancellorship of the cathedral church of Sarum, &c. From a cursory perusal of this volume, the author appears to have been a man of genius and learning, without any very fixed principles of religion. His reasoning displays skill, is generally clear, and often forcible. But as it rests upon an uncertain unsubstantial basis, so it leads to erroneous and dangerous conclusions. The fathers and tradition constitute the *basis*, and human reason the *superstructure* of his system. The reader is not instructed in a knowledge of the lively oracles of God; he is merely amused with the opinions of men, handed down through many generations and moulded into the ever-varying peculiarities of each successive period. Its influence cannot fail to be pernicious. It is published and patronized under the auspices of Episcopalians; and if generally approved by them as a faithful exhibition of the basis of Episcopacy, that system is farther removed from the scriptures, than has been generally supposed, and the foundation of the house is nothing better than sand. The argument by which "the Apostolic Institution of Episcopacy is demonstrated," is subjoined in the words of the author:—

"Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the church, presently after the apostles' times."

"Between the apostles' times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration."

"And therefore, there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore, episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be apostolic: *Quod erat demonstrandum.*" P. 525.

On this argument we offer the following plain observations to plain men:

1. Admitting, for argument's sake, the truth both of his proposition and predicate, neither of which ever have been, nor can be satisfactorily proved, Episcopacy is here clearly based on human authority, doubtless because no higher can be adduced in its support. Consequently faith in Episcopacy is a human faith, because our faith cannot rise above the testimony on which it rests; but the faith of the Christian is a divine faith, resting upon divine testimony, the truth of God, who cannot deceive. "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing [persuasive] 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." 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.

2. Even though it could be proved satisfactorily that episcopacy prevailed "presently after the apostles' times," that could never prove its validity; because primitive Christianity was speedily corrupted, even in the time of the apostles, by Jewish prejudices and Pagan superstitions. "Even now," says John, "are there many antichrists."

3. If this argument be good for any thing, it would prove celibacy a

Christian duty and marriage a sin, more satisfactorily than episcopacy. Mr. Taylor, who is also an Episcopalian, in his "Ancient Christianity," has satisfactorily proved that *perpetual virginity* was universally taught as a Christian duty "presently after the apostles' times." Between the apostles' times and this presently after there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration. Therefore *perpetual virginity*, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be apostolic. We did not intend to enter into the episcopal controversy, but notice a new publication. We shall therefore conclude with the single remark that the prevalence of episcopacy may be owing, in a great measure, to the truth of the Latin proverb—"Men are led without difficulty into the belief of that which they passionately desire."

#### ART. XI.—*Church of Scotland.*

The following letter has been addressed by Dr. Chalmers to the Rev. R. Buchannan, of Glasgow, with reference to the articles which have lately appeared in the *Times* newspaper on the Church of Scotland question.

*Burntisland, Sept. 4, 1840.*

*My Dear Sir,*—I feel obliged by your having pointed out to me the adverse articles on our Church question, which have recently made their appearance in the *Times* newspaper. I shall not be tempted to make any reply to them. There would be no end of it. I have now, I trust, made my last effort in the way of authorship upon this subject, nor will I recall this purpose in the vain hope of putting down either the wilful perversity of our determined opponents, or their obstinate misunderstanding.

We make no surrender of the principle of non-intrusion by quitting the Veto Law, and giving effect to that principle in another form. On the contrary, instead of regressing, we shall make a movement in advance. Of all the methods by which provision could be made for the will of the people in the appointment of ministers, a dissent by a majority was selected for the purpose of making the least possible invasion on the will of the patron. Should we now return to the direct call, and require the assent of a majority, we shall thereby institute a far more stringent and frequently recurring check on the exercise of the patronage. At all events, the cause of non-intrusion never can be abandoned; and that not from a point of honour, but in the spirit of resolved adherence to a principle. I never would have ventured to propose a resiling on the part of the Church, from the Veto Law, had it not been for the confidence I have in the equal, if not the superior, efficacy of other expedients for securing the privileges of the people. If I had had any serious doubt upon this subject, I should have felt that the present form, as well as the unalterable principle, must be maintained till some other method had been adopted, for practically securing this great constitutional maxim of Presbytery, "That no minister shall be intruded into a parish contrary to the will of the congregation."

I could not reduce any three or four propositions into one, or

state them otherwise than in the order of a successive enumeration. But the Church is not on that account to enter blindfold on the first step, and without a prospective reference to the steps that follow. If not reasonably sure of an effectual substitute for the Veto Law, she should remain where she is, content to suffer all, whether in the way of obloquy or persecution, till she has obtained the practical establishment of the great principles for which she is contending.

The idea of relinquishing our prosecution of the Strathbogie ministers, is utterly preposterous. They have disobeyed the repeated injunctions of their ecclesiastical superiors; and they profess to have done so, not in obedience to the opposite injunctions, but in conformity to the opposite judgment, of a civil court. What the matter of these injunctions or of this judgment is, is of no earthly importance. We cannot do otherwise than proceed against our refractory ministers, unless we mean to surrender to the paramount authority of the civil over the ecclesiastical in all time coming. But you will not expect me to repeat the demonstration, which has already been given a thousand times, against the Erastianism of our adversaries—still unquenched, I observe—I fear unquenchable.

It is now too manifest that the opposition of the church's enemies is of such a character as to make a reconciliation of the two elements of patronage and the popular will, a vain and hopeless enterprise. I shall labour for them no more. A repeal of the Act of Queen Anne seems the only solution of our difficulties. A patronage which refuses to be checked and regulated for the good of the people, ought to be extinguished. I ever am, my dear sir, yours most truly,

THOMAS CHALMERS.

---

[From the Presbyterian.]

#### ART. XII.—*Tappan's Review of Edwards on the Will.*

In a former number of this paper, we attempted to point out an instance in which Tappan, in his Review of Edwards, makes a mistake which is fatal to his own cause. Our remarks had reference to his assertion that Edwards' argument against a self-determining will depends on the "*assumption*" that if the soul in the power of willing cause volitions, it must cause them by volitions.

Having asserted this, Tappan attempts to answer Edwards' argument by meeting the "*assumption*;" in doing which, he employs an indirect argument and a direct argument. We propose, at present, to examine his *indirect* argument against Edwards' "*assumption*." It is as follows: "Take any other cause: there must be some effect which, according to the general views of men, stands directly connected with it as its effect. The effect is called the phenomenon, or that by which the cause manifests itself. But how does the cause produce the phenomenon? By a causative act: but this causative act, according to Edwards' reasoning, must itself be an effect or phenomenon. Then this effect comes between the cause and what was at first considered the immediate effect: but the effect in question must likewise be caused by a causative act; and this causative act, again being an effect, must have another causative act before it, and so on *ad infinitum*. We have here, then, an infinite series of

causative acts—an absurdity of the same kind with an infinite series of volitions.”

We are here told that, according to Edwards’ reasoning, namely, that if the will causes volitions it must cause them by volitions, which is absurd, it follows that if a cause in the natural world causes effects, it must cause them by effects, which is also absurd. We will endeavour to overthrow Tappan’s argument by showing that no such thing follows from Edwards’ reasoning.

An act of the will, means the will in exercise. But if the will causes a volition, it must be in exercise in doing so; that is, if it cause a volition, it must do so by an act of will. And the ground of the absurdity of such a notion is this: that the act of will by which that volition is caused must also be caused by the will. But when we say that a cause in nature produces effects, no such absurdity follows; thus, a causative act means a cause in exercise. But when the cause produces effects, it must be in exercise in doing so; that is, when it produces effects it must do so by causative acts. The reason why no such absurdity is involved in this is, because it does not follow that the causative acts by which the effects are produced must also be produced by the cause.

Tappan’s fallacy in his argument lies in these words: “but this causative act, according to Edwards’ reasoning, must itself be an effect.” And the fallacy plainly appears when we look at Edwards’ reasoning. He says that if the will causes its own volitions, it must cause them by volitions. Now, what follows from this? Why just what Edwards himself would have admitted, namely, that if a cause in nature causes its causative acts, it must cause them by causative acts. So that no such absurd consequence as Tappan deduces follows from Edwards’ argument against a self-determining will; and Tappan’s indirect argument against what he calls Edwards’ assumption is vain, and will never be otherwise than vain, until he proves to the world the absurdity, that a cause can cause its own acts. We will perhaps notice his *direct* argument against Edwards’ “assumption” at another time.

J. L. K.

#### ART. XIII.—*Political Ambition—its End.*

While the Presidential election is the all-engrossing topic, it is fitting that we should try to bring valuable instruction from it. And we know not in what way we can do it better, than by pointing to the end of all successful ambitions in politics. John Q. Adams declared in Congress, that the four years of his presidency were the most unhappy years of his life. And an article which is going the rounds of the papers, makes one of Mr. Van Buren’s friends say, that the cares of office have so exhausted his frame, that he appears like a man recovering from a long and severe sickness. Here then is a true picture of the happiness gained by reaching the highest post of political honour. The elevation to that honour, for which so many of our leading politicians are sighing, and making such immense sacrifices, is only a plunge into an ocean of cares and vexations.

And yet with the undoubting knowledge of this fact, there are thousands of the leading minds in the political world, who would be willing to assume that post, though it were in a degree ten-fold of what it is, a bed of thorns. Thus we see that ambition charges.

the mind with a spirit at war with its own peace, and seeks gratification by rushing, with open eyes, right into a scene of wretchedness. It is a fever of mind, or rather a delirium, which seeks to alleviate itself by painful inflictions. As the man possessed of the devil was found cutting himself with stones, to relieve his anguish, so these show themselves possessed with a spirit similar to that of him who caught a fall from heaven to hell, by seeking to climb higher and take the throne of God.

And the spirit which actuates all office seekers, high or low, is the same, and from the same source, and tending to the same unhappy results. So far as the present political agitations are made by the struggles of ambitious men for office, they present the spectacle of thousands of the most gifted men of the nation contending for the prize of wretchedness, and the privilege of making themselves unhappy. Truly "what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue!"—*Puritan*.

---

#### ART. XIV.—*The Scriptures.*

A nation must be truly blessed if it were governed by no other laws than those of the Bible; it is so complete a system, that nothing can be added or taken from it; it contains every thing needful to be known or done; it affords a copy for a king, and a rule for subjects; it gives instruction and counsel to a senate, authority and direction to a magistrate; it cautions a witness, requires an impartial verdict of a jury, and furnishes a judge with his sentences; it sets the husband as lord of the household, and the wife as mistress of the table, tells him how to rule, and her how to manage. It entails honour to parents, and enjoins obedience upon children; it prescribes and limits the way of sovereigns, the rule of the rulers, and authority of the master; commands the subjects to honour, and servants to obey; and promises the protection of its author to all who walk by its rules. It gives directions for weddings and burials; it promises food and raiment, and limits the use of both; it points out a faithful eternal guardian to the departed husband and father; tells him with whom to leave his fatherless children, and in whom the widow is to trust; and promises a father to the former and a husband to the latter. It teaches a man how to set his house in order, and how to make his will; it appoints a dowry for the wife, and entails the right of the first born; and shows how the younger branches shall be left. It defends the right of all, and reveals vengeance to the defrauder, over-reacher and oppressor. It is the first book, the best book, and the oldest book in the world. It contains the choicest matter, gives the best instruction, and affords the greatest pleasure and satisfaction that ever were revealed. It contains the best law and profoundest mysteries that ever were penned. It brings the best tidings, and affords the best of comfort to the inquiring and disconsolate. It exhibits life, immortality, and shows the everlasting glory. It is a brief recital of all that is past, and certain prediction of all that is to come. It settles all matters in debate, resolves all doubt, and eases the mind and conscience of all scruples. It reveals the only living and true GOD, and shows the way to Him; and sets aside all other gods, and describes the vanity of them, and of all that put their trust in them.



**ART. XV.—*A Catechism on the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church.***

“Show them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the laws thereof; and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and do them.”—Ezekiel xliiii. 11.

**PREFACE.**

The Compilers of this Catechism do not publish it in an unkind spirit towards Christians of other denominations, nor with the view of provoking controversy, but for the following reasons:—

1. In these days of conflicting opinions, they deem it a matter of essential importance to the Presbyterian Church, that her members, and especially the rising generation, be thoroughly instructed in their peculiar and distinguishing principles.

2. They regard as *false* and *unscriptural* the opinions which many are disposed to advocate,—that no particular form of Church government and discipline is of Divine institution, and that churches may adopt whatever form seems to them most expedient.

3. They believe that the glory of Christ, the extension of his kingdom, and the salvation of souls, are intimately connected with the faithful administration of his ordinances and laws, according to the form of government which He has instituted in His Word.

4. And *that*, they are persuaded, is the *Presbyterian form*.  
*Glasgow, 1838.*

**I. WHAT is meant by the Church of Christ?**

Either the whole body of his redeemed people, or the whole body of professing Christians on earth, and their children. Eph. v. 25, 27, “Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church. Acts ii. 39, 47, “For the promise is unto you, and to your children.” And the Lord added to the Church daily, such as should be saved.”

**II. How is the Church, in this general sense, usually distinguished?**

Into the invisible and the visible Church.

**III. Is the Greek word (Ecclesia,) translated Church in the Scriptures, confined to these two meanings?**

No. It is used in various senses. It signifies—

1. Any general assembly or congregation of people; (Acts xix. 32,) “for the assembly (Ecclesia) was confused.”

2. An assembled Council, either of civil judges,—Acts xix. 39, “It shall be determined in a lawful Assembly, (Ecclesia;) or of ecclesiastical rulers, Matt. xviii. 17, “Tell it unto the church,” &c., (Ecclesia.) The Church consists of rulers and ruled, Heb. xiii. 17. And according to the order of all well-regulated Societies, complaints are laid before the Rulers. It was so in the Synagogues of the Jewish Church; and, therefore, as spoken by our Lord, and understood by his disciples, the word Church, in this verse, will mean the Rulers.

3. Any particular congregation of Christians. Col. iv. 15, “And the church which is in his house.”

4. Several congregations, or Churches, considered as one body under the same general Judicature. 1 Cor. i. 2, “Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth;” compared with chap. xiv. 34, “Let your women keep silence in the Churches.” Also, Acts viii. 1,

"The Church which was at Jerusalem;" compared with xxi. 20, "How many thousands," or (as in the original) "myriads." A myriad is ten thousand. Many myriads must have made many congregations in Jerusalem,—all called the Church, under the jurisdiction of the Apostles and Elders, Acts xv. 6; and xvi. 4.

IV. Is the word *Church* used, at present, in this last sense?

Yes. We say the Church of Scotland,—the Church of England.

V. Is it a matter of indifference to what Church we belong?

No. It is our duty to join and adhere to that Church which is most agreeable to the Holy Scriptures in its doctrines, constitution, forms, and discipline. 1 John iv. 1, "Try the spirits whether they are of God." 1 Thess. v. 21, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

VI. Has the Christian Church, as a visible society, a form of government peculiar to itself?

Yes. It is a kingdom having laws enjoined by Christ, and its members consist of the rulers, and the ruled. John xviii. 36, "My kingdom is not of this world," &c. Heb. xiii. 17, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls."

VII. Where do we find the ordinances and laws by which it is governed?

In the word of God alone. Isa. viii. 20, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Rev. xxii. 18, "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."

VIII. What is the form of Church government which is founded on and agreeable to the word of God?

That which is called the *Presbyterian form*. It is so called from the word *Presbyter*, signifying *Elder*, which is the usual Scriptural name for the rulers of the Church.

IX. What are the general and fundamental principles of this form of Church Government?

The supreme headship of Jesus Christ, the official equality of its Ministers, the office of ruling Elder, the election of its officers by Church members, and the ministerial and subordinate authority of its Church Courts.

X. What is meant by the supreme headship of Christ?

That He, and He alone, is the King and Head of the Church, and that no other person or persons have any authority to decree rites and ceremonies, or institute offices, in the Church. Ps. ii. 6, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion," 1 Pet. v. 3, "Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." Eph. v. 23, "Even as Christ is the head of the Church." Matt. xxviii. 20, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

XI. How many kinds of office-bearers did Christ appoint in his Church.

Two kinds,—extraordinary and ordinary officers. Eph. iv. 11, "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers."

XII. What were the extraordinary?

Persons endowed with supernatural gifts and extraordinary authority; as apostles, evangelists, and prophets.

XIII. For what purpose were they appointed?

To make known the will of Christ, settle the constitution of the Church agreeably thereto, and commit the administration of it to ordinary and permanent officers. Tit. i. 5, "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting." 2 Tim. ii. 2, "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

XIV. Had they any successors as extraordinary officers?

No. We do not read of any having been appointed or ordained to succeed them in their higher office as apostles, evangelists, or prophets. Acts xiv. 23, "And when they had ordained them *Elders* in every Church."

XV. What are the ordinary Church-officers appointed by Christ?

Presbyters or Elders, (called also Bishops or Overseers,) and Deacons. Acts xx. 17, "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the church." Philip. i. 1, "To all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons."

XVI. What is meant by the Pastors of the Church?

The Presbyters or Elders, who teach as well as rule.

XVII. Is any one of these possessed of superior rank and authority in the Church above the others?

No. They are of the same order and of equal authority.

XVIII. Are not Bishops an order of Ministers distinct from and superior to Presbyters or elders?

They are not. Bishop is only another name for the Presbyter or Elder.

XIX. How does this appear?

1. Bishops are not designated by any *distinguishing* or *peculiar* title, nor addressed by the Apostles as discharging any *distinct* duties.

2. The word (Episcopos) translated Bishop, signifies merely an *overseer*. Acts xx. 28, "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you (Episcopoi) overseers."

3. All Elders are Bishops, or overseers. Acts xx. 17, with 28, "And called the *Elders* of the Church,—over which the Holy Ghost hath made *you overseers*," or "Bishops," as the original word is translated in Phil. i. 1, "with the Bishops," (Episcopoi,) And Tit. i. 5, 7, "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain *Elders* in every city." "For a *Bishop* must be blameless." And 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, "The Elders I exhort, who am also an elder,—feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the *oversight* thereof."

4. Ruling is a less honourable and less important work than teaching; and, therefore, a Bishop, as Ruler, cannot be superior to the Pastor, or Teacher. 1 Tim. v. 17, "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, *especially* they who labour in the *word and doctrine*." 1 Cor. xii. 28, "And God hath set some in the Church,—first, apostles; thirdly, teachers; after that—helps, governments."

5. All Pastors derive their office and authority from Christ, by the *same commission*, and in the *same words*; and therefore, *equal*

VOL. XVII.—28

*official authority* appertains to all. Mark xvi. 15, And he said unto them,—“Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.”

6. Since, then, Bishop and Presbyter are *convertible* titles, and the *same general* character, duties and powers are ascribed in Scripture to the Presbyter and to the Bishop, it evidently follows that they are not two distinct orders, but are one and the same church-officer—the Presbyter being the only scriptural bishop.

XX. What sort of Officers were Timothy and Titus?

They were extraordinary and itinerant officers. 2 Tim. iv. 5, 10, “Do the work of an Evangelist.” Titus (is departed) unto Dalmatia.” 2 Cor. viii. 23, Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you;” and xii. 18, “I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother.”

XXI. Does the word “Angel,” as used in reference to the Seven Churches of Asia, in Revelation, designate an officer superior to the Presbyter?

The word signifies merely a messenger, and may be applied to any servant of God that bears a message from him. It may as well be taken to designate the Moderator of the Presbytery as the organ of communication; or it may signify the Pastors of the Church, in a collective capacity. Rev. ii. 8, 10, “Some of *you*,” “that *ye*,” &c.; and 13, “among *you*.”

XXII. How is the Pastor set apart to his office?

He is ordained to it by imposition of hands, and by prayer. 1 Tim. v. 22, “Lay hands suddenly on no man.” Acts xiii. 3, “And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.”

XXIII. Who has authority to ordain officers in the Church?

A Presbytery or plurality of Elders. 1 Tim. iv. 14, “With the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.” Acts vi. 6, “Whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed, *they* laid their hands on them.

XXIV. Is there any other permanent office in the Church but that of teaching?

There is also the office of ruling. Heb. xiii. 24. “Salute all them that have the rule over you.”

XXV. To whom does it belong to exercise this office?

To the Presbyters or Elders. Acts xv. 6, “And the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider the matter;” and xvi. 4, “they delivered them the decrees for to keep, which were ordained of the Apostles and Elders.” 1 Tim. v. 17, “The Elders that rule well.”

XXVI. How many classes of Elders are there?

Two,—the Teaching Elder and the ruling elder. 1 Tim. v. 17, “Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.” 1 Cor. xii. 28, “Teachers, helps, governments.”

XXVII. Are these to be regarded as distinct orders of office-bearers, possessing different degrees of authority?

No. They are to be regarded as occupying different departments of the same general office, and of equal authority, as rulers of the Church.

XXVIII. Why are they thus distinguished?

Because the one class is ordained not only to rule, but also to teach, and the other to rule, as their distinctive duty.

**XXIX.** What is the general duty of the Ruling Elders?

To act along with the Pastor, as "helps and governments," in overseeing the Church, in exercising discipline and rule, and visiting the families and sick members for exhortation and prayer. 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, "The Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder."—"Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof." Jas. v. 14, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him."

**XXX.** Is it a part of the Deacon's office to teach or rule in the Church?

No. Deacons are not spoken of any where in Scripture, in connexion with these duties.

**XXXI.** For what duty were they appointed?

To manage the temporal affairs of the Church, and especially to attend to the wants of the poor, in order that the Apostles or Teachers might give themselves continually to the ministry of the word. Acts vi. 1, 4.

**XXXII.** Did not Philip, who was a Deacon, teach and baptize?

Philip became an Evangelist, and as such had authority to teach and baptize. Acts xxi. 8, "And we entered into the house of Philip the Evangelist."

**XXXIII.** Have the members of Churches the right of choosing their own Pastors and other office-bearers?

Yes. Churches have this privilege, in common with all other free Societies. Acts i. 15, 26, "And Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples." "And they gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias." Acts vi. 5, "And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen." 2 Cor. viii. 19, "Who was also chosen of the Churches to travel with us with this grace," &c.

**XXXIV.** How should Christians discharge this duty?

In a spirit of meekness, humility, peace, and prayer, with a supreme regard to the glory of Christ, and the spiritual interests of the Church, without partiality, or respect of persons. Phil. ii. 3. "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves." Acts i. 24, "And they prayed and said, Lord, show whether of these two thou hast chosen." 1 Cor. x. 31, "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." James iii. 17, "The wisdom that is from above, is peaceable, without partiality."

#### ART. XVI.—*An Editor rebuked by a Presbytery.*

At a meeting of the West Hanover Presbytery, in New Canton, Virginia, on the first of this month, the following preamble and resolutions were introduced and adopted, as we find them in the Watchman of the South. They passed unanimously, the following ministers being present:—George A. Baxter, D. D., James Wharey, Isaac Cochran, Jesse S. Armistead, Samuel J. Price, John L. Kirkpatrick, Wm. H. Pollard, John H. Bocock, George W. M'Phail, Joseph F. Baxter, and John B. Ross.

Whereas, an impression is sought to be made by the editor of a leading journal in our connexion, (see Philadelphia Presbyterian, of

Sept. 12, 1840,) that the Presbyterian Church in the United States, is upon such a foundation that it will refuse to hold communion at the Lord's table with those who were formerly in the same ecclesiastical connexion with ourselves, and also with the members of the Methodist communion: therefore,

2. *Resolved*, That Presbytery distinctly disavow the least participation in any such exclusive principles or feelings, and that we occupy the same ground of liberality and Christian courtesy towards other denominations, on which we have always stood.

3. *Resolved*, That the Stated Clerk be directed to forward this preamble and resolutions to the editor of the Watchman of the South, with a request that they be published in his paper.

We have long believed Mr. Ingles' general views far too Scriptural for the meridian of the General Assembly, and this belief is daily more and more confirmed.

---

#### ART. XVII.—*A Presbytery rebuked by an Editor.*

Most of our readers will probably regard the following as a very mild, but richly merited rebuke of uncalled for and unjust intermeddling of a presbytery with the rights and privileges of an individual, over whom they had no jurisdiction, and consequently, no warrant whatever to make the subject of *their* judicial proceedings. Want of room prevents us from giving the article entire. The editor, however, we think in error in the distinction he attempts to make between his close communion, and "close communion in its strict sense." In this respect his ground appears untenable; it is inconceivable to us how any denomination can maintain a separate ecclesiastical organization from others, and yet hold communion with them occasionally without justly incurring the charge of schism. If they can conscientiously commune *occasionally*, why not frequently? Why not always? Why are they separated?

But is it not a little remarkable that those liberal Christians who *will not* hold communion with the more orthodox, should be so sensitive when the latter refuse communion with them? that they should make such loud professions of brotherly love for persons whom they constantly oppose, hate, and even slander?

A VEXED QUESTION.—In a late number of our paper, in reply to certain queries proposed to us, we offered some remarks on intercommunion, which have been tortured into a grievous offence against charity. In the first instance, our opinions were not obtruded upon our readers gratuitously, but by request; and at present the reiteration of them is extorted by the violence with which they have been assailed. The peculiar state of many of our churches seemed to indicate the propriety of at least a passing notice of the subject; and although now compelled to revert to it, we do it only in self-defence, and by way of explanation, and with the fixed purpose of not prolonging the discussion. Among those who have attempted to put a false construction on our remarks is the *New York Observer*, which we suppose is entitled to read us a lecture on exclusiveness, as it has

never had any distinctive character of its own. Close communion, in its strict sense, we have never recommended, and we have advanced no sentiment hostile to the ecclesiastical standing of other denominations. To the unkind and vituperative spirit in which our remarks have been met, we had no design to reply; but when an ecclesiastical court, stepping beyond its usual limits, undertakes to arraign us and our journal before the public, a word in self-defence may be deemed necessary. We allude to the extraordinary action of the West Hanover Presbytery.

We can scarcely believe that the paragraph of our paper, which is the subject of this grave legislative action and rebuke, could have been before the Presbytery at the passage of this minute. The premise on which it proceeds, is utterly unfounded; the editor of the Presbyterian never "sought" to make the impression attributed to him, but carefully qualified his remarks as being the expression of his individual opinion, and not as the well ascertained views of the whole Church. By a special disclaimer, we spoke for ourselves alone, and did not pretend to declare what was even the general practice of the Church. Without attempting to interpret for the Church at large, we maintained our own views that it was *inexpedient* to encourage intercommunion among churches, between which there was a material diversity of faith; and that, in cases where individuals, without regard to the purity or peace of the church, and perhaps from a spirit of factious opposition to sessional authority, should persist in such intercommunion, it might formally be made a subject of inquiry in the session. This is the whole front of our offending; and although even here we may not be infallible, yet it is not likely, if wrong, that we should be convinced by mere *dictum*, much less by disingenuous surmising.

The *argumentum ad invidiam*, is with many the best and most expeditious mode of settling an opponent, and they are well aware if they can persuade the public that he is an intolerant bigot, he has but a small chance of obtaining a hearing. Under the charge we feel perfectly placid. We are conscious of kindly feeling to other denominations in their proper place, and instead of restricting them in their liberty, we wish them, as well as ourselves, to enjoy their privileges without intrusion. We should be the last to infringe on the rights of any Christian community, or to claim exclusive privileges for ourselves. We have already said that communion supposes substantial agreement, and hence it is that a Unitarian, a Universalist, and a Calvinist would never pretend to commune freely and sweetly together at the Lord's table. The most latitudinarian liberalist will unite with us thus far; but why not go farther? We very honestly believe that the points of difference between orthodox Presbyterians on the one side, and Arminians and Semipelagians on the other, are material, else why give them such a prominent place in our Confession, and why content for them in long protracted controversies?

Again, an orthodox Presbyterian knows no God, and worships no God, but that sovereign ruler of heaven and earth, who, knowing the end from the beginning, has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass; but the Arminian maintains that such a God would be a *tyrant*, and regards that as a *horrid*, which the other regards as a *holy* decree. Is this a ground for communion? At the Lord's

table both profess to raise their hearts to God and make their love to him the basis of their fellowship with one another, and yet at the time one regards this God in an aspect which is utterly revolting and abhorrent to the other! Whether the one or the other be right, is not now the question; but certainly it is preposterous to suppose that there can be the elements of a peaceful and profitable communion where there exists such a discrepancy of views.

The difficulty is as great with the Arminian as with the Presbyterian, and will be felt and acknowledged by all except those of both denominations who have no distinct and settled views of Christian doctrine.

But to return to our text. The West Hanover resolutions express as much solicitude to be on good terms with the New-school as with the Methodists. If we understand them they wish the whole world to know, that they distinctly disavow the exclusiveness which would refuse to commune with the men whom they, as a Presbytery, *helped out of the church!*

If we mistake not, they took an honourable part in the *exclusive* measure by which the New-school lost their *status* in our church; we say their *status* in our church, for although the exclusion in question did not affect their ecclesiastical organizations, all the world knows, that the excluded party are not now, and never have been, since the passage of the acts, in the communion of the Presbyterian church. When, therefore, this Presbytery, publicly says, that they wish with all "liberality and Christian courtesy" to hold communion with them, what must they think? If such language does not sound like a bitter mockery in their ears, we are not well skilled in sounds. The measure by which the New-school were excluded from the communion of the Presbyterian church was either righteous or unrighteous; if the former, why should we make any professions of attachment which our actions do not sustain; or if the latter, why do we not magnanimously avow it, and invite them back in a body.

We believe it was righteous, and whether right or wrong in our belief, we contend that while the causes exist which led to it, it is utterly inexpedient to hold communion with their churches.

Thus it may be seen, that instead of arrogant pretension, or an uncharitable proscription of others, we have only maintained a rule which operates on all alike, and while we say it is inexpedient to commune with denominations whose faith materially varies from our own, we cheerfully accord to them the right (and it is a right, too, which they are not slow to use) of saying that it is inexpedient to commune with us.

#### ART. XIX.—*Persecution of the Jews at Damascus.*

In the *London Times* of June 2d, additional particulars concerning the progress and the suspension of these outrageous proceedings are given:

The *Journal des Debats* publishes a letter from M. Cremieux, an Advocate and Vice-President of the Israelitish Central Consistory at Paris, stating that on demand of M. Darmon, a lawyer attached to the French legation at Constantinople, M. de Pontois had, on the 27th of April last, sent orders to M. Cochelet, the French Consul-General in Alexandria, to enjoin Count de Ratti Menton, Consul of France in Damascus, to suspend all proceedings against the Jews of that city.

The Israelites of Alexandria had previously addressed a spirited Memorial



to Mehemet Ali, in which they entreated him to direct that the torturing of their co-religionists in Damascus should cease, and that all the documents connected with the affair should be forwarded to him. The Viceroy, it appears, acceded to their request.

On the 1st of May a report of M. Merlain, the Austrian Consul at Damascus, dated the 17th of April, and praying the Consul-General Laurin to obtain from the Viceroy an order for Scheriff Pasha to put an end to the anguish and persecution of the unhappy Israelites of Damascus, was communicated by that functionary to Mehemet Ali. The Pasha without loss of time acquiesced in the demand, and on the 2d issued an order to the following effect, which the Jews themselves despatched by a special messenger, mounted on a dromedary:—"We have been informed," says Mehemet Ali, "that certain powerful men among the Christians attack our Hebrew subjects of Damascus, and that complaints have been vainly addressed to you. Such aggressions displease us; they are contrary to our wishes. I command you, therefore, to prevent their recurrence." The Pasha next desired that the decision of the affair should be left to the consuls of Austria, Russia, Prussia, and England.

The Consul of Austria, in his report, draws a horrible picture of the tortures to which seven of the principal Jewish inhabitants of Damascus were subjected, to extort a confession of their alleged guilt. Two of them expired after the most excruciating sufferings. "The barbarity of the torments inflicted on the five others," says M. Merlain, "is so frightful that a miracle of Providence could alone have saved them from death. They were flogged with rods; they were kept plunged for hours together in cold water, and . . . . . Alas! the cries and groans of the unhappy patients were heard afar. Their ears were torn off, their faces flayed, and their chins, beards, and noses burnt with red hot irons. Soldiers, in compliance with orders, trod under foot their attenuated bodies. Another torture was inflicted on one of them, Moussa Salomich. Small pincers were introduced into his flesh, under the nails of the feet and hands." . . . . .—In a subsequent report of the 23d of April the Austrian Council announces, that "the tortures had been at last suspended, but that scarcely a day elapsed without some fresh insult being offered to the Jews by the ignorant Christians. The first three physicians of Damascus, who had been examined in the affair, were directed to proceed to a new verification of the supposed remains of Father Thomas, and it was thought that they would be ultimately placed in a box and transmitted to the Academy of Medicine of Paris, who would decide whether they are the bones of men or animals. This course had been proposed from the commencement by M. Lograsso, who unhesitatingly pronounced them to be animal remains.

By the last accounts from Damascus, the affair was assuming a most favourable turn for the Israelites; the barber, and most of the individuals examined, having retracted the evidence which the fear of tortures had extorted from them.

On the 11th of June the "Times" has the following:—

Our letters from Malta of the 1st inst. bring intelligence from Alexandria of the 26th ult. M. Laurin, the Austrian Consul-General, had addressed a circular letter to his colleagues, calling upon them to sign a joint Memorial to the Viceroy, praying him to order the revision of the proceedings against the Israelites of Damascus. This invitation had been attended to by the representatives of Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden, and Spain, but declined by those of France, Greece, Holland, the Two Sicilies, Belgium, and Tuscany. M. Laurin, moreover, sent to Damascus a commission of two or three Israelites, who were charged with taking information on all the facts connected with the murder of Father Thomas. M. Melvize, the French Vice-Consul at Alexandria, who was ordered by his government to proceed to Damascus on a similar mission, sailed for that destination, in the English packet, on the 20th.

Another letter from an unquestionable quarter, gives, at great length, the results of an inquiry into the fact of this almost incredible case by a perfectly disinterested party—a converted Jew, belonging to the Christian mission at Jerusalem, and which would leave no doubt whatever upon the innocence of the accused. The writer is exceedingly severe on the French Consul at Damascus, M. Ratti Menton, upon M. Baudin, ex-Consular agent of France in that city, and upon M. Cochelet, the French Consul-General at Alexandria, by whom the former was supported; but he expresses his admiration, and bespeaks

the deep-felt gratitude of the Jews to the British Consul-General at Alexandria, (Col. Hodges,) for his active and zealous efforts to put a period to the persecution of the unhappy Jews.

It is gratifying to observe the deep sympathy that has been awakened for these poor Jews. Their persecution has been made the subject of remark in both branches of the British Parliament, and that Government has instructed its official agents to exert all their influence to put an end to this oppression. We are glad to perceive that the influence of our own Government, also, to the same purpose, will be interposed as far as possible. Public meetings have been held both in Europe and in this country, and a deputation has been sent by the Jews in London and Paris to the Pasha of Egypt, in order to have justice done to their accused brethren in Damascus. The London meeting was attended by the Baron Rothschild and his brothers, and other wealthy Jews, and upwards of \$30,000 were subscribed towards defraying the expenses of the deputation. Sir Moses Montefiore of London, and M. Cremieux of Paris, are at the head of this deputation.

The "Jewish Intelligencer" contains some excellent remarks, pointing out what must be considered the most important feature in this whole affair, the altered tone of public sentiment among Christians towards the Jews. "The persecution of the Jews at Damascus is at this moment exciting an astonishing interest throughout the world. The attention of all parties is turned to it. Superstition and infidelity seem to concur in taking part with the persecutors. Genuine Christianity is the best friend of the Jews. But why such deep interest at this time? Were the Jews never so treated before? Is this accusation a new one? Every reader of history knows that there is nothing new in these painful occurrences. But there is something new in the deep interest now excited. We are reminded of the promise: 'Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set time, is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof.'"

This general expression of deep sympathy with the Jews may do much to awaken kindly feeling in their minds towards Christians, by showing them who are their true and best friends; it may thus remove prejudices, and eventually contribute largely to their embracing the Christian faith. The Lord can, and doubtless will, bring good out of this evil.—*Foreign Missionary Chronicle*.

#### ART. XVIII.—*The Number, Condition, &c. of the Jews in North Africa.*

The following interesting letter was addressed to the Rev. Mr. Lorimer of Glasgow. The writer, the Rev. J. C. Ewald, is a German, which will account for some of the forms of expression. He is also one of the devoted missionaries of the London Jews' Society:—

LEGNORNO, Nov. 29, 1839.

*Dear and Reverend Sir,*—One of the gentlemen sent out by your church, to inquire into the state of God's ancient people, wrote to me from Malta to Tunis, requesting me to give him some information respecting the Jews of Northern Africa. There are residing on the whole coast of Northern Africa, from Morocco to Egypt, great numbers of Jews. In the empire of Morocco, according to the information I could gather from Jews who came from there to me, to Tunis, there reside about 300,000 Jews. These have never been visited by a missionary. In the regency of Tunis there are residing from 150,000 to 200,000. At Tunis, there are upwards of 40,000 of them living; others reside at Baserta, Arianna, Nable, Munasteer, Susa, Sfax, Gerba, Gabis, and Madiä. These are places along the coast which have been visited by me. Besides these, there are many living in the interior of this regency, whom I hitherto have been prevented from visiting; but many of them come occasionally to Tunis, and buy the Holy Scriptures. At Tripoli there are residing about 3,000 Jews. This place I had visited in 1835. At Bengary, which is in the same regency, there are about 1,000; and in the neighbouring villages, 600. Algiers had in 1832, when I was there, about 7,000 Jews. And Constantine is said to have within its walls about 6,000. At Bona, there are also some residing, and a large number live at Oran: both places belong to the regency at Algiers; and are now in the possession of the French. Most of the Jews residing on the coast of Barbary have settled there, after they were driven

out from Spain ; others have been there previously ; and on the Island of Gerca, I have seen a synagogue which is said to have been built after the destruction of the first temple.

The Jews of Barbary, with the exception of those who are residing in the French possessions, are governed by their own laws. The Bey of Tunis has placed over them a governor, who is styled Kaid. All that now the Bey wants of the Jews, he asks the governor, and he exacts it then from the Jews under his jurisdiction. He has the power to punish, to imprison, and to administer the bastinado. The Kaid may be considered the first magistrate of the Jews in all things temporal.—The spiritual concerns are managed by the chief rabbies who have great power, even more than the Kaid himself. Five of the first rabbies, whom they call "Dianim," that is, judges, form the holy tribunal ; the chief of them is styled "Ab Beth Din,"—the father of the house of judgment. Before this court, all matters of strife, all accusations, all things relating to the law, are heard and settled.

The Jews of Barbary are a very laborious class of people,—they are in fact the only working class. You find among them shoemakers, tailors, masons, goldsmiths, and other trades. At Tunis there are about 600 Jew tailors, and about 1,000 goldsmiths. In general they are poor ; they just gain enough to live upon ; nor are they so eager for making their earthly fortune as those of Europe. Most of the Jews of Barbary, have, for centuries, been shut out from all intercourse with other nations. Few, formerly, obtained the permission of visiting Europe. With the Mohammedans, among whom they live, they only come in contact on account of business. They were not allowed formerly to read Arabic ; therefore they were driven back to their own book, and here they are at home. Generally they all know how to speak the Hebrew language. They have all the habits, the manners, the customs, which they had in the days of our Lord.

They are yet distinguished by that zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, of which the holy apostle Paul speaks ; and I believe, if we want to see Jews in their real character, we must go to Northern Africa. As they are not so much engaged in getting riches, you find them always ready to speak to you on religious subjects. There is a feature which encourages the missionary who lives among them. You may enter their synagogues at any hour of the day, and you will always find some of them there, who enter freely into conversation. They are also very eager to have the word of God in their possession. When I first arrived at Tunis, I did not find amongst that large Jewish population twenty entire Bibles. The generality of them were altogether ignorant of the chief contents of that holy book ; and when I quoted passages from the prophets, they would usually say to me, "These passages are not in our Bible ; these you have written in order to make us believe that Christianity is true."

I sincerely hope that you will take the coast of Northern Africa into consideration, when you send out missionaries. Since 1832, I have been alone on that vast coast. Only last year our Society has sent me a young man to assist in the mission. Morocco offers a large sphere of labour. Algiers also, would be a place where a missionary would find a great deal to do among the Jews there ; and if a missionary were going there, recommended to our consul-general, who is Mr. St. John, I am sure this gentleman would do all in his power to promote the cause of God. When I was there in 1832, he was very kind to me. Formerly, Mr. St. John had a chaplain, but now there is no English clergyman there ; and I am sure the Consul, and the Vice-Consul's family, would be glad to hear, on the Lord's day, an English sermon. Tripoli is also a place which deserves your serious consideration. Besides the number of Jews mentioned who reside there, there are about fifty Protestants living there, without any means of grace. The English Consul-general, Colonel Warrington, would receive a clergyman with open arms. In 1835, when I visited that place, I had divine service in the Consulate, and administered the Lord's supper to Colonel Warrington's family. I was begged by several Protestant families to stay there ; but as I had fixed at Tunis, and as there were also a number of Protestants whom I had, by the Lord's blessing, gathered together, I could not forsake that station. Even Tunis does afford work enough for several missionaries ; and I would hail with joy the arrival of a fellow-labourer. The languages required for a missionary to the Jews, on the coast of Barbary, are Hebrew and Arabic. With very few exceptions, all the Jews I have ever

met with, prefer Hebrew. In Morocco they speak also Spanish; but at Tunis, and Tripoli, and Algiers, I did not meet with any one who had any knowledge of that language. At Algiers a great many speak the French language. If you send missionaries to the Jews on the coast of Africa, it would be well if two were to go to the same place, of whom one at least ought to be a married gentleman. I do not think that I can say any thing farther on that subject; I only regret that your deputation did not come to Tunis. May the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, bless your endeavours!—May he make you instruments in his hands, of bringing many sons of Egypt to the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord! Amen. I am, dear sir, yours, most respectfully,

F. CH. EWALD.

[*Scottish Ch. Herald.*]

### *Dreadful Earthquake.*

The account of the falling of a part of Mount Ararat, shaken down by an earthquake, with a terrible destruction of human life, is confirmed. The St. Petersburg *Abeille du Nord* of September 11th, publishes the following letter, dated Tiflis, August 13th:

"You have doubtless heard of the terrible earthquake of Mount Ararat, which has totally destroyed the town of Makitcheman, damaged all the buildings at Erivan, and devastated the two districts of Sharour and Sourmate, in Armenia. All the villages in those districts have been destroyed. The earth is rent in such a manner, that all the cotton and rice plantations have perished for want of water. But the most awful event has taken place in the neighbourhood of Mount Ararat. A considerable mass was loosened from the mountain, and destroyed every thing in its way for the distance of seven wrests, (nearly five English miles.)

Among others, the great village of Akhouli has had the fate of Herculaneum and Pompeii. Above one thousand inhabitants were buried under heaps of rocks. A thick fluid, which afterward became a river, ran from the interior of the mountain, which was opened, and following the same direction, swept over the ruins, and carried with it the corpses of the unfortunate inhabitants of Akhouli, the dead animals, &c. The shock continued to be felt every day in the above-mentioned districts and entirely laid them waste; then the shocks became less frequent. Ararat is not yet quiet; the day before yesterday I was awakened by two violent subterraneous commotions."

**PROPHECY.**—"The validity of our reasoning on prophecy depends upon three conditions. 1. The alleged prophecy must be shown to have been promulgated prior to the event; and the longer the interval the more fully and satisfactorily is this condition complied with. 2. The alleged fulfilment must clearly and palpably answer to the terms of the prophecy, without forced or fanciful construction; and the more minute and complicated the agreement, the more satisfactorily will it fulfil this condition. 3. The nature of the event itself, at the promulgation of the alleged prophecy, must lie remote from human anticipation, and be such as could not be foreseen upon any general principles, or be inferred by the laws of probability or the light of experience. It does not follow that whatever is deficient in any one of these conditions, cannot be a true prophecy; but only that whatever possesses them cannot be a false prediction, but ne-

cessarily proves itself to answer to the idea of a true foretelling of events, because it involves divine knowledge."—*Eclectic Review*.

**HUME, THE DEIST.**—David Hume observed, that all the devout persons he ever met with, were melancholy. On this Bishop Horne remarked—"This might very probably be: for in the first place, it is most likely that *he* saw VERY FEW,—his friends and acquaintances being of another sort. And secondly, the sight of him would make a devout man melancholy at any time."

**TRANSUBSTANTIATION.**—Nothing can begin to exist that exists already; it is impossible to create that which is already created. Christ's body, then; that has existed for upwards of eighteen hundred years, cannot be the same body with that which is created from time to time in the *mass*. The same body cannot have two different periods of commencement of its existence. To assert the contrary is not only untrue, but is a contradiction. The man who says that the true body of Christ, which has existed since his birth, is *made* every time that mass is said, outrages common sense, and can no more be reasoned with than a maniac. His cure must be attempted by medicine: logic cannot reach him.—*Alexander Carson*.

**SELF-TORTURE.**—The following ingenious mode of self-torture, practised by the native devotees in Calcutta and vicinity, is described by Rev. Dr. Duff. It consists in this: A number of devotees enter into a vow, that they will lie down on their backs on the earth, exposed to the blazing sun by day, and the chilling dews by night. They will have in one hand a little earth, and in the other a few seeds. With the one hand they place the earth under the lower lip, and with the other plant the seeds in it; and the vow is, that they will lie there, without moving, or speaking, or receiving any nourishment whatever, until the seeds sprout and germinate, and then they will return to their homes!

"2 Kings xvi. 10—20, Practical Observations.—The arrogant self-wisdom which induces men to new model Divine ordinances after their own vain imaginations, is insufferably provoking to that God who resisteth the proud; and that external magnificence which carnal minds affect in his worship, obscures the real glory of heavenly things, excites false ideas of the Divine character, and turns men aside from the spiritual service, which alone the Lord accepts and delights in. Thus, new ways of worshipping God very speciously introduce gross idolatries; as the Church of Israel and that of Rome, among other examples, have abundantly evinced."—*Scott's Commentary*.

### *Faith and Works.*

Faith goes before salvation, and works follow it; not to be made the ground of our justification; but as the necessary concomitants, and proper fruits of faith; and whenever obedience puts itself in the place of faith, St. Paul's words may fitly be applied to it, "Know

that thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." Why then are works to be the great subject of inquiry at the day of judgment? Because they are the visible effects of faith, and only good as springing from a root of faith, so that the want of them proves, of course, the want of faith.—*Adam.*

**A NEW MOVEMENT.**—The Abolitionists of Boston, as the friends of universal reform, have called a convention for the 18th instant, to *decide* whether the Sabbath is a divine institution, and the ministry a divine appointment, or whether they be not the mere inventions and traditions of man! This call is signed by leading men and women of the party, and the design is too manifest to be concealed—it is a wicked and infidel assault upon Christian institutions. It is to such purposes that the leading paper of the party is now devoted.

The above paragraph is copied from the Presbyterian. The respectability of its source compels us to believe it, until rebutted by good authority; and, if true, the Christian community should possess the information. We, therefore, respectfully request the editor of that paper to give us the names of these "leading men and women of the party," together with the *decision* of the convention, as soon as it may be known.

### *Signs of Repentance.*

"I apprehend that true evangelical repentance may be distinguished from whatever else may bear the name of repentance, by its spring, and its immediate object. Its source, or spring, is a Divine light communicated to the mind, of which we are, by nature, utterly destitute. It is the gift of God, wrought by the powerful operation of his Spirit. By this light, a discovery is made to the soul of those scriptural truths, of which, without it, we cannot, by all our sagacity and inquiries, obtain a more adequate notion than a blind man has of colours. God has not left himself without a witness in the natural conscience, and by the force of this, sinners may be, and often are, put in fear, upon principles merely rational. The thoughts of death—the persuasion of a future judgment—a conviction that their tempers and lives are contrary to the express precepts of Scripture—and some apprehensions of the greatness of that God with whom they have to do, and the impossibility of their escaping his hands;—these, and the like considerations, may be so impressed upon the mind (even without the ministry of the word, but more especially when people sit under an awakening preacher,) as to excite great uneasiness upon account of sin, earnest desires and endeavours to forsake it,—and these attended with success so far, as to cause a great and observable change of conduct,—and this may extend to a seeming delight in the ways, ordinances, and people of God, and yet, all the while, the persons so far wrought upon may be utter strangers to the spiritual light I have mentioned, and therefore their *repentance* will be ineffectual, partial, and temporary. When the lively impressions of fear wear off, they will either return to their old ways, or settle in a self-righteous formality. Such wounds as these have received, may be healed without the application of the blood of Christ."—*Rev. John Newton's Twenty-five Letters.*

# THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JANUARY, 1841.

---

## ART. I.—*The Life of Dr. M'Crie.*

WE heartily congratulate Mr. M'Crie on the publication of his father's life. It is a very valuable piece of biography; full of incident, and full of life; well condensed, and well written; breathing a liberal and catholic spirit; modest and unpretending. The 'bust' we do not like, but the book is itself a bust, and Dr. M'Crie lives in his works. Seldom is it that the life of a Christian pastor, and of a man of literature, present so much in variety of incident to keep up the interest of the narration. The reader of this work will feel little inclined to rise from its perusal till he hath devoured it *in toto*; for, as you proceed, you feel a renewed relish for the repast. The work is divided into eight chapters, and an appendix of miscellaneous articles, chiefly from the pen of Dr. M'Crie. Various valuable letters by Dr. M'Crie, also, are interwoven with the texture of the narrative; and the distinguished author of the lives of Knox and Melville, and the Reformation in Spain and Italy, is vividly brought before us in varied portions, but ever in admirable feeling. We could have desiderated a little more on the *times* as well as on the *life*; but the hazard of running into excess here was imminent; and we admire the modest diffidence of our author, when, in his preface, he speaks of himself as simply "furnishing his contribution for the guidance of the future historian of the Church in treating of the period embraced by the life; a period," he adds, "to which we of the present age live too close, perhaps, to form either a full or an unbiassed judgment."

To the Rev. James Gray of Brechin, one of the earliest and most intimate of Dr. M'Crie's friends, the biographer has been indebted for what he calls "recollections" of the early portions of his history, when teacher of a private school at Brechin, under the patronage of Mr. Gray's father, from 1791-4. Mr. M'Crie has formed something like an apology for the minuteness of Mr. Gray's details in the admiration which that gentleman felt for the memory of his friend, and in the associations of early life. The article stands in need of no apology. Its minuteness is one of its beauties, and the naiveté with which it brings its hero before our eyes, adds much to the effect of the graphic picture. We wish we could afford room for the whole of it. The following extract, while it will interest the admirers of Dr. M'Crie's works, will present Mr. Gray to our readers as a man of discernment, and as capable of writing good English.

VOL. XVII.—29

"The progress of his mind during this period of his life, is to be measured more by the growth of his powers than by the accessions which were made to his share of systematic information. Nor is it at all improbable that under his active duties, and frequent opportunities of relaxation, his mental faculties released from the restraints of swaddling bands, acquired a degree of elasticity and vigour which they might not have attained under more retiring habits and closer engagements of continuous study. He could be busy or idle with all his might, and possessed the rare power of doing much when he appeared to be doing nothing. He studied man in the living delineations, which an intercourse with different grades of society presented, and from the instances in which he had occasion to observe both without and within the lower orders, was taught to cherish sympathy with them as well as a generous affection for his kind, and in high disdain of that servile flattery which is so commonly offered to rank and riches. It has been said that Dean Swift was indebted for no small portion of that powerful writing which made its way so effectively to the breasts of his countrymen, to his familiar acquaintance with Irish life and manners; and that, in order to attain it, his custom in his journeys was, to prefer the inferior lodging-houses, in which he might have an opportunity of observing genuine samples of the native character. To have seen your father in the midst of a reading club, collected in a back shop, to hear the news and comments of the London Courier, no man would have suspected that he was then making any acquisitions which would qualify him to write the life of John Knox; and least of all did he himself imagine it. In such scenes, however, and in the fellowship of some in the humbler ranks, who retained a portion of the spirit of the olden times, the author, who knew how to turn any opportunity to its proper use, acquired his graphic, caustic and business style of writing, discovered both the lights and shadows of Scottish character, was taught to form a just estimate of the spirit and character of the Reformation, and was prepared to furnish that representation of them which was so much calculated to interest and inform the Scotchmen of his day." Pp. 12, 13.

Mr. M'Crie has been singularly successful in investing with deep interest a theme which we feared would have turned out rather a heavy draw-back on the intrinsic merits of the work, as one of general reference. We refer to his account (commencing p. 41) of the disputes between the Old and New Lights in the Secession, with the painful and revolting issues. These disputes were generally classed, by Churchmen of the day, in the same category with the cobweb metaphysics of the Thomists and Scotists of a darker age; and though containing in embryo the leading pictures of the greatest controversy of the present day, they excited little or no interest beyond their immediate actors. Even the talented lawyers whom the Old Lights employed to plead their cause in the house of peers, could only gain the ear of the Chancellor, by claiming a patient listening on behalf of their clients, as to the venerable '*antiquarians of theology*.\*' In 1806, a fellow-student one morning told us, in the college square at Edinburgh, that he had chanced the day before to light upon some dark coterie, of Secederism, where furious de-

\* See printed papers in process.



bates were going on, about matters which only the parties saw, and that dimly. Our feelings were that of complacency, that we dwelt in a calmer region, and that Dr. Hunter did not examine us on such knotty points. Moreover, so late as 1810, on hearing at Perth a good slow-paced sermon from *Jedediah Aikman*, we had some little difficulty in comprehending any sufficient reason why he and his excellent colleague, Mr. Taylor, should have had a plea about the stone and lime of the house in which they alternately met. The almost prophetic anticipations of Dr. M'Crie on this subject, pp. 129, 130, have been actually realized, and with an accuracy, even as to chronology, that is singularly remarkable. The whole detail is deeply affecting. The conduct of the Synod reminds us of the similar proceedings of *our own* Assemblies, in the matter of Mr. Gillespie; and we feel thankful that *such elders* as those of the Potterrow, in their conduct to their excellent pastor, a compound of the hyena and the fox, have to seek for their types in other quarters than the region of the establishment.

Dr. M'Crie's sentiments regarding establishments, were the result of mature deliberation. In his early life he held rather liberal views, and it would appear that on taking license from the Secession body, he was one of those who asked and obtained leave to subscribe the formula with some latitude of interpretation. A more interesting sketch of the movements of an honest and conscientious mind, in its search of truth on this matter, there cannot be than that which his biographer has given in this part of his work; and our reverence and love for the distinguished subject of the biography, have been, if possible, aggrandized by the view here afforded, of a candour rarely exemplified, and a tenderness of conscience which throws a singular loveliness around his transcendent mental reign. It was in 1835 we chanced to hear Dr. M'Crie lecture in Potterrow, on one of those passages in the first epistle of John, which treat on the spirit and process of error, and the corresponding duties of the friends of truth; and distinctly have we in remembrance the leading pictures of his admirable exposition, which we now perceive, from the statements of his biographer, to have been a just copy of the actual state of his own mind. He had been prosecuting truth amid mazes of plausible error. He had been feeling his way in opposition to cherished prejudices, and native, and not unamiable nor unbecoming, partialities. Many popularly pleasing considerations would have combined to lead him to far different conclusions than those which he saw meet to adopt. But Dr. M'Crie was *even then* an independent thinker, and strong in his love of truth, and candid and prayerful in his investigations, he arrived, by the most philosophical and Christian of all routes, at those great principles which he never saw reason afterwards to abandon. We recollect well the impression which his discourse made on our mind. We feel it to be one of the very best illustrations which a professor of theology could have given of the mode of examining religious truth. We wondered to hear such profound and sagacious admonitions addressed to a congregation of plain people; and we desiderated their transfer to the logic classroom of the Divinity Hall.

It was Dr. M'Crie who, in 1813, *put it into the heads* of the leaders of the Established Church at Edinburgh, to apply for a share in

the good things that were then *in fieri*, for our brethren in British India. The worthy men of Edinburgh were thinking nought upon the subject, satisfied that the way was opened to a free introduction of the gospel into India, by whatever instruments might be employed. The object was a noble one; but Dr. M'Crie saw the folly of contending for an establishment of Christianity exclusively at home, and irrespective of its foreign relations; and he stirred up the spirits of Sir Henry, Andrew Thomson, and other good men of the day, to make a push for a branch of that Establishment in distant lands, which, with all its faults—and they were *then* not few—Dr. M'Crie loved and revered as the noblest national institution on earth. Partial success attended the effort. Three chaplainships were obtained for Scotsmen; a fourth (for Ceylon) was refused; and by a skilful ruse *that* was granted in the way of voluntary compromise, which *ought* to have been granted, and many years after was granted, by the same parliamentary statute which established Episcopacy in India. Dr. M'Crie's mind perpetually grasped great principles. He seldom descended to the mere details of enterprise; but give him an opening of probable good on an enlarged scale—a vista view of future years—and what Bacon would have called “germinating developments;”—show him (we mean, let his mind show itself) a proper measure or a rational process, well principled, well projected, honestly pursued, and with a probability of good, by the blessing of God, in an extended range, and he gave it a large share of his thoughts; he treated it as an adopted child; he forgot all minor differences for its sake; he threw into its scale the whole force of his comprehensive mind. Hence his zeal for liberty and Greece, hence his expanded views on the union of Protestants of all sections, hence his kindling enthusiasm on every topic that told for God's glory and man's good, without involving a sinful latitudinarianism, or an inglorious compromise.

With regard to Dr. M'Crie's sentiments regarding the Established Church at the present day, we are much pleased with the candid and just account which Mr. M'Crie has given in chapter vii. We are not *quite sure*, however, whether he would have “cordially approved” of her present movements, p. 356. Of the *struggle itself* he could not but approve, as one which involved in it all that is truly valuable in our ecclesiastical establishment. But as he never approved of the veto, we are not quite certain whether, on that act having been declared illegal, he would not at once have advised the Church to go back upon her inherent right to judge of all such cases as that of Auchterarder, on her own principles, and with a regard to the *maius bonum ecclesiæ*. At all events, of one thing we are certain, that disapproving as he did of the conduct of the Assembly in not petitioning for the abolition of patronage, in 1833 and 1834, he would have advised us instantly to hoist the standard of anti-patronage, and at all hazards contend at once for the spiritual independence of her courts and for the rights of the Christian people.\*

\* We have just read a pamphlet on the “Revolution settlement,” by a member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; and also the “Historical part of the testimony of that church.” They seem to be written by the same person, although the latter is a public document sanctioned by the general body. We are quite aware of the defects in the Revolution settlement, and that it is the duty of the church to contend for essential reform, particularly the abolition of patronage. But we can-

"It is unnecessary for me to demonstrate," said he on one occasion, "that the continuance of this servitude is inconsistent with the inherent freedom of a church, and that the long boasted liberties and independence of the Church of Scotland must be in a great measure nominal, so long as a sentinel is placed at the door of each of her nine hundred churches, without whose permission no minister can enter, and so long as a power, chiefly foreign and extraneous, has the right of directly or indirectly filling her judicatories, and directing her councils."\*

We add the following heart-stirring passage, from one of his sermons, printed after his death:—

"Nothing on earth would give more joy to my heart, than to see sure and decided symptoms of reformation in the national Church of Scotland—to see the Zion of God in our land rising from the dust and shaking herself, putting on her beautiful garments, and looking forth as in the morning of her day, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners,' to the confusion of those who would have quenched her light, and plucked her from that firmament in which she once shone with surpassing brightness. I would go seven times to the top of her highest mountain, to look out for the harbinger of her relief, though each time I should have to return with the message, 'There is nothing,' provided at last I could hail the appearance of 'the little cloud out of the sea, like a man's hand,' the sure prelude of the plentiful rain, which shall refresh the weary inheritance, make her wilderness as Eden, and her desert as the garden of the Lord.

"Do not despair, neither be discouraged, my brethren. There is abundance in the promise. Wait in faith, and patience, and prayer for its accomplishment. God hath done great things for Scotland; and he hath not suffered them to be forgotten. He hath reserved for himself a remnant, both in the established church and out of it, who think with gratitude and praise of his wonderful works. This is a token for good. And when he hath tried and humbled them, and led them to the exercise of prayer and confession,— 'Then will the Lord be jealous for his land, and pity his people.'"

In 1827-8, we had frequent occasion to consult Dr. M'Crie, partly on the subject of the Wodrow MSS., and partly on the publication of a new edition of Wodrow's history. It fell to the lot of the writer of these pages to disinter from the rubbish of years, and to disentangle from the grasp of an unconscious "adhesiveness," not fewer than fifty goodly volumes of MS., comprising the series of "*analecta*" complete, and correspondence for thirty years, to and from the indefatigable historian, whose only monument as *yet*, but *perennius ære*,—is the record of "the Sufferings of the Church,"—besides many miscellaneous articles of interest. In effecting a safe lodgement for these exuvizæ, where they now are, in the Advo-

not allow that the church has precluded herself from doing so, by her acceptance of the Revolution settlement. Dr. M'Crie did not think so, see p. 370. Do our excellent friends of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, really mean that before we can effectually struggle for our independence, we must first agitate for the dissolution of the union, and a tearing up of the Revolution settlement? There are many excellent things in the pamphlet, and still more in the testimony, and therefore we cordially recommend them to extensive perusal; but we are sorry to see that we are not likely to meet.

\* "What ought the General Assembly to do? 1833."

cates' Library, Dr. M'Crie's advice and aid were *con amore*, given; and one of his most interesting sketches in ecclesiastical history, that, namely, on the "Marrow Controversy," which appeared in 1830, in the pages of the *Instructor*, and which, with continuation, we rejoice to hear, is to be published in the forthcoming collection of his "Miscellaneous pieces," owes its existence mainly to the rich mine of incidental information which the minute and graphical details of Wodrow in his correspondence for the period supplied. With regard to the republication of the history, Dr. M'Crie suggested various sources of information, together with not a few practical hints, which were duly improved.

We hope Mr. M'Crie's readers will not think, from any thing said on that head, that the Dr's. dislike to encyclopedias and compends extended to magazines and reviews. For many years he was himself editor of a magazine; and within two years of his death, he consulted the writer of this on a plan which seemed to be a favourite with him, namely, that of a magazine to be published in Glasgow, as the more likely field—for even the *Guardian* could get no footing in the modern Athens *then*—a magazine which should be consecrated to the assertion and illustration of great principles, such as those involved in our national reformations, and in conducting which, *all sound men* could coalesce. The idea was not acted on; but its suggestion proves the influence which Dr. M'Crie ascribed to periodical literature, and the importance of giving to it a right direction. We think he rather undervalued encyclopedias; or rather he tried them by a standard to which they do not profess to appeal.\* On one occasion he silenced, in a way more plain than pleasant, the proposal of a worthy Christian philanthropist, to preface a new edition of an old book of merit; a plan which may be abused, as all good plans may, to the ends of selfishness, but which has in many instances been profitably employed in rescuing from oblivion some of the finest pieces of the olden time.†

Mr. M'Crie's sketches of his father's associates in the original "Constitutional Presbytery" are well drawn and deeply interesting.

\* The article "Ecclesiastical History" in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, which it seems he was asked to contribute, was afterwards furnished by one of the most ingenious and accomplished men whom our Church has of late years produced—the late Dr. Hodgson of Blantyre. It does not aim at profound research, but it shows accurate and extensive reading, and is valuable as a *coup d'œil* view of an extended theme.

† The excellent biographer, it is plain, had not meant to give a complete enumeration of Dr. M'Crie's articles, either in our own miscellany or any other. As it may be interesting to some, however, to recognise the hand of Dr. M'Crie, where perhaps they have not expected it, we beg to notice the following articles as from the pen of that eminent individual; and even yet, the list must not be considered as perfect. The lamented death of Dr. Thomson covered these scenes of agreeable literary interchanges with a funeral knell; and now the removal of these two eminent men to a better world, will for ever prevent the exact truth in this and some other things from being ascertained. We think we can vouch for what follows, from the information of Dr. Thomson at the time:

Christian Instructor for 1812, September No., Review of the Christian Reader's Guide, November No., Review of O Reid's Reviewers Reviewed. 1813, May No. Review of M'Leod's Essays and Inquiries on the Gifts of the primitive Church. 1814, July and November Nos. Two articles in the miscellaneous department, signed "Innocuus." One entitled, "Extracts from the Apology for Herodotus:" the other, "Testament of Peter Pithon"—both curious. 1816, July No. Review of Dr. Stevenson of Ayr on the Atonement. We were *horrified* by the appearance, at p. 226, of a quotation from the Christian Instructor for 1835, in which some rather slighting remarks on Dr. M'Crie's Review of the Tales of my Landlord, are quoted,

One of them (Mr. Aitken) we had occasion to know well, and we can attest the exact truth of the portrait here given of him. Another (Professor Bruce) we know well from his works; and we desiderate a fuller account of his life and labours than has here been furnished us. His "Review of the Synod's Proceedings" is rather a heavy work, and we fairly stuck fast in the midst of it. His "Life of Morus," though most wretchedly printed (at Whitburn) we have *repeatedly* read with more intense delight than we ever perused the finest octavo from the press.\* His "Occasional Lectures to Students," which we wish Mr. M'Crie had noticed more particularly, afford some fine specimens of those *reliefs* which theological professors ought now and then to throw in, that they may lessen the tedium of systematic sameness.

We observe that at p. 171, our excellent friend has copied the typographical mistake in the Edinburgh Review for July 1812, where the editor, speaking of the author of the life of Knox, says: "It affords us very great pleasure to bear this public testimony to the merits of a writer who has been hitherto unknown, we believe, to the literary world, either of this or the neighbouring country;—of whom, *or of whose existence*, though residing in the same city with ourselves, it was never our fortune to have heard till his volume was put into our hands." We do not know whether the erratum was ever corrected in the work itself, but if Mr. M'Crie will ask Lord Jeffrey about it as a little bit of literary curiosity, we rather think that his lordship will tell him that the word in the MS. was not "existence," but "eminence;" and this the sense of the paragraph obviously requires.

We cannot conclude this article without taking special notice of the concluding chapter, which contains a summary of Dr. M'Crie's private character, drawn up by the biographer, and succeeded by sketches published at the time by others. There is particularly an admirable sketch drawn by David Scott, Esq., and published in the Courant at the time of the Dr's death; and the heart-stirring letter from Mr. John M'Crie, then at Vienna, to his brothers; a letter which one cannot read without mingled reverence for the subject of it, and affectionate interest in the promising young man by whom it was written, and who—"sicut flos succisus aratro"—has since followed his venerated sire to the "resting place of the spirits of the just."—*Edinburgh Christian Instructor*.

besides some other objectionable things. We could not believe that such things could be genuine; and yet on looking at the volume of our work for that year, we find these passages in a long note to a letter signed "Philo-Liberal." How this Mr. Philo got these passages we cannot divine. That seems to have been the brazen age of the miscellany. In the volume for the following year, there appeared a review of Dr. M'Crie's posthumous sermons, some passages in which we had occasion to know at the time, gave great and just offence.

\* This work was reviewed in the *Instructor* for March, 1814, at great length and with much critical acumen. It was written by John Brown, then of Biggar, now of Broughton Street. We quote its closing paragraph as creditable alike to professor Bruce and his reviewer. "We now take our leave of Mr. Bruce, with a sincere respect for his talents, acquirements, and virtues, and offering him many thanks for the instruction and entertainment he has afforded us. Before bidding him farewell, however, we must be permitted to remonstrate with him, (we wish to do it with all due deference,) for not undertaking some work more worthy of himself, which might serve as a lasting ornament to the literature of his country, and a monument to his own fame. We believe him very capable of such a work, and might, we suggest a subject, we would propose the History of the Protestant Church in

**ART. II.—*A Catechism on the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church.***

**CHAPTER II.**

*The Constitution and Jurisdiction of Church Courts.*

**I.** What is the nature and extent of that authority which Christ has given to the rulers of the Church?

It is merely ministerial and subordinate. 2 Cor. i. 24, "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy."

**II.** What is meant by Ministerial authority?

It is authority, as Ministers or servants of Christ, to proclaim, apply, and execute his laws, for promoting the order and spiritual edification of the Church.

**III.** What is meant by subordinate authority?

It is the subjection of the inferior to the superior Court of the Lord's house,—as of Session to Presbytery, and of Presbytery to Synod, and of all to Christ.

**IV.** How is this rule or authority exercised?

By the Presbyters or Elders assembled in Session, Presbytery, Synod or General Assembly. Acts xv. 6. "And the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this matter."

**V.** What is a Church Session?

It is the Ruling Elders of any particular congregation met as a Church Court. It may be called a congregational Presbytery. 1 Cor. v. 4, 13, "In the name of the Lord Jesus, when ye are gathered together." "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person."

**VI.** In what manner should the business of the Session be conducted?

The meeting should be constituted by prayer, in the name of Christ, each member called on by the moderator to give his opinion on the subject under consideration, and the question afterwards decided by a majority of votes. Its decision may be appealed from to the Presbytery.

**VII.** How are matters brought before the Session for judgment?

By an Elder as an overseer of the Church; or by any other person preferring a complaint, or presenting a memorial.

**VIII.** Who are subject to the authority of Session?

All the members of the Church of which it has the oversight.

**IX.** What is the duty of each church towards the Session?

To respect and uphold that authority which is given it by Christ; to render a cheerful obedience to its decisions, in the Lord; and cordially co-operate in the plans of usefulness which it recommends. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and ad-

France. This is a subject peculiarly fitted for history. It has a beginning, a middle, and, alas! an end. Such a work is a *desideratum*, and, we believe, it is a work which Mr. Bruce, from his intimate acquaintance with French Protestant literature, could accomplish with much greater facility than perhaps any living literary character: or, should this appear to Mr. Bruce too wide a field for him, at his advanced age, to attempt to travel over, might he not favour the world with some illustration of the history of his own country and church, which are so necessary, and which the work we have been reviewing proves he is so well able to furnish?

monish you. And to esteem them very highly in love, for their work's sake. And be at peace among yourselves."

X. Of what does a Presbytery consist?

Of the Ministers of a convenient district, with a Ruling Elder from each congregation.

XI. What is the extent of its jurisdiction?

It extends to its own members, and to the several Sessions, and congregations belonging to it. It is a court of Appeal from Sessions, and has the general oversight of the congregations under its care. An appeal lies from its decision to the Synod.

XII. Of what does a Synod consist?

It consists of the Ministers of several Presbyteries, with a Ruling Elder from each Session. In the Presbyterian Churches of Ireland, it is the Supreme Court of jurisdiction and appeal. But in other more numerous and extended Churches there is also a General Assembly, composed of a specific number of Ministers and ruling Elders, appointed by the Presbyteries.

XIII. Does the New Testament furnish any model of Presbyterian Government by such Church Courts?

It does, in the 15th chapter of Acts.

XIV. How does the 15th chapter of Acts establish that form of Church government?

The facts therein recorded for our example, furnish its outline or general principles. In the Church at Antioch a question was disputed, affecting the faith and practice of all the Churches of Christ. Ver. 1, 2. It was referred for settlement, to an assembly to be convened at Jerusalem. Ver. 2. The Assembly consisted of the Rulers of the Church, but was open to the people. Ver. 6, 12. It acted in a deliberative capacity. Ver. 7, 12, 13. It decided, not by direct inspiration, but by discussion and consideration, under the ordinary guidance of the Holy Ghost. Ver. 7, 22, 28. One member of the Assembly proposed a resolution, which was unanimously adopted as its decision on the question. Ver. 19, 22. The decree thus enacted was authoritative, and extended to all the Churches. Ver. 28; and xvi. 4. These principles are applied in government, with all the necessary and expedient details, to particular congregations, by the *Session*; to the Churches of a convenient district, by the *Presbytery*; and to the whole Church, by *Synod*, or *General Assembly*. "This is the law of the house." Ezek. xliii. 12. "Let all things be done decently, and in order," 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

[From the Presbyterian.]

### ART. III.—*Tappan's Review of Edwards on the Will.*

In our last remarks on Tappan's book, it was stated that we might, at some future time, examine his *direct* argument against what he calls Edwards' assumption. Before this can be done, it is important to examine an absurd consequence, which he tells us follows from the conclusions which his *indirect* argument leads to. It is as follows: "It follows from this, that there can be no cause whatever. An infinite series of causative acts, without any first, being, according to this reasoning, the consequence of supposing a cause to cause its own acts, it must therefore follow that a cause does not cause its

own acts, but that they must be caused by some cause out of the cause. But the cause out of the cause which causes the causative acts in question, must cause these causative acts in the other cause by a causative act of its own: but the same difficulties occur in relation to the second cause as in relation to the first; it cannot cause its own acts, and they must therefore be caused out of itself by some other cause; and so on *ad infinitum*. We have here again the absurdity of an infinite series of causative acts; and also, the absurdity of an infinite series of causes without a first cause. Otherwise we must come to a first cause which causes its own acts, without an act of causation; but this is impossible, according to the reasoning of Edwards. As therefore there cannot be a cause causing its own acts, and inasmuch as the denial of this leads to the absurdities above mentioned, we are driven to the conclusion, that there is no cause whatever. Every cause must either cause its own acts, or its acts must be caused out of itself. Neither of these is possible; therefore there is no cause."

We freely admit that this is very plausible; but let it be observed,

1. That there is a confusion in the author's mind which arises from his supposing, that a causative act *in the abstract*, must have an efficient cause. Let it be remembered that a causative act means a cause in exercise. Now, causes produce effects by being in exercise; but the question what causes those causes to be in exercise in the production of effects, involves an absurdity. All second causes are produced by God, but the fact that when these causes produce effects, they are in exercise in doing so, is a truth of the same kind as that, if equals be added to equals, the wholes are equal. If any one should ask me, What is the cause of this, that when equals are added to equals the wholes are equal? I would answer that the question is absurd. In like manner it is absurd when causes produce effects by being in effect, to ask what causes those causes to be in effect in the production of their effects; for it never has been nor never can be conceived of, that a cause could produce an effect without being in exercise in doing so. Therefore, to ask for the cause of a cause being in exercise in producing an effect, is the same as to ask for the cause of the existence of any other truth, whose non-existence cannot be conceived of. But,

2. The will is a power of a living agent, which that agent is capable of exercising in different ways. It may therefore very properly be asked, what causes the act of the will to be thus, rather than otherwise; for that is the same as to ask what causes the living agent to exercise its power of will thus rather than otherwise? And when it is answered that a certain motive is the cause, no man would ask, what causes the act of the motive to be thus rather than otherwise, unless he supposed that the motive was a power of some living agent, which that agent is capable of exercising in different ways. And the same may be said of any cause in external nature.

Thus it appears, that upon the supposition that a cause does not cause its own act, it by no means follows "that there can be no cause whatever."—We close these remarks by saying, that Tappan's "consequences of Edwards' system," which are contained in the second part of his book, have for the most part been brought forward again and again, and that some of them were anticipated by Edwards, and were proved by him to be of no account whatever. J. L. K.



ART. XII.—*Two Sabbaths on the Continent.*

[We solicit most serious attention to the following statements just received from a friend on whose accuracy and faithfulness most perfect confidence may be placed. Similar pictures have often been presented to the eye of Scotsmen; but the detail cannot too frequently be pressed on the conscience and the heart. The sanctity of God's day, and the purity of Sabbath observance, constitutes the great palladium of religion in a land; and we cannot be too zealous in their defence.—EDITOR OF THE EDINBURGH CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR.]

We doubt not but the generality of the readers of the *Christian Instructor* are aware that, although the manner in which the Sabbath day is observed and respected in Scotland is not what could be wished, yet, when we look to Continental nations, we find that there matters are even in a worse condition. We doubt, however, if many of them are aware of the awful extent to which Sabbath desecration is sometimes carried on the Continent, and even with the sanction or aid of the government. In order to convey some idea of the scenes which at times take place, we shall give a short account of the proceedings which we ourselves witnessed on two several Sabbaths. The first is the 29th July, 1838, at Paris. This was the three fête days which occur annually in July in commemoration of the Revolution in 1830. We had been a few days in Paris, and as we had often heard of the loose manner in which the Sabbath is kept, we were curious to observe how far report had spoken the truth.

On rising in the morning, our ears were saluted by the noise of vehicles passing to and fro. We next distinguished the cry of the old-clothesman and of the fruit-vender; and on looking out, we found the streets filled with people going about their usual employment. After an early breakfast, we sallied out to make our observations. The shops we found nearly all open, and quite busy; the wrights we found repairing fronts of shops, &c.; and the masons tearing down old houses. In the Palais Royal, that world's epitome, the waiters were standing at the doors of the various Cafés dressed in their blue jackets and white aprons, with a napkin under their arms, and chatting to each other, or perusing the morning journal, awaiting the arrival of guests, as the principal business of the day was scarcely commenced. Besides the Cafés, there were open the shops of jewellers, tailors, haberdashers, &c. &c., all seemingly quite unconscious that such a day as the Sabbath had ever been instituted. A little later in the day, crowds of visitants may be found in the Louvre, the Bibliotheque du Roi, the Conservateur des Arts et Metiers, and all other public exhibitions, the most of which are here shown gratis, and are open for public inspection on Sabbath, as a matter of course.

About mid-day, or towards two, P. M., the shops begin to shut, all except those which sell eatables, and the inmates set out for a walk. A certain number, we have no doubt, attend public worship, but the great bulk of the population are bent on amusement. To-day they are gathering along the quays of the Seine, to witness the sham fights on the river, which are supplied by government for the amusement of the people on such occasions. The people were collected on each side of the river, between the Pont des Arts and the Pont de la Concorde, to the number of at least 50,000; and the number might have been still greater, had not at the same time a similar scene been enacting by the troops in the Camp de Mars. Numbers, also, were engaged in visiting the travelling wonders which were collect-

ed in the Camps Elysées and Passage de Neuilly, in the shape of giants, wild animals, over-grown and under-grown men, fair girls, and black boys, Munich railways, shooting at stucco images with pop-guns, skittles, merry-go-rounds, and a thousand follies quite unnameable.

After dinner, towards dusk, we again resumed our observations, and began with the gardens of the Tuilleries.\* Here we found a splendid circular orchestra erected, and adorned with various-coloured lamps, hanging in festoons round the roof, and in flowers from the pillars or supports—the whole nicely painted and ornamented. In this erection was placed a band of musicians, who played to amuse the by-standers, who were very numerous, waiting for the King and Queen to appear on the balcony of the Palace, which they did shortly after, accompanied by various other members of the royal family. Turning again towards the river, we found parties engaged setting off balloons loaded with fire works, which were discharged when the balloons had attained a considerable height. In a short time, and as the shades of evening began to close, commenced the grand entertainment of the evening. The Pont de la Concorde was covered with fire works and painted scenes, so arranged as to represent the city of Pompeii. Behind it, and by the side of the Chamber of Deputies, was an immense scenic representation of Vesuvius, the eruption of which was intended to set fire to the city of the bridge. Before the eruption, an extraordinary discharge of rockets took place, which was kept up for nearly an hour without intermission, and they were fired off not one by one, but by the dozen at a time—serving to fill the whole atmosphere with smoke, and sparks, and bells of many colours. During all this time the cannons were firing from the Hotel des Invalides, the noise of which, added to the smoke and fire of the rockets, produced a most imposing effect, which one might have enjoyed amazingly, had it not been on the Sabbath. It was indeed very grand, when at last, amidst the roar of cannon and the sulphureous vapour of the fire works, Vesuvius itself blew up with tremendous violence. This was the signal for dispersing, and immediately the multitude turned to witness the illumination in the Camps Elysées and the Passage de Neuilly, which were decorated with lights hung in festoons from tree to tree, and with clusters of various-coloured lamps, from the garden of the Tuilleries to the Barrière de l'Etoile, a distance of nearly a mile. The travelling caravans, and all sorts of exhibitions, were now in full operation, and the concerts, theatres, and circuses making a complete harvest. Such is a short and imperfect account of what we witnessed in Paris on the Sabbath already mentioned. Heaven grant that we may long be spared from witnessing, in this country, such scenes on the day of God.

The other Sabbath of which I intend to give a short account, is the 6th October, 1839, at Leipsic, in Saxony, during the fair.

We arrived in Leipsic during the Michaelmas Fair, when every person was astir and busy, and felt very anxious to see what respect would be paid to the Sabbath by that immense concourse of people, gathered together from all corners of Europe, and even from Asia and America. Knowing, also, that Saxony was a Protestant coun-

\* The gardens of this Royal Palace of Paris are patent to the public.

try, we felt the more curious as to what would be the result. We naturally expected, that as Germany was the birth-place of protestantism, we should there find the respect paid to the Sabbath in its most perfect state: how miserably our expectations were disappointed, the sequel will show. The first object which attracted our attention in the morning, was a carrier's quarters, where they were busily employed packing and despatching their wagons, and that next door to a church, into which the people were gathering. Passing along the crowded streets, we found the shops all open, and seemingly busy; the workmen were employed at their usual daily labour; and the sledges and carts were passing to and fro, transporting the goods to their various destinations. Both sides of all the principal streets were lined with stalls and booths with merchandise, and all the squares and open spaces, both in and around the town, were occupied in a similar manner. Every one seemed bent on business, and no one seemed to take a single thought whether the day was Saturday or Sabbath. The streets were crowded with strange faces and stranger dresses: Jews and Russians, Greeks, Armenians, Turks, Persians, Americans, Italians, Frenchmen, and Englishmen, were all here co-mingled in one dense mass, seemingly combined to set at nought the day of the Lord. In one place might be heard the sound of music and dancing, in another the deep-toned voice of the organ leading the worshippers in the house of God, mingled with the hoop of the car driver, and the cry of the fruit-vender. Here and there might be seen a few solitary worshippers entering or emerging from the house of prayer, and mingling with them the burden-bearers, or the itinerant Tyrolese, selling gloves and shawls, or the Hungarian with his mouse-traps, or the Turk with his perfumes. The Sabbath bell had sounded, but few had responded to its call; immersed in the pursuit of this world's wealth, each one seemed engaged in paying those adorations to mammon which are due alone to the Lord of Hosts.

Turning homewards, we sought for quiet in our rooms, but even there it was not to be had; as in another apartment, from which we were separated only by a thin partition, the song and the dance were going on, and the jest and the laugh went round. By their noisy mirth, one could easily tell that they either did not believe, or had entirely forgotten, the denunciations with which the scriptures threaten the breakers of the Sabbath day. In the evening, the theatre and other places of amusement are all open and crowded—this being considered a day of recreation.

On ordinary occasions when there is no fair, the shops and places of business in Leipsic, are all shut on Sabbath; in fact, outwardly, that is, in the streets, there is as much an appearance of a Sabbath as we find in the streets of London—there not being a greater proportion of shops, or places of business open, than in the British Metropolis. The theatres, cafés, and dancing halls, however, are open every Sabbath, and are more crowded than on week days.

When we thus see how far man may sometimes go astray from the paths of righteousness, it ought to make us very careful lest we also should be found acting in a like manner. It should cause us, with one heart and one mind, to unite our utmost endeavours to keep pure and entire the day of the Lord. It should lead the advocates of the Voluntary principle to pause ere they give more vent to their

vituperations against *all legislation* on "things sacred." It should prompt the clergy and people of Scotland, of every grade and denomination to resist, before it be too late, those incipient evils with which Continental intercourse, railways, steamers, and public barges, threaten to overrun the land; and to lift a solemn protest against the attempt now making by too many, to number 'the Sabbaths' of Scotland among the 'things that have been.'\*

Leipsic, 30th Oct., 1839.

### ART. III.—*Church Psalmody.*

The following article is copied from *The United Secession Magazine*, for September, 1839. It is inserted in that work without note or comment; and may, therefore, be regarded as a fair indication of sentiment in that body, which appears to be diverging rapidly to the wildest kind of latitudinarianism.

It is certainly a striking fact in the history of the churches of the Secession, that while in the services of the sanctuary the whole of the sacred volume should be open as the legitimate source from whence to draw materials for *instruction* and *prayer*, the *praises* of the church should be confined exclusively to the language of *one book* of the sacred record, and that book belonging to a dispensation which has passed away;—that while the duty of a minister of the New Testament may be summarily stated to be "to preach Christ and him crucified," and while the name of Christ is "the Alpha and the Omega" of prayer; we should—in some of our churches at least—never on any occasion take the name of Jesus into our lips, in the exercise of praise, except in the indirect and shadowy language of Old Testament Scripture!

It would, perhaps, be difficult to furnish another proof equally illustrative of the power of prejudice and habit to familiarize and reconcile the mind to incongruity. What would be thought of an attempt again to introduce among us the Liturgy, and confine the language of prayer to any set forms of words, however numerous and appropriate these might be? Would it not be treated as an indication of insanity in any one who would propose it? But, at the same time, we do voluntarily confine our praise to the language of a comparatively small portion of Old Testament Scripture, and effectually shut our eyes to the perception of its inconsistency. We are but little surprised that the churches of the Establishment, with their friends of the Old Light body,—wedded as they are to long established customs, and deprecating with a like sincerity the slightest appearance of change in the *accidental forms*, as in the *essentials of religion*,—and with the Unitarians, from the peculiarity of their doctrines, should have voluntarily confined the language of their praises to Old Testament psalmody; but that the Secession, with the example of their brethren of the Relief, Independent, Baptist, and other churches before them, should have so unduly restricted the services of the sanctuary, is certainly matter of no small astonishment.

It would be too much to claim for ourselves in this matter an ad-

\* While we admit the truth and justice of the above remarks, and lament the evil complained of, we cannot but consider the writer has brought himself also under the charge of Sabbath profanation, from the unnecessarily curious method he has taken to obtain the above facts.—Y.

herence to the practice of the church in early times, and to assume that the Relief, Independent, and other churches, from their use of hymns, are chargeable with innovation. The very reverse of this is the case. Among others, we learn from the testimony of one who lived in an early age of the Christian church, that the converts to the faith were in use to meet together on the first day of the week, to sing hymns in honour of Christ, wherein he was worshipped as God.

It has been contended by some, that the Psalms were expressly written for the praises of the church; but this can never be a proof that they exclusively were to be so used. Every reason that can now be urged for the use of the "Psalms of David," will apply with nearly equal force to the "Song of Solomon," and other books of the sacred volume. And if, to give them a preference, it is said, that the language of the Psalms is better adapted for praise than other portions of the Bible, we might admit the fact, and would only be carrying the argument to its full extent in contending, that if these Psalms were thus exclusively chosen by the Old Testament church, as being most expressive of those feelings which should find utterance in praise, surely, on the same principle, the language most suitable for the New Testament church, is that which most fully and directly gives expression to the feelings of the devout New Testament worshipper.

It may not be in the knowledge of some of the readers of the *Secession Magazine*, that at one time the attention of our church was directed to the anomaly we have just stated; and with a view to obviate it, the venerable Ralph Erskine was solicited to direct his efforts to the preparation of a collection of hymns for the use of the church. But although he proceeded some length in the performance of his task, and has left us in his poetical works, a number of the spiritual songs, which were by him intended for the public worship of the sanctuary, the dissensions which unfortunately occurred among the Seceders, prevented these good intentions from being carried into execution. Now that the breach has been healed, how desirable is it that we should return with redoubled zeal, to these efforts for the edification of the church, which for a time our unhappy differences had suspended!

It will not be denied, that in not a few of the Psalms the reference is very obscure, so much so, that a considerable number of them in whole, and large portions of others, are rarely, if ever, used in worship,—our ministers being perfectly aware that no stretch of sanctified imagination could draw any distinct analogy whatever between the language of the Psalmist, and the circumstances in which the assembled worshippers are placed; and from the use of such Psalms we are of course excluded, so long as we would comply with the apostolic direction, to sing with the heart and with the understanding. Every devout and intelligent reader will be ready to sympathize with us, when we say that we have often been pained to witness on the part of injudicious preachers, a portion of the Psalms selected for worship, in which it was apparent that a great proportion of the congregation, from a misapprehension of the meaning of the language, were professing to engage, in praise, under the influence of feelings—suggested no doubt through this misconception of the reference of the Psalm—which, to say the least of it, were far from being acceptable or well pleasing in the sight of God.

If it were stated in answer to all this, that although there are portions of the psalms, which, for the reasons we have stated, are not so suitable for being used in worship, and are therefore rarely introduced; yet there are other portions, large and numerous, which are not only appropriate, but eminently fitted, as abounding in the true language of praise, for being the medium of expressing the best feelings of the church, in that exercise throughout all ages; we would at once admit the truth of this statement, and rejoice that it is so. Let it be borne in mind, that we would by no means advocate the entire discontinuance of the psalms in worship, far less speak lightly or disparagingly of any portion of them. The whole drift of what we have said, is to deprecate the *exclusive use* of this Book in the praises of the church; and while we freely admit the great excellence of not a few of the psalms, the result of the matter is clearly this, that exactly in proportion to their excellence and beauty, is the care with which they are impressed on the memory of the young persons belonging to our churches, and thus, long ere they have arrived at the age when they could intelligently use them as the exercise of praise, the frequency with which the language has passed through their minds, has made it so familiar, that eventually, it has almost ceased to excite any appropriate feelings, if indeed any distinct idea is attached to the language at all. So little are we impressed with that which long acquaintance has made familiar to us. Such is the practical influence of a *limited and unvaried psalmody*. We could with confidence appeal to the experience of every reader, whether it be not the case, that we can repeat those psalms with which we have been long familiar, without the presence of a single appropriate sentiment. How frequently do we feel ourselves going along correctly enough with the congregation in the language of praise, while our thoughts are astray on the mountains of vanity! This can scarcely be our experience, when we worship with our dissenting brethren of other denominations, who use a more extensive psalmody. Not being familiar with the language, we are necessitated either to abstain from the appearance of joining in this part of the worship, or do so with some degree of attention.

What has been said is probably sufficient to accomplish our object, which is merely to draw attention to the subject. It is of considerable importance; and we feel confident, that there is not wanting in the Secession, either the taste which is necessary to make a proper selection from the sacred poetry of which we are already possessed, or to furnish such additions as may be deemed requisite. We hope to see the subject taken up in an influential quarter, and entertain little doubt that if this were the case, the Secession will not be reluctant to adopt a measure, which may so easily be discerned to be an improvement. H.

GLASGOW, July, 1839.

#### ART. IV.—*Father Mathew.*

WE had almost resolved to say no more on the subject of this individual's movements, but we cannot resist copying the following. The Editor of this paper will not yield to any man in zeal for the defence and propagation of the great and holy cause of Temperance. He has, from the first, pleaded in public, this cause with earnest-

ness and no small success. He has been, (by the aid of God,) the humble instrument of putting down three distilleries by the mere exhibition of **THE TRUTH** in this holy cause. He also is firmly persuaded that a glorious Temperance reform is in sure and steady progress in Ireland, under the same means, and by similar-minded men, as those among ourselves. But, he must be allowed to say, that he has no faith in *Father Mathew's* movements. His advocates may yet live to see the issue of their superstition and humbug, and, he fears, a painful and distressing reaction from ignorance and fanaticism against the Temperance cause.\*

*From the Balt. Lit. and Relig. Mag.*

FATHER MATHEW's temperance operations in Ireland have made a great stir, both in the old and in the new world. And the faithful, in this country, are beginning to understand the operation, and act accordingly. We have seen through the affair from the beginning; and were sometimes amused and sometimes pained at the gullibility of the temperance operators in both hemispheres. There is a certain madness in all bigotry. The abolitionists† have been foolish enough to court the papists, for a long time past; and the teetotallers are now at it. They and all others who go shares with the whore of Babylon, will get for their share, contempt and shame. —By the best and most recent information, Father Mathew's accounts stand thus: three millions have taken the pledge; at a shilling each, for a medal, or button, that cost a penny a dozen; sixpence, for a certificate of membership; sixpence for a ribaud, as a badge; and a pledge of a penny a week, during life, for masses. Total, in our currency, for the three millions—\$1,500,000, cash in hand; and \$3,000,000 per annum, continually. *All this for the spread of popery. To which superadd the physical force created, by the organization of papism throughout Great Britain, under the name of temperance!!* In this country the charges are fifty cents, in hand on joining; and a cent a week afterwards. Certainly it is a good thing, for the deluded victims of priestcraft to *stay sober*; but whether it be good in Protestants to approve an outrage, at once so gross and so dangerous, is another question.

The following is still later from Ireland. We copy it from the *Achill Missionary Herald*, one of the ablest and best conducted religious papers of that land; whose editor and patrons are as warmly devoted friends of the Temperance cause as any other Christian.

#### FATHER MATHEW—VIOLATION OF THE PLEDGE.

The following extract from Father Mathew's last address to the people of Cork, is calculated to cast a damp upon the hopes of those who expected a *permanent* establishment of orderly habits of outward conduct, as the result of the medley of secular, and superstitious motives, upon which this advocate of temperance bases his appeals to the people.

“The numbers which have violated the pledge in this city almost incline me to think that they are obstinately bent on their own destruction. Cork is the only place where the pledge has been violated, and violated to such an extent, that, when in parts of Con-

\* Not very modest.

† Not intelligent abolitionists.—ED. RELIG. MON.

naught and Leinster, I have been actually ashamed to read the Cork papers, so many instances were recorded of people having been brought before the magistrates for the crime of drunkenness. Indeed, I cannot possibly conceive why the people of this city are so blind to their own interest."

And the following, from our excellent cotemporary, the "Dublin Warder," shows that Father Mathew does pursue that debasing and idolatrous practice of touching the maimed and crippled, as professing to have the power to perform miracles!

#### TEMPERANCE.

*Interesting Correspondence—the Rev. Mr. Sirr—Father Mathew.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STATESMAN.

17th September, 1840.

SIR—So high is the personal consideration I entertain for the Rev. T. Mathew, that I would not think of publishing the following correspondence, had not the mistake out of which it arose been very widely spread, and propagated through various provincial papers.

I would take this opportunity of adding, that the worship I have sworn to be idolatrous is *not the Catholic*, for that worship I myself render to the Most High.—I remain, sir, your obedient servant.

JOSEPH D. SIRR.

Kilcoleman Parsonage, Claremorris, 8th Sept.

REV. SIR—I have been just shown in a provincial paper the report of a speech said to have been made by you in Cork, wherein you are represented to have said that the pledge was taken in Claremorris, both by the parish priest and by the *Protestant Clergyman*. I entertain no doubt that if you did happen to refer to the Protestant Clergyman at all, it could not have been in a manner so contrary to fact. If any reference was made to me, I should be obliged by your having the goodness to inform me of the nature of the statement you really made.

While I entertain a very high respect for your benevolent character and patriotic exertions, and sincerely wish you God speed in repressing drunkenness, it would be impossible for me, with my principles, to sanction your mode of operation, especially at Claremorris. I could not renounce my liberty in Christ Jesus by bringing myself under the bondage of a voluntary vow—I could not sanction the superstitious veneration attached to your medals by the ignorant population of the country—I could not bend the knee to a fellow worm of the dust—I could not yield a momentary countenance to the delusion so widely spread of your reputed miraculous power, which, though verbally disowned, is yet upheld by your touching the ulcerated, crippled, &c.—nor could I, in especial, have appeared as your supporter or disciple at Claremorris, where your visit was avowedly solicited for the purpose, and rendered tributary to the enlargement of a chapel, in which a worship, I have sworn to be idolatrous, is wont to be offered. I do not say these things offensively, but in explanation—and have the honour to be, Rev. sir, your faithful servant, for Christ's sake.

JOSEPH D'ARCY SIRR,  
Rector of Kilcoleman.



Rev. Theobald Mathew.

REV. DEAR SIR—I deeply regret the mistake in the report of our Cork Temperance Meeting. I have not seen it. What I said was, that almost the whole population of Claremorris had taken the pledge, the parish priest and two other clergymen, his curates, being of the number. It pains me that you for a moment believe me capable of such an impudent falsehood.

I did not even hear of your being at Claremorris. The benefits resulting from the total abstinence pledge are so numerous, that the superstitions, &c., of which you complain appear as dust in the balance. If I could prevent them without impeding the glorious cause, they should not have been permitted; but both are so closely entwined that the tares cannot be pulled out, without plucking up the wheat also. The evil will correct itself, and the good, with the divine assistance, will remain and be permanent.

I do not consider the promise to abstain from intoxicating drinks a vow. I look upon it as a simple resolution to perform a moral act. The kneeling posture has been adopted to preserve order.

As you very unnecessarily alluded to your oath, that the Catholic worship is idolatrous, I beg leave to say that I would not on any account take such an oath.—I am, Rev. dear sir, yours sincerely,

THEOBALD MATHEW.

Cork, Sept. 12, 1840.

We now hope to be done with Father Mathew, until, at least, some new outbreaking take place.—*Protestant Vindicator*.

---

ART. V.—*Remarks on Genesis iv. 7; and on Micah vi. 8.*

THE Arminian, acting the part of a superficial observer, and taking the words in their ordinary acceptation, without any regard to the connexion, applies these passages at once to the general character and conduct of men; and, without hesitation, makes our good works the ground of our acceptance with God. But every person must know, that “doing well” is a relative phrase, and before the meaning of it can be understood, the person must know to what it relates. There may be doing well in the way of keeping a law which has never been broken; and there may be well doing in the way of making up a breach which has been made. But the thing is not the same in both cases. Before you can know what is meant by doing well, therefore, you must know to what class it belongs. A glance at the connexion of the passage under consideration, will be sufficient to satisfy every one in the present instance, to remove all difficulties, and to give the true meaning of the passage. What is recorded and treated of in the chapter? Is it not the offering of sacrifice: “And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering. But unto Cain, and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? And why is thy countenance fallen? If thou

doest well"—that is, evidently in the way of offering sacrifice, if thou bringest the sacrifice prescribed, if thou sacrificest in the manner required, wilt thou not be accepted? "And if thou doest not well"—that is, still in the way of coming unto God by sacrifice, if thou bring not the sacrifice required, or come with that sacrifice in an improper spirit, or after an improper manner—then sin, both in its guilt and in its punishment lieth at the door.

The same simple process will be equally useful in guarding against misinterpretation, and in leading to the true meaning of Micah vi. 8: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Not a few seem to imagine that the good referred to in the first part of the verse, which the Lord had showed, and doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God, mentioned in the last part of the verse, mean the same thing; and that both just mean good works on our part; and that our good works, of course, constitute our way of access to God—the ground of our acceptance before him. Now, this would not only be tautology, but what is far worse, it leads to a doctrine which is certainly contrary to the general tenor of Scripture. Whereas, if we attend to the connexion in which it occurs, we will be led to a more correct and orthodox view of the passage. In the commencement of the sixth verse, that all-important question is asked—"Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God?" By way of answer to the question, a variety of other questions are asked—"Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" Then, in the way of rejecting all these methods, I conceive it is said in the beginning of the 8th verse—"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good." Good, for what? Why, for coming before the Lord with. He hath showed thee, O man, what is good for this purpose. Why then all these questions about the way of coming before the Lord? Hath he not showed thee what is good? Of that good to which the Lord hath directed the attention of men, as that with which they are to come before him, none possessed of the scriptures need be ignorant. Is it not the sacrifice of Jesus Christ? Does not the whole Bible speak one language on this subject?

And then, after having come before the Lord in this way, and obtained pardon and acceptance—What next? Is it that you may live as you list, "turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness?" No, indeed. God forbid. What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

CRITICUS.

---

#### ART. VI.—*Thoughts on Occasional Hearing.* (No. III.)

Mr. Editor, I come now to consider those Scriptures relied upon by the Doctor to support his positions. I must not, however, pass over your remarks in the Sept. No. in silence. You say, I am "candid," "undisguised." Perhaps there is more meant here, than meets the

eye. I cannot believe that you regard candour as so rare a virtue among your correspondents that you deem it worthy of special notice, and hence I conclude you look upon me as standing in open hostility to the doctrine in question, and as having thrown down my glove demanding a contest: no such inference can be justly drawn from any thing I have advanced. A becoming diffidence and distrust of my own powers as well as the solemn nature of the subject, forbid such a course. I thought a few suggestions on the subject of occasional hearing not uncalled for. If my memory is not exceedingly treacherous, some things have been said in the Monitor, if not intended to wound, yet very far from being calculated to heal. Have not the motives of those who scruple, been impugned? Has it not been insinuated, if not openly declared, that those members of our communion who hesitate to admit the sinfulness of such hearing, can but lightly esteem Secession principles; and have not our church sessions been arraigned at the judgment bar for admitting such to communion and fellowship? It is certainly plain to every unbiassed understanding that if persons be admitted to membership, having doubts on this or any other point of doctrinal or practical religion, they are, nevertheless, entitled to confidence and respect: on this point I complain not. Withdraw your confidence, treat us, if you will, as proselytes of the gate, not a murmur shall escape my lips; but ask me not to make an avowal involving deeply the condemnation of creditable ministers of the gospel, on evidence other than the most cogent kind.

It is true, I have spoken freely of the arguments advanced, and why should I not? The ingenuous mind intuitively recoils from a cringing and servile manner; and ~~when~~ <sup>when</sup> ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> adopt it, let my tongue be sealed in everlasting silence. Well may we tremble at the word of Him who spake as never man spake; but the fear of man never has nor ever will cease to bring a snare. If there are in our society persons who are diseased, others who are whole ought to rejoice when they make their case known. That man is cruel to himself, and unjust to his physician, who conceals from him the worst symptoms of his complaint. If candour is ever out of place, it certainly must be in reference to something else than the concerns of our immortal souls.

You assert that the fancied speech which I put into the Doctor's mouth is sufficiently ridiculous, and are pleased to let him speak at least in part for himself, in what you esteem a much more appropriate manner. Had you drawn upon the discourse under review, it would have been much more to your purpose. What the author has said elsewhere, or what others may say now and again is, on this point, a matter with which I have no concern. If you affirm that I have done the Doctor injustice—that the speech which I put in his mouth discords with the tone and tenor of the sermon, I join issue with you, and the author himself shall be the witness, testifying not partially but wholly and fully for himself. Hear him: "Nor is occasional hearing the proper way of coming at the knowledge of the peculiar principles of a particular church." And again: "With respect to occasional hearers, they contribute no more to the true peace between opposite church communions than whisperers and tale-bearers do to the reconciliation of two persons at variance;" and yet again: "In order to this healing, churches and

their members must be brought under such deep concern to attain the true knowledge, and to walk in a steadfast adherence to it, as will cure them of the levity of occasional hearing." I leave the reader to pronounce the verdict with the single remark, that if any one can discover here a solicitude to obtain hearers from other communions, he must possess an intellectual acumen, to which I am a stranger.

Is it so that all who hear among the denominations referred to are chargeable with sin for such hearing? I have seen reasoning in the Monitor from which I would naturally draw such a conclusion, but was hardly prepared to hear its avowal from you. Must we not draw the conclusion from this, that they are not churches of Christ, that their ministers have no rightful authority to dispense gospel ordinances? Does the wretched idolater commit an act of moral turpitude when he forsakes the temple where his forefathers practised for countless ages the horrid orgies of heathenism, and goes up to the house of the living God? Does not this sweeping condemnation embrace the dead as well as the living, nor can the hearers of Luther himself plead innocence. Have we no evidence that ministers in evangelical churches around us are the real ambassadors of the Head of the church? What evidence do we ask except "regular ordination" and the fruits of the Spirit? "By their fruits shall ye know them." Errors they have, but will any one affirm that as officers they are destitute of these qualifications? This you seem to be disposed to do when you suggest that no one can be commissioned to preach error. A commission has respect to two things, a work to be performed, and a person authorized to perform it. Ministers are commissioned, to do what? Why, to preach the gospel. Their instructions are the words of truth, and these instructions they are bound to obey and follow; but it is not every departure from them that vacates their commission, else we would not have a shepherd on earth to feed us with the bread of life.

I feel no desire to restrain others, but for myself I can only say; that while my views of duty remain what they now are, earth has not that to bestow which would induce me to make such a declaration. If the avowal of such sentiments subjects me to the imputation of entertaining a high respect and veneration for ministers in other communions, I *plead guilty*. I trust my record is on high, that I bear them on my heart, and hope I do most sincerely pray the Lord of the harvest to send abundance, even of such labourers into his vineyard, and prosper his work in their hands until the desert blooms like the rose, and the song of joy, and melody bursts upon every hamlet on our globe. If such views and exercises be at variance with secession principles, I own I have something to unlearn.

I know not what purpose can be accomplished in this controversy by referring to the old prophet of Bethel. The man of God suffered for disobeying a direct and plain command of God. You are logician enough to know that reasoning *a priori*, a taking for granted the thing to be proved, is an unsound mode of reasoning, or rather is no reasoning at all. The question is, What is the command, and not, Should the command be obeyed? Besides, have we any reason to suppose that this prophet was really a teacher sent from God? I think not. Dr. Scott observes, that "perhaps he had been taught in the schools of the prophets." It is evident, however, that he was

an ungodly man; and until we can show that the ministers spoken of are liars, base deceivers it is a perfect nullity to reason from this case to them.

I cannot regard your observations in reference to the concern which we ought to feel for the favourable opinion of others as either judicious or just. A deep concern in this respect is what those *will* feel who are well grounded in the truth. How can we expect to do good unless we recommend ourselves, our principles and our practice to those around us? We must indeed obey God rather than man; but what says the scriptures? We are commanded so to let our light shine, that others seeing our good works may glorify our Father who is in heaven. We are cautioned not to suffer our good to be evil spoken of. What has this to do, you ask, with allegiance to Zion's King? It is one evidence at least of fealty and obedience.

I shall now briefly notice a few texts of scripture—and first, Prov., xix. 27, on which the author founds his discourse: "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." Who is here the speaker, and who is spoken to? Christ, the personal wisdom, is here addressing an adopted child in the endearing language of a parent, and warning him not to wait on, or countenance such teachers as he has not commissioned to give instruction. Is it any thing short of blasphemy to assert that the Head of the church commissions ambassadors to proclaim peace and pardon, whose characteristic conduct is, that they give instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge? These words clearly teach us that there are two agencies at work, one authorized by the King in Zion, whose feet are beautiful on the mountains and who bring glad tidings; the other full of all deceivableness, doing the will of the prince of darkness, and leading the blind captive at his will. To one or the other of these agencies every son and daughter of Adam must belong, and of course every teacher must be a teacher of righteousness, or he must give instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge. Now will any one affirm that ministers of the gospel in all other denominations in our land are engaged in doing the works of darkness? On the contrary, have not they, or some of them, the authority and approval of Heaven? That such is the fact is as evident as the truth of the divine record itself. What is here said to one son is said to all, and if it be sinful for one child to wait upon the preaching of one who causeth to err from the words of knowledge, it must be so for another. Is it possible that from this text we can legitimately draw the conclusion that it is an act of moral rectitude for one child to attend on the word preached by one who has been sent, while it is an act of moral turpitude in another child to wait upon the same? Yet how can we avoid drawing this conclusion from the views maintained in the sermon? It is freely conceded, that if ministers in other communions have no message from Heaven to deliver, people ought not to hear; and when this point is rendered even questionable this scripture comes in fully to sustain the opinions intended to be supported by it, but until this is done it seems to me that its bearing in that direction is even more than doubtful.

But we are enjoined to *mark such as cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, and avoid*

*them*, Rom. xvi. 17. There is perhaps no complaint more frequently, or more justly made by preachers and commentators, indeed by all, than the little regard paid in explaining scripture to its clear plain import as manifested by its general bearing. How often do we find not only propositions separated from such as stand immediately connected with them, and on which they depend for their true meaning; and these propositions are divided and sub-divided, and made to speak any language which the author pleases! While all join in censuring such a practice as tending directly to the subversion of truth, I fear, few of us are clear of it. Is the Doctor not verily guilty here? Why did he not assign the reason why we should do as the apostle directs? Why did he not give the characteristics of such as we are called upon to *mark* and *avoid*? He is the more inexcusable for this, inasmuch as the sacred writer has given the reason in *immediate* connexion with the duty enjoined; *for* says he, "*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.*" We are here called upon to *mark* and *avoid* certain persons in the church, such as cause divisions and offences. Why so? Because such serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies. Now it is clear, that if we assert that men who cause divisions do not, nevertheless, serve their own bellies, but the Lord Jesus Christ, we put ourselves in direct opposition to infallible truth. We ought to be exceedingly careful who we *mark* and who we *avoid*. If we thus brand and discountenance those who are building up Christ's cause here on earth, who are counting all things but dung and dross, that they may obtain the pearl of great price, who count not their lives dear that they may obtain an imperishable crown. If we do so what must we expect? "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Again, we are referred to 2 Thes. iii. 6—14. The remarks made above may well be applied here. Who are we to note and keep no company with? We are not left in the dark as to that matter. "*For we hear that there are some who walk among you disorderly, working not at all, who are busy-bodies.*" What is meant by "*walking disorderly*" in the 6th verse is here explained, and to give it any other meaning is doing violence.

I might notice other texts, but as the author appears to rest the argument principally on those cited above, it is not deemed necessary.

If any private member amongst us were to charge a minister of the gospel of respectable standing, in a neighbouring evangelical denomination with being a busy-body, as walking disorderly, and serving not the Lord Jesus Christ, but his own belly, would not all regard him as worthy of censure for such slanderous conduct? How such conduct can be looked upon as so odious in detail, while it is deemed meritorious to deal in it by wholesale, is not readily perceived. I shall however, for the present, close the subject by a solemn caution: "Touch not mine Anointed, and do my prophets no harm." He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me

PILGRIM.

ART. VIII.—*Reply to Pilgrim.*

WE can assure our valued friend "Pilgrim" that there was nothing more in our commendation of his openness and candour than "meets the eye." Truth, and not victory, is our aim, and we believe it to be his. Some things have appeared which Pilgrim regards as "very far from being calculated to heal;" but not from the editor, and they were arrested as soon as it could consistently be done.

The remark of Dr. Anderson—"with respect to occasional hearers, they contribute no more to the true peace between opposite church communions than whisperers and tale-bearers do to the reconciliation of two persons at variance,"—strikes us in a totally different light from what it has appeared to Pilgrim. It is in our opinion an evidence of the penetration of that truly great man. And as this sermon of Dr. Anderson has been so frequently referred to, we shall insert from it a few notes. It may prove useful to some who have never seen it. For profound theological knowledge, deep insight into human nature, and fervent piety, we have not read its equal on the subject of which it treats. In the same paragraph from which Pilgrim quotes we have the following words:

"When the healing Spirit is poured from on high, *each church member* will be saying, 'here are two opposite doctrines; they cannot both be of God; for there is no inconsistency in him. I now see it to be a matter of infinite importance for me to have a certain knowledge of the truth which is of God. Nor will I rest till through the Lord's blessing on the use of the means, namely, searching the Scriptures, communication with fellow church members, meditation, and ardent prayer for the illumination of the Spirit, I attain a solid knowledge and full satisfaction as to this matter. And when I have thus bought the truth, that is, when the Lord has freely given me the understanding of it, I will make a consistent adherence to it in profession and practice, the study and the business of my life.'"

If it be the duty of "*each church member*" to follow the rule here laid down, then it is his duty to attend a sound ministry. And these words imply as direct an invitation to "hearers from other communions as could well consist with that modesty which distinguished the Doctor's *remarkable* character."

Pilgrim's argument drawn from the idolater turning from "the horrid orgies of heathenism," reminds us of Hosea vii. 16: "They return, but not to the Most High." But what says the Spirit of God? Jer. iv. 1: "If thou wilt return, O Israel, saith the Lord, RETURN UNTO ME." It is the duty of the heathen to abandon their

"What is aimed at in this discourse is, to strike at a principal root of the numerous *divisions* now in the visible church. It teaches that we ought not to be in a *state of separation* from any church-communion, but upon such grounds as are scriptural; and upon such considerations, as involving the declarative glory of God, are of inconceivable and infinite importance. Were this doctrine embraced, there would be no separate church-communions upon trivial pretences, or for the sake of religious tenets or usages in the worship of God which have no foundation in his word; no separate church-communions on account of local customs, uncertain opinions, or uninstituted ceremonies; no separate church-communions founded on the narrow and interested views of a faction."—*Preface.*

"horrid orgies" and return to the Lord, and follow him FULLY, as did Caleb and Joshua at the first hearing of the gospel. Corrupted Christianity, at least as it is corrupted by many ecclesiastical bodies whom we regard as neglecting or opposing certain revealed truths, is indeed less odious than Paganism. So is tale-bearing less odious than perjury; and envy than murder; but tale-bearing and envy are nothing less than moral stench in Jehovah's nostrils. We hold it as an impregnable maxim, that God requires us to learn, believe, and maintain all his revealed truth as fast as it can be attained by a diligent and prayerful use of all the means of his appointment. If, then, we have discovered any revealed truth, which is denied and steadfastly resisted by other denominations, we must set up and maintain a separate communion, where we can bear a faithful testimony to such truth—and thus maintain that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free; for he has delivered us from the doctrines and commandments of men. Our course must be onward, in knowledge, fidelity to God, and holiness of life, even though our mother's children should be angry with us, and our enemies be they of our own household. We have never yet met with an argument for occasional hearing in other bodies, from whom we have separated, which might not be legitimately and fairly construed into an apology for sin. We suppose this will sound harsh to the ears of many, but we cannot help it; right or wrong we speak the truth as we have learned it, and dare not do otherwise.

Nor does this view of truth lead to the conclusion that "every departure," from truth vacates a minister's commission: neither will many departures produce this effect. We speak of errors publicly avowed and obstinately maintained as the profession of those public bodies from whom we are in a state of secession. Besides we have shown in a former number that a minister's commission to preach and our obligation to hear are not correlative.

Nor does the view we take hinder our prayers or charity or any other work of Christian benevolence towards those from whom we differ. It only restores these duties to their legitimate place and gives a right direction to the energies of the Christian church.\*

\* Let none from hence conclude that the ministers and people belonging to the Associate Presbytery, judge that the administrations of those that are not of their communion, are invalid. The validity of ordinances is derived from their agreeableness to the word. The Lord will never bless any error or corruption in his church to promote her edification; but where there are many things wrong in churches the Lord has his servants and people, as was the case in the seven churches of Asia: These evils being reproved by the Lord, shows that the Lord is a strict observer of the state of matters in every church. After the reproofs and warnings given to the churches of Thyatira and Pergamos, if they did not reform, it was doubtless the duty of the people of the Lord, desirous to cleave to the Lord's cause, to separate from their communion. The Apostle, in like manner, reproves the corruptions and laxness that had tarnished the glory of the Corinthian church; but still he supposes persons may build on the *foundation, wood, hay and stubble*, and may be at great pains and expense to promote this building with *wood, hay and stubble*; for which they shall suffer the loss of their pains in so doing: "but he himself will be saved, yet so as by fire." 1 Cor. iii. 12—16. It is a gross aspersion cast on us, that we think none will get to heaven but ourselves. Whoever will get to heaven, it will be by Jesus Christ alone. Some say that the various religious professions are like the different ways to a city; but the fact is, that the way to heaven is one, and the Lord's people among the different denominations all travel one way, have one guide, and have communion with Christ only in the way of his truths. It would be blasphemy to suppose the Lord would bless any thing contrary to his blessed word, as a mean of edification to his church. But how far the Lord may bless the truths of



In regard to the favourable opinion of others, if we are anxious to secure it we shall certainly lose it; and if our religious course be influenced by any such considerations, if we are indeed the Lord's people, he will humble us. The only lawful anxiety on this point should be to show men that we know the truth, believe it, practise it, and prize it more than the gold of Ophir; yea, more than natural life itself. If this will not overcome the natural enmity of the human heart to truth, no other means within our power can do it. If this will not overcome envy, prejudice, selfishness, party spirit, malice and revenge, it will at least baffle them, and cause them to recoil upon the heads of their guilty authors.

P's exposition of Prov. xix. 27, reminds us of the exploded Hopkinsian tenet that every volition of the soul is either absolutely holy, or absolutely sinful. His two *agencies* must be, the one class absolutely infallible, so that we must not question our obligation to hear them; the other absolutely messengers of Satan, so that we must shun them as we would the prince of darkness himself. This argument is also a contradiction of a preceding one, that "not every departure" from truth vacates a minister's commission, or it is not at all to his purpose. It also nullifies the apostolic injunction, to "withdraw from every BROTHER that walketh disorderly." Truth lies mingled with more or less error in the mind of every man. And error is not the less dangerous when emanating from the mind of a man who has received an outward commission, either by the laying on of the hand of a diocesan or of a presbytery, than if proceeding from any other person, but the more so. And as to the commission of Zion's king, or a call of the Spirit to the work of the ministry, we know nothing respecting it, farther than they speak the mind of the Spirit expressed in the scripture, and are led by the Spirit in the general deportment of their lives. Again: P's exposition of this text runs counter to all the commentators to which we have access at present.

"The wholesome words of our Lord Jesus are the means of a spiritual, experimental and fiducial knowledge of Christ, which is preferable to all other knowledge, and even to every thing in the world; and therefore care should be taken, and every thing avoided that TENDS to cause to err from these words and doctrines which convey, promote and improve this knowledge."—*Gill*.

"In order to profit by good instructions, no longer regard such as are of a contrary nature and tendency.' As numbers 'turn away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables;' so they that would *hearken* to the truth must turn away their ears from lies, *especially such as are most plausible and agreeable, and set off with the greatest show of art, genius, eloquence and learning*. 'Take heed *what* ye hear;' and 'Take heed *how* ye hear.'"—*Scott*.

"This is a good caution to those who have had a good education, to take heed of *hearkening* to those who, under pretence of instructing them, draw them off from those good principles under the influence of which they were trained up."—*Henry*.

his own word, or the ordinances of his appointment, though dispensed with many corruptions, would be presumption in any to determine. Eminent lights have appeared and shone forth among Independents and Episcopalians, but yet their defences of gospel truths, and their distinguished piety, do not make these different forms of religion any more agreeable to the word, but only show that *we know in part, and prophesy in part*; and that we ought to call no man master, nor follow any man, however learned or pious, farther than he follows Christ.—*Dr. Anderson*.

Again: P. changes the terms of the text, which is not only an unfair, but exceedingly dangerous method of reasoning about divine truth. The language of the text is, "Cease to hear the *instruction*;" but, says P., "Christ is here warning us not to wait on such as he has not *commissioned*." Not a word in the text of commission; and yet by the substitution of this word, P. rears his fallacious superstructure.

His exposition of Rom. xvi. 17, is not less unhappy. The text which he quotes in connexion, and for the omission of which he blames Doctor A., only gives additional force to his construction. Both texts, taken in connexion, clearly teach the following doctrines, 1st. That the church has already learned a certain definite system of doctrines.\* 2dly. That public teachers exist in the church who teach another system, or parts of another, and thus deceive the hearts of the simple. 3dly. That these false teachers are the guilty authors of divisions and offences. 4thly. That they are bad men, though more plausible, and, therefore, more popular with the generality of people than good men. 5thly. That the church should mark them by an exposure and judicious condemnation of their errors. 6thly. That Christian people must *avoid* them, not go to hear them. If it is contended that these false teachers were not in the church, we reply, then the apostle's injunction had not been needed. For these primitive Christians could not think of going back to their Pagan teachers; besides, it is not those that are without, but those that are within who cause these divisions and offences.

In reference to 2 Thess. iii. 6—14, we observe simply, that teaching error in the name of God is a very high immorality; and the

\* It may be asked, "for what purpose does the communion of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania exist in this country, and what are their distinguishing principles?" We answer, that it exists for the purpose of holding a public and judicial testimony for the doctrine and order of the church of Christ: In which they testify and declare from the word of God, such articles as follow—That the covenant of works was made with Adam as the representative of all his posterity descending from him by ordinary generation—That man is now in a fallen and ruined state, and cannot help himself by his doing or suffering therefrom—That the Lord Jesus Christ, as the surety of the elect, has, by his obedience to the law as a covenant, and satisfaction to the justice of God, purchased eternal redemption for all his people, and they only;—as election, redemption, and his intercession, are of equal extent—That the gospel strictly taken, only contains precious promises, and all precepts and threatenings belong to the law. That there is a free and unconditional grant or offer of Christ made in the word to all sinners of mankind, wherever the gospel comes, without any regard to previous qualifications—That the surety righteousness of Christ is the true and proper condition of the covenant of grace, and not faith, repentance or sincerity—That saving faith is a persuasion wrought in the heart of a poor sinner by the Holy Spirit, and grounded on the gospel grant alone of Christ being indeed a Saviour, a Prophet, Priest and King, to him in particular—That love to God, a principle of gratitude for redemption through Christ, and a regard to the glory of God, are the motives of obedience in the hearts of true believers, and not the hopes of heaven and the fears of hell—That the Lord will never leave nor forsake his saints, so that they shall totally or finally fall away from a state of grace—That all saints are imperfect in the present state—That the punishment of the wicked will be for ever and ever—That a Confession of Faith is necessary for the well-being of the church, and every article of it should be a term of communion—That public covenanting, or the public avowal of the truths and ways of God with the solemnity of an oath, is both warranted by the word, in New Testament times, and seasonable at this time—That the Psalms of David are proper to be sung in worshipping assemblies, and in families, and not psalms or songs of human devising—That Presbyterial church government is the only form of government of divine institution—That the whole church ought to have (what the nature of Presbyterial government requires) the same terms of church communion in all its particular congregations—That the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's

14th verse speaks of obedience to the word. "If any man obey not our word." It is presumed P. will not undertake to restrict this passage to a part of the apostle's word. It must be extended to the 6th as well as to the 11th verse.

Finally, we are surprised at P's. concluding paragraph. The term busy-body is nowhere applied by Dr. A. to the ministers of the gospel of any denomination, unless by a far-fetched and disingenuous inference, founded on the supposition that they as well as their people indulge in the prohibited practice of indiscriminate hearing. If they do attend on the ministry of those concerning whom they have solemnly declared to the world they could not have fellowship, on account of their errors, it appears to us the application of the term busy-body to them is not altogether unsuitable.

Thus I have endeavoured to answer P's. objections, whether satisfactorily to him or others is not for me to judge. But the least return I can make to that Saviour who has redeemed me from all evil is to leave a faithful testimony to his precious truth with such ability as he has given. It brings no joy to me to be dabbling in controverted points of religion, much less when that controversy is carried on with patrons and friends, and brethren in the same ecclesiastical body. "I never like myself worse, than when found with a visor of disputing in controversies. The complexion of my soul is much more pleasant unto me in the waters of Shiloah. Small pleasure in those walks which are attended with dangerous precipices and unpleasing difficulties on every side. No quiet, nor peace in these things and ways, but continual brawls and dissensions. The strongest *bonds* of nearest *relations* are too commonly broken by them. Were it not for that precept, Jude 3, and the like, of contending earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints, with the sounding of my bowels for the loss of poor seduced souls, I would willingly engage myself into an unchangeable resolution to fly all wordy battles and *paper* combats, for the residue of my few and evil days."—DR. OWEN.

---

ART. IX.—*An Address delivered to the Rev. Joseph T. Cooper, at his Ordination to the Office of the holy Ministry, and Installation to the pastoral Inspection of the Second Associate Presbyterian Congregation of Philadelphia. September 25, 1839.\**

DEAR BROTHER,—When Paul left Timothy at Ephesus he gave him a charge that he should not "give heed to fables," the tendency of which would be to "minister questions," and lead to "vain jangling;" things opposite to the design of the Gospel, whose end "is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of

Supper ought to be both alike publicly administered and accompanied with the preaching of the word—That the revolutions which take place in the kingdoms of this world, or church members living under different civil governments, do not affect the unity of the church of Christ, and therefore there is no such thing as foreign jurisdiction in the church of Christ, of whom he says, "my dove, my undefiled, is but one"—That it is a dangerous principle to give up with those truths which are disputed among men esteemed pious and learned, and that an appearance of saintship alone, without a sound profession of the faith, and a gospel conversation, is all that is necessary for church-communion.

\* In the midst of a dearth of original matter, we have drawn from one of our old manuscripts, for the want of something better.

faith unfeigned." Timothy had, by apostolic authority, been set apart to a service in the church of such magnitude and difficulty that nothing less than "faith and a good conscience" could sustain him in his arduous work, or furnish a well grounded hope of success. Accordingly, the apostle gives him a great variety of directions respecting his manner of life—his public ministrations—the difficulties he must expect to encounter—and the encouragement which he might reasonably expect in the faithful discharge of the work connected with his high and responsible office.

You, in like manner, have now been set apart to the service of the church, by "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," in conformity with apostolic example, and according to the command of Zion's King. You have enrolled your name among a "great cloud of witnesses" for the despised truths of Jesus Christ—you have vowed in Jehovah's great name, and in the face of his church, that you will "come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Therefore, you cannot lawfully desert this most honourable post of danger which you have voluntarily assumed. You are a self-devoted man. Your labours, henceforth, must be in the house of God. Your personal interests are in a great measure identified with the interests of Zion. In her afflictions must be your grief; in her joy your triumph.

Whatever view we take of the new relation you now sustain, whether it be regarded as to its bearing on your own peace of mind and comfort in this life—on your prospects for the future and unseen world—on the outward peace and prosperity of this congregation—or their spiritual growth and eternal destiny, it imparts to the enlightened mind the deepest emotions of fear and hope. *Fear*, lest the arch enemy of God and man should, through subtlety, obtain admission into this sacred enclosure, as into Eden of old, mar your peace and paralyze your efforts. *Hope*, that the King of Zion will cover your head in the day of battle, teach your hands to war, your fingers to fight, bruise Satan under your feet, and give you souls for the reward of your arduous service.

That our fears may be disappointed, and our hopes realized, we have no other directions to give than those which the apostle gave to Timothy, which you have known from your youth. They are too numerous to be embodied in this brief address. But take them with you into your closet; let them occupy the most prominent shelf in your study; carry them with you in all your intercourse with your people; let them be your constant companion in your public ministrations; and remember that the design of these lessons of heavenly wisdom is to qualify you for feeding "the church of God which he purchased with his own blood." Consequently, your life, your doctrine, your prayers, your labours and trials, your joys and sufferings, must all be brought into subserviency to "this one grand design. Therefore, as the mouth of this Presbytery, I CHARGE you in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ,—

*Let the manner of your life be such as shall tend to impart spiritual nourishment to the church.*

Shake off indolence. The slothful man accomplishes nothing. He is a pest to the community at large, much more to the church of God. "I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; and, lo, it was all grown over with

thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down. Then I saw and considered it well. I looked upon it and received instruction." Such is the brevity of human life that but little can be accomplished even by the hand of the diligent. Leave indolence then to the voluptuary whose God is his belly; but thou, O man of God, "be vigilant."

"Be sober, given to hospitality, not to wine." This sobriety should extend to your apparel, your table, and your household equipage. The manner of living, the pastimes, social amusements, and entertainments of this luxurious and dissolute age, are, with few exceptions, unfriendly to holiness. Neither flatter nor traduce, neither court nor despise the rich, the gay and the fashionable. Never choose them for companions, and avoid, as much as possible, their society and manners. A desire after their dainties is altogether unpardonable in him who professes to be a living example of that self-denial which has ever been the peculiar characteristic of holy men. The indulgence of such a desire would inevitably bring upon you the contempt of those whom it might be supposed to please. For while they contend stoutly for the innocence of their mode of living, they have discernment and conscience sufficient to condemn it in a professed servant of Christ. It would also operate injuriously upon another, more numerous, and, therefore, more important class; and should it not lead, as it frequently does, to incurable vices, it will be attended with expenses which must necessarily make a man greedy of filthy lucre, and lead him not to feed, but to *feed upon* the flock of God, purchased with his blood.

"Be no striker." You may expect opposition and reproach, not only from the world, but from brethren. "Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." The design of such men is the promotion of their own worldly interests. They labour not to draw disciples to Christ; not to induce men to take the living God for their portion, but to draw men into their own net. They never rise above the grovelling views of the sectarian, and their sect is confined within the narrow precincts of their own domicil, or, at most, their own congregation. Their adherence to principles is according to their prospect of successful proselytism to a party. Such men must be resisted and their hypocrisy exposed by a steadfast application of discipline; which will exasperate and lead them to deeds of revenge. And no duty will be found more difficult than the suppression of the angry passions in such circumstances; but the sacrifice must be made: "be thou no striker."

*Let your doctrine be such, and such only, as leads directly to a knowledge of Christ crucified, as the only refuge for guilty men.*

For the accomplishment of this purpose your ministry must embrace the whole system of revealed truth. All scripture being given by the inspiration of God, must be regarded as one entire, perfect, harmonious system; additions, or omissions are alike injurious, and must necessarily mar its symmetry and darken our view of Christ, the one only and perfect oblation for sin. Not that any mere man can be supposed to know all that is contained in the inspired volume; not that any created intellect is able fully to penetrate the height, the depth, the length and the breadth of these divine mysteries;

for in this land of shadows, we know only in part, we prophesy only in part. But the spirit of this rule requires you to make known all that you have learned; all that you may hereafter learn by unwearied study, accompanied with fervent prayer to the Father of lights for perfect knowledge: so that you may close your ministry among this people, or wherever God in his providence may call you to labour, in the full assurance that your departure from the field of conflict shall be to the possession of a crown of glory. Hear the language of the great apostle to the Gentiles on taking a final leave of the weeping elders of Ephesus, and let it animate your spirit to faithfulness—"And now behold, I know that you all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore, I take you to record this day that I am free from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you **ALL THE COUNSEL OF GOD.**"\*

Steadfast resistance of the first encroachments of error will be found necessary to faithfulness. The citadel must be defended at the very point where the attack is made. Hence, much of your labour must, in the nature of things, partake of a controversial character, unless the world and the church should suddenly change the positions which they have hitherto respectively occupied from the beginning. To contend for truth, for the truth's sake, is godlike; to love controversy for its own sake is diabolical. The enemies of religious controversy are generally blind guides, or at best weak Christians. In discharging this part of your duty too much vigilance cannot be exercised, by painful, unwearied research into the inexhaustible store-house of gospel mysteries, that your mind may be richly garnished with their heavenly furniture, and deeply imbued with their spirit. Were there no danger of remissness on this point, we should not hear the Spirit of God commanding us to "Buy the truth and sell it not;" nor the apostolic declaration—"I am set for the **DEFENCE** of the gospel;" nor the injunction of Jude, "**EARNESTLY CONTEND** for the faith once delivered to the saints;" nor a multitude of other similar scriptures which I need not recall to your mind.

\* The following forcible testimony of Dr. Chalmers on this subject will be read with satisfaction. It is extracted from one of his Discourses on the Christian Revelation.

"And here I cannot but remark, how much effect and simplicity go together in the annals of Moravianism. The men of this truly interesting denomination address themselves exclusively to that principle of our nature on which the proper influence of Christianity turns; or, in other words, they take up the subject of the Gospel message—that message devised by Him who knew what was in man, and who, therefore, knew how to make the right and the suitable application to man. They urge the plain word of the testimony, and they pray for a blessing from on high; and that thick, impalpable veil, by which the god of this world blinds the hearts of men who believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should enter into them—that veil which no power of philosophy can draw aside, gives way to the demonstration of the Spirit; and thus it is, that a clear perception of scriptural truth, and all the freshness and permanency of its moral influence, are to be met with among men who have just emerged from the rudest and grossest barbarity. Oh! when one looks at the number and greatness of their achievements—when he thinks of the change they have made on materials so coarse and so unpromising—when he eyes the villages they have formed—and, around the whole of that engaging perspective by which they have obsequered and relieved the grim solitude of the desert, he witnesses the love, and listens to the piety of reclaimed savages,—Who would not long to be in possession of the charm by which they have wrought this wondrous transformation?—who would not willingly exchange for it all the parade of human eloquence, and all the confidence of human argument?"

Study great plainness of speech. For this purpose give attendance to reading the scriptures. The very words of scripture are more significant, the style richer, and far more eloquent, than any other that can be found. On this point the danger of erring is less now than it was in some former periods of the world. It is not now customary, as formerly, to sprinkle sermons with a quantum of Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew words and phrases addressed to a rude, untutored audience, merely to display the preacher's superior knowledge. Yet there may be danger of substituting the style of the bar, and senate chamber for that of the pulpit. Therefore we would say, if you wish discretion to guide your intercourse with men, if you wish to become a wise man, let the Proverbs of Solomon be your text book. If you desire to melt the obdurate hearts of sinners, make them familiar with our Lord's discourses, in connexion with his unparalleled sufferings. Do you wish to increase the doctrinal knowledge of your people, you have the epistles; to warm their affections, you have "the Song of Songs, which is Solomon's;" to rouse their devotion, take the Psalms. Do you wish to present them with living, standing examples of Christian character, you have the biography of the saints, especially of our blessed Lord. Do you wish to please men with figures of rhetoric, read the prophets. Do you desire to rouse them to action by the power of eloquence, let Paul be your model. In a word, never lose sight for a single moment of the grand design of a gospel ministry, namely, the salvation of the church,—“It has pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe,”—then you cannot fail to speak a language which your hearers will both understand and feel.

*Let your mind be braced with indomitable resolution against all opposing obstacles.* Difficulties must be met and vanquished. It would contradict both scripture and history to suppose they can be avoided. No degree of learning, or holiness, or faithfulness, or prudence, can purchase exemption. Indeed, the greater the measure of a minister's gifts and graces, the greater his faithfulness, the greater will be his conflict with opposing elements. The prescribed limits of address, on an occasion like the present, prohibit any attempt at an enumeration of these difficulties. Some are of a more private, others of a more public nature. One only of the latter class will be noticed, namely,

*The morbid literary taste of the age, taken in connexion with a superficial knowledge of the scriptures.* That a high state of mental culture distinguishes the present period of the world will not be denied, which ministers largely to the natural wants of men, and contributes much to the amount of human happiness. And not only so; this mental discipline leads us to look forward in hope, that the day is not far distant when a much greater amount of human learning shall be consecrated to the service of the church. At present, however, all the intellectual faculties appear to be put in requisition for the production of works of fiction. And the great mass of readers supply aliment for this disease, by an idolatrous worship of human genius, displayed in such works. Poetry and romance are regarded, especially is this true of the latter, by the more cultivated classes of society, as suitable sources of recreation and amusement, which consume their hours of relaxation from business, or the more severe pursuits of literature; while the Bible is regarded as a book

belonging to another age, if not a different race of beings. The consequence is, there are multitudes among us who would be thought accomplished ladies and gentlemen, and are so regarded by others, who are really so utterly ignorant of the scriptures of truth, that they are incapable of hearing a gospel sermon with any degree of profit. They have not enough in them to serve as a foundation on which the minister may begin to build. He speaks in a language, and adopts a style of address, to which they are strangers. It differs from their favourite authors, so that he is really a barbarian to them. He brings an intellectual feast so opposite to the aliment on which their minds have long subsisted, and which has in fact incorporated itself with the very elements of their intellectual powers and moral feelings, that it is wholly unpalatable. The minister is destitute of sentiment and feeling; is boorish, unmannerly, indelicate, harsh, illiberal, if not a bigot. His sermon contains nothing which can administer delight to a vain mind and a depraved disposition; rendered doubly so, if possible, through the influence of that gross morality, soft dalliance with vice, and mawkish sensibility which usually characterize the pages of the novelist, and enter into the constituent elements of romance. There is, then, by these means, superadded to the natural depravity of the soul, a species of actual transgression, which is, perhaps, wholly of a mental character, and which adds to the number and aggravation of those sins denominated vices of the mind. Under the influence of these vain imaginations, the gospel falls powerless on the ear. The intellect is shrouded in the impenetrable gloom of darkness, and the heart resembles Ezekiel's chambers of imagery. But spare them not. Let not their amiable social qualities, let not their kind offices, their influence in the community, nor the fear of incurring their displeasure, deter you from the ungracious task of dissecting their hearts, with the sword of the Spirit. Drag their moral deformity to the light. Let the devotee of an infidel and voluptuous literature, behold his own likeness in the glass of the gospel; that if he will not see, *others* may, and flee from the wrath to come.

Finally: Lest you should falter in your course, keep steadily in view that consoling promise of our Lord, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." The Master's presence is a sufficient safeguard, and the Master's approbation a sufficient reward. While obedience is required of you, the event is in the Master's power. For while God has been pleased to employ the feeble instrumentality of men, he has reserved the ultimate issue in his own hand. If your instrumentality be exerted according to the divine will, your own soul shall be saved, whatever may be the final condition of your hearers. For if our gospel be hid, it is hid to those that are lost. And the excellency of the power, in them that are saved, is of God. The sinner may boast of his natural ability, like the poor maniac of his wealth, yet can he not extricate himself. For the testimony of God is this: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." It is then to the exceeding greatness of God's power that you must look for support, encouragement, and success, in your ministry. Bringing souls to the Lord Jesus Christ is a work ascribed to all the adorable persons of the Trinity. "No man can come to me, except the Father who sent me draw him." Again says the Saviour, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all



men unto me." And again; we "are born of the Spirit;" we are "saved by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

So, on the other hand, the elect sinner, in his natural state, may drown the voice of conscience in the intoxicating bowl; or give himself up to work uncleanness with greediness; or yield himself to the dominion of Satan by the unrestrained influence of malice and revenge; or, scaling the giddy height of ambition, like Nebuchadnezzar walk proudly on the battlements of his palace; or, taking the scoerner's chair, fortify himself with the sophisms of infidelity; yet in the day of God's power the soul shall come out from under the dominion of these cruel tyrants—the lawful captive shall be delivered, and the prey taken from the terrible.

Taking then these considerations for your encouragement, enter upon the great work to which you have this day been set apart, without fear, in full assurance that the presence and power of God are with you. "Keep that which is committed to thy trust," avoiding "profane and vain babblings, and opposition of science falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen."

#### ART. X.—*Proceedings of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

THE committee appointed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia to present some plan, for the proper application of such funds, as have been, or may be, committed to their care, for the education of young men for the ministry, would offer the following:

*Resolved*, 1st. The primary object of the Presbytery in the distribution of its funds shall be the assistance of such students at the Seminary as are under the care of this Presbytery, and who may need such assistance.

2nd. A secondary object shall be the assistance of young men within its bounds who give evidence of piety desiring to devote themselves to the ministry, but unable to obtain a literary education without such assistance.

3rd. That each congregation be required to take up a collection *annually* for these objects, which collection shall be paid in to the treasurer at the semi-annual meeting of Presbytery in May.

4th. That it be the duty of each Session to look out such young men as may desire encouragement, and recommend them to the care of the Presbytery.

5th. That the Session report to the Presbytery the person or persons, with their recommendations, needing assistance, and the amount needed, and that the appropriations be made, in all ordinary cases, by the Presbytery; but that, as assistance may be required during the recess of Presbytery, that a standing committee be appointed to make appropriations in such cases to a small amount.

6th. That Presbytery anticipating much good to the Church, through this means, would earnestly call upon each congregation to contribute liberally for this object.

7th. That the Presbytery recommend to the ministers of this Presbytery to lay this subject *specifically* before the congregations, and impress upon their minds the duty of *actively* co-operating in this matter.

8th. And, that this object may be more effectually attained, the Presbytery recommend to the congregations under their care the formation of contributing societies.

The above report was adopted, and the committee instructed to send it for insertion in the Religious Monitor, with an accompanying address to the people under the care of Presbytery.

DEAR BRETHREN,—The undersigned have been appointed a committee, to address you a few words on the subject to which the above resolutions refer. You will perceive that this Presbytery has taken into serious consideration the duty of holding out encouragement to young men, to devote themselves to the ministry. Those who are familiar with the present state of our church, cannot but be convinced that there is a loud call for an increased supply of gospel ministers. This call has been sounding in our ears for some time past; but we have not regarded it with that attention which its urgency and solemnity demand.

It has, however, by the providence of God, become so pressing, that we have felt that we could not resist it any longer, without unfaithfulness to Zion's King, the prosperity and extension of whose kingdom we are bound by our ordination vows to promote. Impressed with this conviction, we have taken the subject into consideration, and have adopted the above resolutions, as expressive of the sense of our obligations, and of our views in reference to the most proper course to pursue, for the attainment of the desired object. We know, brethren, and we trust that we *feel*, that all human efforts, without the Divine blessing, will be vain and fruitless. It is only when He gives the word, and sends it with power to the heart, that "*the company of those that publish it shall be great.*" This is a truth that should never be forgotten by us, and any measure that would be calculated to weaken its impression upon our minds, should always be discountenanced. Our Lord has taught us, that it is "the Lord of the harvest who sends forth labourers into the harvest;" but while this is the case, has he not directed us to pray, that He would send these labourers into his vineyard. He *has*. It is the duty of the church to pray for an increase of gospel ministers. Has this duty been performed by us as a church? We fear, brethren, that we are all chargeable with great neglect in this respect. We have not importunately besought God, in the sanctuary, the family and the closet, that he would incline the hearts of our young men to come up to the help of the Lord.

And may it not be owing to this, that God has been pleading a controversy with us, for some time past?

And have we any reason to look for a true revival of his work among us, so long as we neglect to call upon the great husbandman, to send forth labourers into His vineyard? If we read the 36th chapter of Ezekiel, from the 24th verse, we will find, that God makes a great many rich and precious promises to the house of Israel; and in the 37th verse, he says, *I will yet for this be inquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them.*" Also, in Jeremiah xxix. 11, 12, God says, "I know the thoughts that I think towards you, thoughts of peace and not of evil; to give you an expected end. *Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me.*"

Daniel, we know, before the restoration of the Babylonish captivity, "*set himself to fasting and prayer.*" Prayer also was made by the apostles, previous to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost. And we are told, that the church at Antioch was *fasting and praying* when Saul and Barnabas were called to go and preach to the Gentiles. Here are some of the glorious fruits of prayer. Can *we* expect similar fruits, if we continue prayerless? No—we cannot. Let us then pray importunately to the Lord of the harvest, to send forth labourers into his harvest; and if ever there was a time for such a prayer, surely it is now,—now, when the love of many is beginning to wax cold," and "the strength of the bearer of burdens is decaying, and there is much rubbish." *Now*, when error shows itself, in a thousand forms, through the land. *Now*, when multitudes are scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. We exhort you, then, to pray for the increase of Gospel ministers, as a means for the attainment of this object; and of impressing upon the mind, the insufficiency of all human efforts, without the Divine blessing. But think not that this is the only duty which you are called upon to perform. No—He who does not *labour* for the increase of the church, gives evidence that his prayer is a dead prayer; for as "faith without works is dead," so is prayer. We would then call upon you to exert your influence, for the attainment of this object. Parents, we call upon *you*, to dedicate your children, even in infancy, to this work,—to give them to the Lord, as Hannah did Samuel, hoping that He will call them in his own good time. Present the offering in faith, and he may accept it at your hands. O that parents could be brought to see their responsibility, in this respect. It is true that they cannot change the hearts of their children, and qualify them for this work, but should they not pray to God to do this?—and should they not exhort them to go forward to the work, and give them a preparatory education? In this way, they would manifest their desire to promote the glory of God, and express their confidence in his power and grace, to incline the hearts of their children; and who knows but God may bless their efforts, and "fulfil their desire" according to his promise? But the responsibility does not rest merely with parents—it presses upon *all*,—all should exert their influence, with pious youth, possessing the requisite qualifications, to go into the field as labourers. But, instead of this, is not a criminal indifference on this subject too prevalent amongst us?—and is not this indifference a sad evidence, that we do not "set Jerusalem above our chief joy?" We appeal to you then, dear brethren, as "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," to show that you love "the city of our solemnities," and pray for her prosperity, by exerting your influence in her behalf.

And we call upon you, to show a spirit of liberality, in contributing for the assistance of such as are willing to go forward, and have not the necessary means of preparation for the work. There are many such. You know that the Head of the Church, generally, makes use of the poor of this world, as his workmen in building up his spiritual temple. With these, he laid the foundation of the New Testament Church; and such he has generally selected, for this purpose. Now, brethren, it becomes us to afford assistance to such as

we have reason to believe, he is calling to be workers together with him. It is true, that in affording this assistance we are liable to deception, but because some unworthy individuals have been assisted, and because there may be others, this surely would not justify us in withholding it from those who *are* worthy. This circumstance calls for caution and discrimination in the application of our contributions, and it is for this purpose that the Presbytery adopted the above resolutions. They wish to guard against an injudicious expenditure of their funds. And it is hoped, that the above measures may be effectual in securing this object at least to a great degree. And now, they call upon you, to encourage them in this effort to extend, by the blessing of God, the boundaries of our Zion. They call upon those congregations especially, that are under their care, to co-operate with them. May we not hope that this call will meet with a cordial response?—we are *sure* that it will, from every “*right-hearted*” Seceder. Show then that you love the principles of your profession, by helping forward those, who are willing to labour for their extension. Remember that the wise man has assured us, that “there is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty;” and that “he that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver.” Remember also, the solemn words of the apostle, “They that will be rich, fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

Committee of Presbytery, { JOSEPH T. COOPER,  
  { JOSEPH R. DICKSON.

---

ART. XI.—*Resolutions adopted at a Meeting of the Theological Students on the 19th of November, 1840.*

Believing that it is our duty, as candidates for the gospel ministry, not only to make ourselves acquainted with the doctrines of the word of God, but also to be observers of the signs of the times, and diligent students of the moral aspect of the world, and especially of our own country; and believing that we ought, as, in the course of Providence, suitable occasions may arise, to express our approbation of what is right, and in condemnation of what is wrong, to reprove those who commit, and sympathize with those who suffer injustice; and pointedly to condemn every gross violation of the law of God, and the rights of man, that may fall under our notice, and, particularly, as a gross outrage has lately been perpetrated on a minister of the church with which we stand connected; therefore, we, Students of theology, in the Theological Seminary of the Associate Presbyterian Church, deem it our duty to express our sentiments concerning that transaction, as follows:—

1st. Resolved—That the outrage committed on the Rev. Thomas S. Kendall, in South Carolina, would have disgraced a *heathen country*; and that its perpetration on the *Sabbath day* indicates a heathenish state of morals, but little above the level of barbarism.

2nd. Resolved—That a people who persecute a Christian Minister for peaceably discharging the duties of his office, when violating

no law of the land, may justly be branded with hypocrisy in professing to be a *Christian and republican people*.

3rd. Resolved—That the mildness of the pastoral letter of Synod, for reading and explaining of which Mr. Kendall was persecuted, highly adds to the injustice of his treatment.

4th. Resolved—That in this transaction we recognise the outrageous spirit of slavery, and see an exemplification of its opposition to religion, and its utter disregard of *all law, all right, and all order*.

5th. Resolved—That we consider this transaction as a call in Providence to be more *earnest* and *energetic* in seeking the overthrow of slavery, since it excludes the preaching of the Gospel according to our witnessing profession, from nearly the whole Southern portion of our country.

6th. Resolved—That in this outrage, committed on an *unprotected stranger*, we see a specimen of the so much-talked of "*chivalry*" of slave-holders!

7th. Resolved—That "*chivalry*," which implies courage, magnanimity, and generosity, together with a high sense of honour and justice, cannot exist in the breasts of tyrants; and that true "*chivalry*" is shown by taking part with the weak against the strong—the oppressed against the oppressor—the injured against the injurer.

8th. Resolved—That we admire the noble and Christian bearing of Rev. Kendall, while in the hands of his cruel persecutors; and while we lament his inhuman treatment, we congratulate him that he was counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus.

9th. Resolved—That it is our duty as students of the Word of God, to learn to wield that mighty weapon as the main instrument of the downfall of slavery, and that in our prayer for the same object, we ought not to forget to pray for the oppressor, nor for those who committed the outrage on Mr. Kendall.

10th. Resolved—That those in the Secession Church who oppose the action of the Church on Slavery, and those who hold back their brethren from freely testifying and acting with vigor against it, are guilty of protecting a system which is sending millions of souls to perdition.

11th. Resolved—In connexion with this subject, that we consider the resolution of the trustees of the Theological Seminary denying the use of the Hall for public meetings on the subject of slavery, to be *pro-slavery* in its character, and that we are constrained to believe, from what we know of the circumstances, that it was designed, at least by a majority of the board, as a blow at the Anti-Slavery cause.\*

12th. Resolved—That the preceding preamble and resolutions

\* It is probable these resolutions would have given more general satisfaction, and produced a more *happy* effect had the 11th been omitted. We cannot see the *propriety* of impeaching the motives of others without the most conclusive evidence; nor yet the *charity* of imputing base designs to the conduct of men, which is capable of quite an opposite construction. The church, at large, ought to require better evidence than surmise before they give credence to the charge that the men whom they have honoured with a responsible trust have designedly aimed a blow at any of her professed principles.

And we are unable to discover in this resolution any good degree of that *modesty*, which is becoming in young gentlemen preparing for the ministry, and which would argue fully as well for the church and their own future advancement and usefulness.

—EDIT. REL. MOV.

be forwarded for publication in the "Religious Monitor," the "Christian Witness," and "Xenia Free Press."

Canonsburg, Penn., Nov. 21st, 1840.

JAMES R. DOIG, Pres.

JOHN SCOTT, Sec.

## ART. XII.—*The Apocrypha.*

In our last number we gave a brief history of the books commonly called the Apocrypha, with the view of showing that up to the council of Trent, that is during a period of sixteen centuries, they were not recognised as canonical. We now proceed to bring forward a few specimens from the books themselves, to show that they never should have been admitted to a place among the oracles of God.

1. Some statements in these books are at variance with facts recorded by the inspired Oracles, some with other authentic historical records; and some with other parts of these books themselves.

The history of "Bel and the Dragon" is entirely at variance with the inspired account of Daniel's being cast into the Lion's Den. The Book of Wisdom claims to be the work of Solomon; yet it contains passages quoted from Isaiah and Jeremiah, prophets who lived centuries after the death of that monarch. Baruch is said, (Baruch i. 2,) to have been carried into Babylon, at the same time that Jeremiah says he was carried into Egypt, Jer. xliii. 61. The story of Judith is irreconcilable with all authentic accounts, sacred or profane, of the period when the events it records are pretended to have taken place.

Antiochus Epiphanes is said to have died at Babylon, 1 Maccabees vi. 4—10; to have been slain by the priests, in the temple of Nanea, in Persia, 2 Maccabees, i. 13—16; and yet afterwards to have died a miserable death in a strange country, among the mountains, 2 Maccabees, ix. 28.

2. Doctrines are taught in these books, precepts given, and practices sanctioned, directly opposed to the Holy Scriptures. The following are specimens:

1. The merit of works. "Whoso honoureth his Father, maketh an atonement for his sins."—"Water will quench a flaming fire, and alms maketh an atonement for sins." Eccles. iii. 3, 30. An Angel is represented as teaching the same doctrine: "It is better to give alms than to lay up gold; for alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sin," Tobit xii. 8, 9. See also Esdras, viii. 32, 33. Can these be the words of the same Spirit, who, by the Apostle Paul, teaches that it is by our Lord Jesus Christ we receive the atonement; that he is the propitiation for our sins; that He, by himself, purged our sins; and that it is by his righteousness, and not our own, we are justified? See Rom. v. 1—12; 1 John ii. 1, 2; Heb. i. 3; Titus ii. 4—8; Gal. ii. 16.

2. Magical ceremonies enjoined by one styling himself an angel of the Lord. "And when thou shalt come into the marriage chamber," says one who calls himself 'Raphael, one of the seven Holy Angels,'—"thou shalt take the ashes of perfume, and shalt lay upon them some of the heart and liver of the fish, and shalt make a smoke

of it, and the devil shall smell it, and flee away and never come again any more." But, no Holy Angel could recommend that which is an abomination to God, and which the Scripture condemns. See Lev. xix. 26; 2 Kings xvii. 1. 17. It is no wonder to find this Angel guilty of a lie; Tobit v. 12, he says, "I am Azarias the son of Ananias;" but in chap. xii. 2—15, he calls himself "Raphael, an Angel of the Lord."

3. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls is taught. "For I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea, rather, being good I came into a body undefiled." Wisdom viii. 19, 20. This might do for the disciples of Pythagoras, or the Bramins of Hindostan; but it merits not a place among the writings of Moses and the Prophets.

4. The doctrine of sinless perfection in this life, once and again meets us in the Apocryphal writings. "Riches are good to him that hath no sin"—"Thou hast not appointed repentance to the just, as Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, which have not sinned against thee." Eccles. xiii. 24; Prayer of Manasses. But Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, were all sinners; nor is there a just man upon the earth who doeth good so as not to sin; and so true is it, that we have all sinned, and that if at any time we should say we have no sin, we only deceive ourselves, that our Lord taught us to pray, "Forgive us our debts;" nor will there ever be, nor has there ever been, on earth, one to whose lips that petition is unsuitable, our Lord himself excepted. 1 Kings viii. 46; 1 John i. 8—10.

5. To pray for, and offer up sacrifices for the dead, are practices recommended and sanctioned. "And when he had made a gathering throughout the company, to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain, should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead." 2 Maccabees xii. 43, 44. But throughout the canonical Scriptures, the state of man is represented as being decisively and finally fixed at death; at that period the soul immediately enters upon happiness or misery: and therefore, prayers and sacrifices for the dead are useless and unavailing. See Heb. ix. 27; 2 Cor. v. 6—8; Phil. i. 23; Luke xxiii. 43; Ecclesiastes, ix. 6.

6. Assassination and suicide are directly sanctioned. Judith is represented as praying for strength to commit the crime of assassination, and exalting the cruel and perfidious deed of Simeon, which drew down upon him the prophetic malediction and severe condemnation of his father Jacob. See Judith ix. 2—9. And Razis, one of the elders of Jerusalem, is praised for committing suicide, 2 Mac. xiv. 41—46.

Thus, as the Apocryphal writings were not recognised for sixteen hundred years by the Christian Church, they never should have been so; and were declared canonical merely to support the system of the Church of Rome, which could find no support in the inspired Word of God.—*Dublin Christian Magazine.*

#### ART. XIII.—*Unpublished Letters of Scots Worthies.*

To the Rev. Mr. Ferrie, of Easter Anstruther, we are indebted for MSS. of the following letters. They may be regarded as in-

teresting relics of the "olden time," and as not unsuitable to the design of a miscellany, consecrated as ours is, to the historical illustration of the Church of our fathers. Private letters of the men of other times, even though limited it may be to domestic transactions and incidents, sometimes throw light on matters of a more public nature, while they exhibit valuable traits of character.—EDIT.

LETTER I.—From the Rev. John Carstares of Glasgow, (father of the Principal) to the Rev. James Durham, his colleague.\*

"For my reverend and dear brother, Mr. James Durham, minister of the gospel at Glasgow."

"My Dearest Brother,—It seems the Lord has some great and notable piece of service for you, wherein he will make you useful to his people, thinking good to put you to such pieces of tryall and exercise. Your dear wyfe, our sweet Lord Jesus his friend, is sicke, it would seem, even to death. She is in good care, marvillouslie upheld, and kepted quyet in reference to all thinges, and ye may come home with your owne conveniencie.

"If the Lord purpose hir removal, whereof ther is some appearance, it's lyke ye cannot be here before that. O bless him, dear brother—bless him that ever ye knew him, that ever he yoked you together—he has undoubetlie blessed your fellowship to hir, and has blessed you together, and will bless your children. Be quyet, dear brother, he will doe that which is good in his sight in this particular, and that which will be good and best for hir and for you, and for the poor young ones. Now the Lord himself quyet, compose, sothe, and comfort you. I am, dearest brother, your own brother, desirous to sympathize with you, with whom Jesus sympathizes, a tender-hearted high priest, touched with the feeling of all our infirmities, and afflicted in all our afflictions.

"MR J. CARSTARES.

"Glasgow, at your house, November, 3, at 4 o'clock.

"Dr Cunningham has been here, he has his own seares—your mother is here also, she is mindful of yours, your wyfe, I mean."

LETTER II.—From Principal Wood, of St Andrews, to his wife, Katherine Carstares, a sister of the Rev. John Carstares, of Glasgow, and aunt of Principal Carstares; dated from Edinburgh.

"Dearest Heart,—Though I have not much to say, yet I cannot but, when occasion favours, write to you to let you know both that I am in good health, and that I desire much to know as much of you, the rather that I have, since my coming hither, that is, ten or eleven dayes, received word from you onlie once, whereas, in regard of the condition you are in, I would wish, if it were possible, everie day to know how it is with you. I was not a little comforted by the letter

\* Mr. Carstares was married to Janet, and Mr. Durham to Margaret Mure, (widow of Mr. Zachary Boyd), daughter of William Mure, of Glanderston, Renfrewshire. In July, 1681, the Earl of Rothes, being on his deathbed, "appeared concerned," says Wodrow, "upon views of eternitie; and the Rev. Mr. John Carstares, upon his desire, waited upon him and prayed with him, the Duke of Hamilton and many others of his noble relatives being present; and few were present without being affected very sensibly. When the Duke of York heard that Presbyterian ministers had been with the Chancellor, he is said to have used this expression, "that all Scotland were either Presbyterian through their life or at their death, profess what they would." He is supposed to have died in 1685."



I got, written by Mr Dow, showing that you were tending toward a recoverie. I entreat you, my verie deare heart, let me have renewed understanding of your condition as soon as possible you may, that if the Lord in his goodness be carrying on your restoring, I may, by the knowledge thereof, be enabled to bear my necessitate absence from you with the greater ease, for I fear it be longer than I expected by reason of important and weightsome bussinesses that we have in the Assembly, which is like to draw it longer than the next week. Our Principal's business is not come in againe as yet, and it is thought that they will pass from him, and will fall either upon Mr David Dickson or me, whereof I know Mr Samuel will be as unwilling as myself (and he is unwilling in truth) or I was of his removeing, but I shall advise you of whatsoever I provide of this business. Now, my jewel, I must still entreat you for care of me in caring for your own person. Verie dear, my Katharine, your own beloved,

"MR JA. WOOD.

"Edin., July 13, 1649."

LETTER III.—From Mr. A. Peacock, to the Rev. Robert M'Ward, of Glasgow, then in prison on account of non-conformity. Perhaps some Church antiquarian may be able to tell us something about this Mr Peacock.

"My Reverend and Dear Brother,—I received yors of the date April 25, and am much obliged to you, who are not forgetful of me when you have occasions to this country. I am much refreshed to hear of yor health in prison, and of the Lord's standing with you in yor answers before the commissioners and Lords of Articles; and you may take it as a token for good, and as the Lord's bearing testimony to his own truth qch you are called to witness for, and as the fulfilling of his gracious promises, in that qch hath been suplicat for by many in yor behalfe. The sad overturnings qch this strange tyme hath brought forth, and the desolations threatning the Lord's work amongst us, in a tyme of so great forsaking, are for a lamentation, and if these dayes be not shortened, Christ is lyke to have a thin kirk in Scotland. But yoo have wherein to rejoyce that yoo are counted worthy to be amongst the first of his witnesses; yoo have no reason to weary though your bonds be continued, that piece of service qch the holy Lord hath employed yoo in, is so honest, yoo may look sometymes upon Psalm xlv. Your parents are for the present in health, yor mother was sick, but is recovered; your sister Jeann is much affected with sickness. You have heard, I suppose, of the violent interruption of our Synod, when wee wer about to declare our adherence to the established government of this church, and against the abjured corruptions, and to suplicat the parliat for securities to religious intrests. Our presbetry have them kyndlie remembered to you, and desyred me to signifie in ther names how much they sympathize with you in yor bonds. My wyffe, and relations, and yor Christian freends have them remembered to you. I say no more, but the Spirit of God and glory rest upon you. I am yor affectionate brother,

"A. PEACOCK.

"May 16, 1661.

"Present my respects to Mr Guthrie, and Mr Gillespie yor fellow-prisoners."

**LETTER IV.**—From Mrs. John Carstares to her husband. This letter wants the beginning and the conclusion; but Professor Mackie, who was remarkably accurate in his information, has designated it as above. It wants a date, but its contents seem to fix it to a period soon after the battle of Pentland. The incidental information which this letter contains, and the references to the events of the period, will be perused with interest by all who have “pleasure in the stones of Zion,” and “to whom her dust is dear.”

“There is some of the prisoners of the Castels out upon the taking a bond for keeping the publique peace. Gen. Major Montgomerie, Cesnock, Menstrie, and Dunlope, Ralstoune, and Halket, Hill, of Leith, Captain Brown, and Captain Mure, have supplicated for their liberty, and upon takeing the bond hath all gotten their liberty. Sr James Stewart and Sr Jon Chiesly did supplicat for their liberty, and would have taken the bond, if the counsell would have *put these words in it, to keep the publique peace*, as good and faithfull subjects, qh they refused, and was heighly displeased wt them, and did presently send them away to the tolbuith of Dundee, where they are kepted close prisoners, and non of their relations have libertie to come at them, there is fears they may be hardly dealt with. Cunynghamehead, Pollock, and Rowallend, doth yet ly still in prison quietly, and heath done nothing; but they say they will be hardly dealt with go doth not suplicate and take the bond. It hath pleased the Lord to remove, by death, yor kinde freend Largo and Greenknows. They died both of a great fever, but I heard they died both very well. Largo hath no children, so his brother Alexr hath fallen to that estate. There is two outted ministers of Galloway died in Edinburgh. They were two brethren. They called the one Mr Robert Fergusson, the oyr Mr James Fergusson; they were both very good men. Mr Jon Smith, minister of Edinburgh, is also dead, qu hath carried himselfe very weal to the great satisfaction of all honest fock. He hath left a testimonie behind him for presbyterial government and aganst episcopasie: was buried in Edinburgh, and had a very great burial; when his burial was intimat, he was proclaimed Mr John Smith, minister of the gospell in Edbgh; qu highly displeased the curates of Edinburg, and one of them wrot to the Provost, that they wondred he suffered such absurdities, that a man should be cal’d minister of Edbgh, qu was found unworthy to be a minister of the church of Scotland, qhyn the Provost red, he desired the messenger to show his master, that he wold do him the favor as to give his letter the benefite of the fyre, that his follie sould not be seen to the world; and so the Provost presently threw the letter in the fyre before the bearer of it. I hear Mr Douglass is witness to Mr Smith’s testimonie. Mr Douglass is very kinde and respective to the honest people that was put to suffer for the last year’s bussinesse. I cannot get yor best freend’s letter send to you now, because his son hath it, and he is not at home; there is none forfaulted yet, but these that were forfaulted at the begining; for any thing wee hear, they intend not to take any more lives; they are highly dissatisfied wt ym that refuses to take the act of Indemnity and the bond. The counsell was to sitt and determine qt sould be done to them this last Thursday, but wee yet have not heard word. The King keeps these forfaulted men’s estates to himself, and will not give a gift of them to any, though

Gen. Dallyall have suplicated for Caldwells and Kerslands estates, yet he is refused. Hussell, (Househill) a gentleman in Renfrew, has gotte the uplifting of these estates, and is a little more favorable to the gentlemen's wives. The writer of this has him most kindly remembered to you.

"I received a line from our freend in Holland; he is weall. The last time I wrote to him, I sent him 500 merks. I pray send me word if yee stand in need of mony, for I have enough beside me. I intend to send Sarah and Kathrine into Edh. in the spring, for I would have them perfect in shewing. If you think I wold let Sarah stay wt my Lady Kenmure, and go to the schooll out of her house."

In the Appendix to Dr M'Crie's lives of Veitch and Bryson, there are a number of very valuable letters of Mr John Carstares, together with an account of the last hours of that eminent servant of God.—Ed. *Edinburgh Christian Instructor.*

---

#### ART. XIV.—*A fancy Sketch; and yet not all fancy.*

"SHE floated about like a fair, but very voluptuous-looking spirit, and cut her toes hither and thither, and swayed her body to and fro, in a way which was a caution to all inflammable young gentlemen, gray-headed or not. The lovely creatures who graced the scene, looked on enchanted, and made all bright with their smiles; the vast crowd of men shouted and applauded with their whole might, and the beautiful dancing woman giving them an extra flirt or two, which set them off in a perfect agony of delight, made her bow—the curtain dropped, the dear Fanny tapping her Wring-your-neck-off, upon the shoulder, said, 'dere, dere is te one tousand dollars almos—now let us go.' But the audience said no, and they shouted and screamed, and thumped for her to come out and——"

"At that moment, in an obscure hovel, open in many parts to the cold, biting winds, without fire, alone, sat a poor woman, holding to her chill'd bosom her sick and dying babe, while upon a rude pallet of straw lay two shivering little creatures, her children too. Her eye was heavy with watching, her cheek sunken with hunger and suffering, her heart filled with the very gall and bitterness of life. Still how truly, oh! how truly, answered that heart to the pang of a mother's love, as she gazed into the innocent face of her dying babe; how fast flowed the tears from eyes which had known little but sorrow and weeping through many weary days—how deep and fervent was the prayer which came up from the very fountains of privation and grief. There was no heart near to sympathize, no kind hand to aid, no soft voice to soothe—the physician's healing art—charity's angel arm came not to soften the dying moments of her poor babe, and as life flickered and wavered in its fair urn, and the sobs of the mother sounded in that solitary room, as in the agony of her grief she exclaimed, 'a few pence had saved thee to me, my sweet babe,'—as the sleepers on the pallet of straw murmured in their uneasy slumber: 'Mother, dear mother, give me some bread'—as the keen wind came through the crevices, and she clasped the dying child to her bosom; at that moment, a dancing woman, a stranger, with her wealth of thousands, and her ingots of gold and silver, made her last graceful bow, and took the princely sum which was hers for a few moments' pleasant labour.

"As the spectators gave their last shout, the babe's innocent spirit winged its flight from earth, and the mother gazed in despair upon all that remained to her of the little prattler whom she so dearly loved. Such is life."—*Richmond Enquirer*.

#### ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Allegheny, held on the last Wednesday of October, 1840, Mr. THOMAS GILKERSON was ordained to the office of the holy ministry and installed pastor of the congregation of Conemaugh, Indiana Co., Pa.

At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, held on the 13th of November, 1840, Mr. JAMES G. AUSTIN was admitted to the study of Theology in the Associate church.

**THE DEACON:** *An Inquiry into the Nature, Duties and Exercise of the Office of the Deacon, in the Christian Church.* By JAMES A. WILLSON, A. M., Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Congregation, Philadelphia. 76 pp. 8vo.

"Let the Deacons be grave, &c." 1 TIM. iii. 8.

"Let all things be done decently and in order." 1 COR. xiv. 40.

WM. S. YOUNG, 173 Race Street, 1841.

This is a seasonable and valuable production. It is desirable that it should be in the hands of all sound Presbyterians; but we have not room to give it an extended notice this month. The reader's attention, however, will be called to it in the next number.

#### ART. XV.—*Queries and Answers.*

The following questions on the Purchase of Temporal Benefits, and on Christ's Mediatorial Government, are, at the request of some who heard them, offered for the pages of the Monitor:

Question 1. "What are the temporal benefits which Christ did not purchase?"

Answer. Christ purchased no temporal benefits whatever, either for his own people, or for others. Food, drink, clothing, air, light, animals for service, civil government, &c., belong to that class of things which we call temporal benefits, and which we say Christ did not purchase. Though this is sufficient as a direct answer to the question, we presume it is expected that some reason will be given in its support. Accordingly, the following brief arguments are offered.

1. The blessings which Christ has purchased do not perish by the use of them; while the greater part of temporal benefits in the fullest sense do, and all, without exception, must come to an end in a temporal use.—John vi. 27.

2. The blessings of Christ's purchase are all spiritual and supernatural, Eph. i. 3, and all belong to our saving relation to Christ; but temporal benefits are natural and belong to the things of this world.

3. The blessings of Christ's purchase are all saving in their nature, John vi. 27. We cannot partake of them but in the favour of God, in union to Christ, and as included in the eternal covenant, nor without a spiritual benefit which shall never be lost; but unbe-

lievers, without union to Christ, without the saving favour of God, and without any saving benefits to their souls, partake of temporal benefits.

4. Christ died in no sense for those who perish, and consequently, he purchased nothing for them, as he died only according to the provisions of the eternal covenant, which were only for the promised seed, Isaiah liii. 10, but unbelievers partake of temporal benefits; therefore they were not purchased.

5. All the blessings of Christ's purchase are received and enjoyed by faith; not only in faith, and with faith, but faith is itself the act of participation, Eph. ii. 8, iii. 17. We, however, partake of the temporal benefits by natural means, whether as believers who have faith, or as unbelievers who have none.

6. All the blessings of Christ's purchase are applied by the Holy Spirit supernaturally; Tit. iii. 5: but we partake of temporal benefits by natural means.

7. Of no part of Christ's purchase does it need to be said, "it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer," and therefore is "good and not to be refused;" but of all temporal benefits this is said. 1 Tim. iv. 4. 5.

8. Christ's purchase was wholly employed on that which was lost: Mat. xviii. 11. Spiritual benefits were lost by the fall, and these are recovered through Christ. Temporal benefits did not lose their existence by the fall of man, and, therefore, they needed no purchase. It is true, man lost one comprehensive temporal benefit, that is, his temporal life; but it is worthy of remark, that even this one temporal benefit was not purchased by Christ. Man still must die temporally, although the person be redeemed by Christ. Is it objected that the union of the believer's soul and body in heaven is secured by the purchase of Christ? True, but not the temporal union of the soul and body which is our temporal life. Is it further objected, that Christ did purchase something respecting our temporal life? It is granted that he did; yes, and something respecting all our temporal benefits, but it was not the temporal life itself, nor any temporal benefit itself; but the covenant blessing with these, and redemption from the old covenant curse, which are not natural, but spiritual blessings, and not temporal, but eternal.

But, is it further objected, that Christ did purchase the bodies of believers? It is granted; yet he purchased them *as their bodies*, and not the temporal materials of which they are in this world composed. It was not necessary to purchase the body as such, and also the materials of it as it exists in this life, which the objection means, if it mean any thing on the question before us. If it be the materials of the body that are purchased, then the materials of the bodies of unbelievers are purchased as temporal things, and again lost when they become component parts of their bodies; which cannot be said of any part of Christ's purchase. Besides, if the temporal materials of the believer's body were purchased, then in the course of a long life, they are many times lost, as the body is continually losing the old matter and taking on new. We cannot comprehend the *identity* of the body in its temporal or final state. But it is not the temporal materials of the believer's body that are purchased, as that will be raised at the resurrection, but a spiritual body, 1 Cor. xv. 35—44,

although it is the believer's own body that is purchased, and will be raised at last.

Question II. "How are we to ask for temporal benefits, which Christ did not purchase, seeing we ask them in his name and for his sake?"

Answer. There are two ways, and only two of receiving temporal benefits; namely, 1. Under the broken covenant of works, and therefore with its curse, Gal. iii. 10. And, 2. Under the covenant of grace, with its blessings, Gal. iii. 13. Under one or other of these covenants all mankind are without exception. Now unbelievers enjoy temporal benefits, and therefore have them under the covenant of works, and with the curse; but no blessing of Christ's purchase is bestowed under that covenant; consequently temporal benefits do not belong to Christ's purchase. Believers have temporal benefits under the covenant of grace, without the curse, Gal. iii. 13, and with the blessing, Rom. viii. 28. This privilege they have by the purchase of Christ; and, therefore, they ask temporal benefits to be given *in this way for Christ's sake*. Neither believers nor unbelievers can ask them acceptably, but under this view. Thus Christ purchased the new covenant blessing for believers with their temporal benefits.

But it may be said, We not only ask the blessing with the temporal benefit, but the benefit itself for Christ's sake, and how do we ask this in such a manner if he did not purchase it? We reply; Christ has all things put into his hands for the good of his church, Matt. xi. 27; Eph. i. 22. Yet many things are put into his hand for government and dispensation, which he did not purchase; as our earth, the sun, moon, seasons, human genius, gifts, and acquirements, the inventions of men, and even the nations of the world. Now, in prayer, we ask that these things which are put into the hand of Christ for our use and to be dispensed by him, may be given us for his sake, as far as they are suitable to us for our good, and that they may be given with that blessing which he has purchased.

Inference: We should never ask a temporal benefit, merely for its temporal use, but for God's glory, and our spiritual, as well as temporal benefit.

PURITAN.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—As our friend of Cadiz thinks we acted discourteously towards him, by refusing to publish his communication, we recommend to him to withdraw it and procure its publication elsewhere. This would enable the public to judge between us. We certainly acknowledge the obligation of courtesy to all; but cannot admit that courtesy requires us to insert every thing which may be offered for our pages. If so, the Monitor would soon become a strange medley.

The Review of Dr. M'Crie's life, by his son, the Rev. Thomas M'Crie, is copied from the Edinburgh Christian Instructor, and given as an article of literary intelligence. The uncharitable reflection cast upon Seceders, we suppose will break no bones, when it is borne in mind that the Reviewer is a stanch advocate of establishments.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

FEBRUARY, 1841.

---

ART. I.—*Queries and Answers respecting Christ's Kingly Power.*

QUESTION III. "If Christ's kingly power as Mediator be limited to the church, how can he add any more to the church? How can it be said that he executeth the office of a king in subduing us to himself, in ruling and defending us, and in restraining and conquering all his and our enemies?"

ANSWER. This question consists of a supposition, and two arguments against it. The supposition is in these words: "If Christ's kingly power as Mediator be limited to the church." The remainder contains arguments against the doctrine here supposed. Now we, as well as the writer of the question, reject this supposed doctrine, and agree with the arguments here employed against it; and consequently, with this statement the discussion might end. But as the proposer of this question and many others appear to think that the Associate church holds the doctrine, "That Christ's kingly power as Mediator is limited to the church;" and as there is a disagreement of views respecting Christ's Mediatorial Government, we shall add some farther remarks for correction and explanation.

We remark then, that the Associate Church does not hold "that Christ's kingly power as Mediator is *limited* to the church;" but, on the contrary, that, "all power in heaven and in earth"—and "all judgment"—and "authority to execute judgment are committed" to Christ as Mediator; Matt. xxviii. 18, John v. 22, 27,—and that he is "head *over all things* to the church," Eph. i. 22; and consequently, that his power as Mediator extends to all things; and, therefore, that he can, as Mediator, restrain and conquer his own and his people's enemies, and subdue to himself, and add to the church from the world as he pleases. What then is the point in dispute? It is this: whether this universal authority of Christ as Mediator, is exercised *mediatorially* to the world as such, or only to the church, "which is his body?" the Associate Church maintains the latter—that Christ exercises his power *mediatorially* to the church only. The question, then, is not respecting the extent of Christ's power and government as Mediator; for it is agreed that it extends to all things in heaven, earth and hell, but it solely respects the *nature* of that government which he exercises over the church and world respectively. That is, Christ's government of the church is mediatorial in its nature: on this all are agreed: but is Christ's government of the world, as such, mediatorial in its nature to them? On this the Associate,

VOL. XVII.—33

Church answers in the negative. Light may be cast on this question, as was stated, by fixing distinct and definite ideas of the mediatorial government of Christ. In order to this, let the following points be duly considered:

1. The origin of Christ's government as Mediator. In illustration of this point we observe, 1st, Christ, as God, has a universal and absolute government over all things, which was never delegated to him, but belonged to him eternally and essentially.

2. Of this essential and universal government he cannot be divested, and therefore is not divested of it by receiving and assuming his mediatorial office.

3. He has, as Mediator, a delegated government, over all things for his church. This is of equal extent with his essential government, Eph. i. 20—23, and was given him by eternal covenant as the Redeemer of his people, Psal. ii. 6—12; Phil. ii. 6—11.

4. Christ's essential government and his delegated government, as Mediator, do not interfere with, hinder, nor limit one another; for it is still his essential government that he exercises; but, by delegation, he exercises it in order to effect a special object determined by the eternal covenant. That is, his government as God, is, by covenant arrangement employed for the good of his church, even while natural things are, by him, conducted by natural means to their natural ends. This is his government as Mediator, and is mediatorial to the church, but not mediatorial to the world as such.

II. Consider the objects which were to be effected by Christ's mediatorial office for his people.

1. He makes peace between God and man, Rom. iii. 25, v. 1,

2. He carries on communications of peace after reconciliation is made, Eph. ii. 18; 1 John ii. 1. 3. He governs his people both in making actual peace, and in carrying on that peaceful intercourse, Psal. cx. 3.

4. He protects and defends his people from all their enemies, Isa. xxxii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 25. These being the leading objects to be effected by Christ's mediation in regard to man, let us next consider,

III. By what means Christ effects these objects of his mediation. He effects them,

1. By his blood, or meritorious righteousness. 2. By his intercession. 3. By his Spirit applying his redemption. 4. As external means, by his word, his laws, his ordinances, which he has given to his church. And 5. By his providence under a covenant engagement that "all things shall work for good" to his people.

Now it is agreed, we presume, that Christ effects the above *objects* only for his church; and that it is only for her that he mediates by his blood, his intercession and his Spirit. The whole question then respects the external means of Christ's mediatorial government; namely, his word, laws and church ordinances, and his providence, under the covenant arrangement that it *shall work for good*: and may be thus stated: does Christ govern the world and the nations as such by these means, or only his church? We answer, that it is only his church that he governs by these means, in this manner, and to the above mediatorial ends or objects; and we think that the actual state of the nations, viewed in connexion with the scripture truth, that Christ, according to his delegated authority, does govern them, is conclusive in support of our answer. But, in farther support,

IV. Consider what are the characteristics of Christ's mediatorial government, as distinguished from his essential government? Since



Christ's mediatorial government was conferred on him by eternal covenant, ~~was~~ exercised on the ground of his atonement, and to effect the salvation of his people, therefore it must have such characteristics as the following:

1. Christ's mediatorial government must be characterized by its purposes and ends towards the subjects of it. If the purposes and ends of his government be saving to those who are the subjects of it, it is mediatorial to them; if it be not of a saving tendency, nor by saving means, it is not mediatorial to them, whatever it may effect for others. Thus Christ, as Mediator of his church, governs heathen nations, and his government is not mediatorial to them, although it is so to his church.

2. Christ's mediatorial government must be by means which are appointed and adapted to the ends of his mediation; namely, for effecting peace, and for carrying on communications of peace between God and man. But his government of the world and of the nations, as such, is not by such means.

3. His mediatorial government must be by means, which when blessed will actually effect the ends of his mediation. But the government of the nations, as such, is not by such means.

4. Christ has a right, as Mediator, by the eternal covenant, and on the ground of the atonement, to employ his mediatorial government, and all the means of it, for saving purposes to his church; and without that covenant and atonement, he has no right to employ them for such purposes. Yet without a covenant, or atonement, he has a right to govern the nations and the world.

5. Christ's mediatorial government is such that his people are bound to accept it, to receive it, and the means of it, in faith, and therein to serve and own him as their Lord and Saviour; but many of the laws, regulations and policies of nations, by means of which, Christ, by overruling them for good to his church, carries on his purposes in the world, we are rather bound to reject, while we adore the wisdom, holiness, and sovereignty of his providence. Such a government by the Mediator is not mediatorial to the nations as such.

6. His mediatorial government is such, that his people accepting it, and engaging to him in it, distinguish themselves from the world, and the church thereby distinguishes herself from the nation in its civil character. Thus, we see that Christ's mediatorial government has saving purposes and tendencies towards the subjects of it, and means of a saving tendency, and which, with a divine blessing, are saving; and that this government is exercised on the ground of the atonement, and according to the eternal covenant. We therefore conclude that Christ exercises his mediatorial government only over the church, and not over the world. That is, it is mediatorial only to the church, and not to the world as such. We shall now—

V. Offer some remarks in order to remove objections.

1. It is true that in the preceding remarks we have considered the nations of the world as they are, and almost always have been, and not as they ought to be. But in so doing we have endeavoured to take a particular view of Christ's *actual* government of the nations, to ascertain the nature of his government over them, and to oppose the opinion maintained by some, that his government of the nations, as such, is even *now* mediatorial.

2. But were we to assume, what will in a happy measure be the case in the millenium, that the nations of the world were become

what they ought to be, still this would not warrant a different or contrary answer to the question. For if "the kingdoms of this world were become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ," yet our Lord's declaration would still be true, "My kingdom is not of this world." That is, it is not natural, civil, or temporal, as political kingdoms are and must be. And though every individual of a nation were a child of God, that would be his church character, and not his civil state. And though a nation should govern themselves wholly by the laws of Christ, as they ought to do, yet by these very laws, civil rulers would take care not to assume ecclesiastical functions, but attend to civil matters as their immediate objects as civil characters, and to religious matters as their immediate objects as Christians. And Christ's mediatorial government would be exercised over them as individual members of his body. He, as Mediator, will make them, in their civil character, subservient to the good of his church, without bringing them, in that character, under his mediatorial government.

3. A government by Providence, and by means which Christ may make subservient to his church's good, and to the salvation of souls, is a mediatorial government to his church, but not to others. Thus, he will make the desolations and even the sins of nations subservient to his church's good, but this is not a mediatorial government to the nations. So Christ governs the devil and his hosts, and as Mediator, they are subjected to him, and he will even make their malignity subservient to the good of his church; yet surely he does not exercise a mediatorial government over devils. His government as Mediator is over all things to his church, Eph. i. 22, and, therefore, is mediatorial only to his church.

4. Though Christ's power exercised over the heart of a sinner in bringing him into a state of grace, is the exercise of his mediatorial government with that sinner, yet it is as one of his elect and one of his church that he so governs him. Christ, by his power as Mediator of his church, brings such a one under his mediatorial government; and he is then no longer of the world.

5. Though the gospel offer belongs to the authority of Christ as Mediator, and though sinners in their state of nature are under the same authority, yet the mere offer of the gospel is not so properly Christ's mediatorial government over them, as it is an invitation to come under his mediatorial government. And this exercise of the authority of the Mediator does not warrant the conclusion that the world from which the sinner is invited, is under the mediatorial government of Christ.

6. It will be observed, that throughout the preceding remarks we have kept up a distinction between Christ's power, commission, or government as Mediator, and his mediatorial government; such as holding that his power as Mediator extends to all things, but his mediatorial government is over his Church, and for her only. The phrase mediatorial government has long been used ambiguously, sometimes for Christ's saving and peculiar government of his church, and sometimes for his universal government as Mediator, which includes his natural government of the world, his moral government of men and angels, and his judicial judgments executed on his enemies; and from this ambiguous use of the phrase have arisen confusion, error, and contention. There is a justness and propriety in the above distinction, as well as necessity for it; and familiarity with it will make it

plain. Thus, Christ's *mediatorial government* is saving, or of a saving tendency to all the subjects of it; but his government as Mediator extending to all things, is destructive to many of its subjects: Christ as Mediator of his people, governs holy angels, but his government is not mediatorial to them:—As Mediator of his people, he governs nature, but he is not the Mediator of nature:—As Mediator, he governs devils, but a mediatorial government of devils is utterly repugnant to all our ideas of the words. But some may say, this distinction is more speculative than practical. We reply, it is because it is practical that we maintain it: for to say that all Christ's government as Mediator, (which is universal,) is mediatorial, not only to or for the church, but to or for all the subjects of it, is to say that all his government is founded in grace, not only to the church, but to all the subjects of that government, whether to nations of mankind, to fallen angels, or to those of mankind in hell, who are past the offers of mercy: for Christ, as Mediator of his church, governs all these. And from this error, encouraged by the confused ideas attached to the phrase, *mediatorial government*, arise many others, such as, if all Christ's government as Mediator be founded in grace to all the subjects of it, then the world exists only by his mediatorial interposition:—he has nothing in his hands for government, or dispensation, but what he purchased:—Therefore, he died in some sense for all mankind: and he must have given up his essential government in assuming the mediatorial. Such errors pervert the faith and the practice of the church.

We shall close with the following summary:

1. Christ exercises his essential as well as his mediatorial authority and government, and these do not interfere with, or limit one another, but perfectly harmonize.

2. Christ's essential government directs all things to their natural ends, according to the laws of God as Creator and Moral Governor; and his mediatorial government makes all things subservient to the church's good, to the work of salvation, and to the glory of God in that work.

3. Christ, as Mediator, has all things put into his hand, to be by him made subservient to his mediatory purposes, even things that he has not purchased, as well as those that he has.

4. Christ's mediatorial government is saving, or of a saving tendency to all the subjects of it; is directed to a supernatural end, and is founded on his atonement and the eternal covenant.

5. Christ does, in fact, as Mediator of his church, govern the nations of all descriptions.

6. He does not, in fact, govern the nations and the church by the same laws.

7. He does require his church to observe ordinances and perform duties, which he does not require, nor even allow civil governments to observe or perform. 2 Chron. xxvi. 18, 19.

8. Magistrates and their subjects may be members of the church, but in a distinct character from that in which they are members of the civil state, and their duties under these distinct characters are in many respects different.

9. It is submission to Christ's mediatorial doctrines, laws, and ordinances that distinguishes the church from the world, and from nations in their civil character.

10. All who obtain salvation, obtain it as individual persons, and not as collective bodies; yet Christ has one body, of which he is the Head, and but one, and that is a collective body, which is the church. Col. i. 18. The nations, even though they were, in their government, conformed to his will, are not, in their national capacity, his body; but yet he is head over them to his Church. Eph. i. 22.

PURITAN.

## ART. II.—*Foreign Missions.*

MR. EDITOR,—Truth never suffers by *discussion*. She never claims to be believed, but after the most thorough investigation. And she always appears to the best advantage, when presented in the *clearest light*. Investigation is the spirit of the age; it is also the spirit of the Bible. While we are commanded not to be “carried about by every wind of doctrine,” we are at the same time “to try the spirits, whether they be of God,”—to “prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.” Believing that the pages of the Monitor are open to the discussion of all religious subjects, conducted in the spirit of candour and Christian charity; and being fully aware, that on this subject “of foreign missions,” we differ from many of our brethren, whose talents and piety we highly respect; we ask your indulgence for a few very brief remarks. If we are *right*, the church is evidently *wrong* in delaying action on the subject. If we are *wrong*, is it a matter of no interest to the church, that we *grope in darkness*? Does not charity require of our brethren, at least one effort to convince us of our errors, and to impart to our minds the light that brought conviction to theirs? But before giving our views on the subject, permit us to say, that we think your remarks on the “*Address on Missions*,” (contained in the July and August numbers of the Monitor,) rather more severe than merited. We do not, however, for a moment doubt, but that they were made with the utmost candour. With the same candour, we trust, the few remarks will be received, which we think duty to ourselves and our President requires. You say, “the address is too long.” This may be; but has the church heard *too much* on this subject? Look at her practice, and you have the answer. We cannot be silent on this subject, until our church *acts*. And when *all our ministers* commence addressing, we will then be satisfied with *fewer* remarks from our President. “Much of its verbiage is either redundant, or weakens the force of his thoughts.” Here you have not *specified*, but left us alone to seek the places to which you refer. We have again and again examined the address. That there are some passages of this description, we freely admit: to deny it would manifest evident partiality. This was of course to be expected. The address was designed, more to throw *light* on the subject, than to be proof against the niceties of criticism. But that there is much of this character, after careful examination we cannot think. “It aims too much at the orator.” In what respect we cannot see. Nothing, we know, was farther from the writer’s object—nothing more opposed to his known character. Nor is it censurable, we think, if occasionally the warmth of his feelings should glow into the language of eloquence. It is not surely a *sin* to *feel*. And the man who would speak or write without feeling, about the eternal interests of a perishing world, manifests a degree of coldness we do not envy.

"Some of its statements and conclusions are greatly exaggerated." As one instance, you refer to the calculation on page 106th, stating that the contributions of our church for missionary purposes might average \$1,00 annually for each member, making \$18,000—sufficient to support thirty foreign missionaries, until they could make arrangements to support themselves—or support 15 missionaries—and educate 90 young men for the ministry. What part of this calculation is exaggerated? The average, we think, is rather too *little* than too *great*. A far greater amount, we are confident, is annually thrown away by our members in *useless* expenditures.

Our Saviour said of the poor widow, that she cast in all that she had, even *all her living*. Would this be true of our church after she had deposited her \$18,000 in the treasury? We are only *stewards*. God *owns* all our worldly substance. To pay, then, \$1,00 a year to God of that which is entirely his *own*, is certainly not extravagant. Would this paltry sum exceed the *worth of the Bible*? Would it be too much to pay for the *gospel of Christ*—and the salvation of *immortal souls*? The Jews gave the one tenth. Should New Testament Christians give less? Is our dispensation *more obscure—more burdensome*? The primitive Christians sold their possessions, and laid them *all* at the apostles' feet. Did they give *too much*, or are our obligations *less* than theirs? Or even if we should be compelled to deduct something from our rich dress—high living—grand carriages—and elegantly-furnished dwellings—we think it would admit of a question, whether humility and real, practical godliness would suffer much by the change. This calculation you cannot surely think to be exaggerated a "hundred-fold."—Each member, then, instead of \$1,00 annually, should contribute one cent, for the *spread of the gospel among the heathen*! Surely it must be an important object, which calls for so liberal a contribution! This \$18,000 would furnish \$600 a year, for each of the 30 missionaries—or the same amount for each of the 15, and \$100 annually, for the 90 young men in preparation. What extravagance is there in this, after careful examination we are unable to see. In the calculation on page 106th there are, indeed, three mistakes, perhaps typographical errors,—but of this we cannot be positive, as we have not now access to the original copy. They do not, however, in any way affect the train of reasoning.

You farther say, "A little more experience, a little hard, and ill-requited service in the church, and a few rebuffs from the enemy, will banish these vain imaginations, like the shapeless and unmeaning visions of the night." And shall these make us turn back, saint-hearted from the enemy, and prove treacherous to the cause of Christ? Never! no, never! We calculate on ill-requited service in the church, and rebuffs from the enemy; but neither of these is the standard either of our feelings or our principles. We are to take up our cross, and follow Christ through good, and through bad report. If our principles are to vary with the usage we receive, we may save ourselves the trouble of forming any principles at all.—From your last remarks, we would almost conclude that your heart beat responsive to ours. And gladly would we believe this to be the case. And our prayer to God is, that the same feelings which warm our breasts, may glow throughout our church, until she awakes from her long slumber, and sends to the *dying heathen* the leaves from the tree of life.

We will now state briefly our views on the subject of foreign missions. And permit us to say, that if wrong we are not so by *prejudice*. We have come to our conclusions from all the light within our reach: let our brethren convince us of our error, and we will be the first to renounce it. And we will as warmly oppose the very same principles as ever we have advocated them.—We believe our church should engage *immediately* in foreign missions, and this for the following reasons among many others:—

1st. From a consideration of the wants of the heathen.

Our people know that there are heathen in the world—that the Christian religion embraces but one little sunny spot, in the vast, moral waste; but do they know their situation—their character—their destitution of temporal comforts—the darkness of that night which envelops their mind, the grossness of that superstition that fetters their souls in its iron chain? Their wretchedness mocks at the little eloquence of language. From the deep silence of this *grave of souls*, a voice comes up far louder than words. A world sinking down into the flames of eternal fire, turn their last look of anguish to us, and entreat us by our love to them—to the blessed Bible and the dying Saviour, to send them the gospel. Can we refuse? To that extent to which we might have warned them, if we neglect, will not *their souls be required at our hands*? Let us imagine ourselves in their situation, and how would we act? When our brethren talk so coldly about the “want of men and means,” while a *world is dying*, they must pardon us if we manifest some little signs of uneasiness. Grant that we can do but *little*, should we refuse to do that *little* for the strange reason that we cannot do more? We profess to be followers of the Saviour, whose whole life was one uninterrupted scene of beneficence, and his dying aspirations those of the most God-like benevolence. But have we manifested the same spirit? We are soldiers of Christ—but where are the trophies of our battles and our victories? The church should be evangelistic as well as evangelical. The spirit of the gospel is diffusive in its very nature.

2dly. We have another argument from the *command* of our Saviour, contained Mat. xxviii. 19: “Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to *every creature*,” &c. Christ is the head of the church, and from him flows all its authority. Here then is his *positive command*—no provisions made for any circumstance—no possibility of any evasion. Gospel ministers are the persons commissioned—Christ the author of the commission—the *world* its extent. Here is the *charter* of the church, the great *reason* of her existence. This command either binds our church now, or it does not. If it does, our church should obey it, by *immediately* establishing a foreign mission. If it does not—cannot satisfactory reasons be given why? We confess we have not sufficient ingenuity to find them ourselves, and we have never heard them. Why then, when the fields are *white* to the harvest, stand we idle in the market place?

3rdly. From the *promises* made to Christ of the *heathen* for his *inheritance*, and the *uttermost parts of the earth* for his *possession*. “God hath sworn by his holiness,” and by “the right arm of his strength,” that the *whole earth* shall be filled with his glory, and *all flesh* shall see it together.” We are told again—“the peo-

ple shall praise thee, O God, *all the people* shall praise thee." "*All nations* whom thou hast made shall come and worship thee," "the *heathen* shall fear the name of the Lord, and *all kings* thy glory." But how are these promises to be fulfilled? The age of miracles is past—if fulfilled at all, they must be by human instrumentality. Open the Bible, and you find the corresponding duty of the church. "Declare his glory among the *heathen* and his wonders among *all people*." "Say unto the cities of Judah, and to the tribes of the *heathen*, Behold your God!" If any thing can be inferred from these promises at all, the duty of the church to send the gospel to the heathen now is certainly a fair inference.

4th. From the example of Christ—his apostles—and of the church in all reforming periods. Our Saviour was a *missionary* from heaven. And we are told that he went through "every village and city," preaching the word of life. The apostles, after they tarried a short time at Jerusalem, for the effusion of the Holy Spirit, commenced their labour of love as *missionaries* among the Gentiles. Paul—the great apostle of the Gentiles, was their great *missionary* too. And even before the death of the apostles—the banner of Jesus was waving in almost every land. And when we look back to the periods of reformation in the history of the church, we find that in the purest times, the greatest efforts were made to spread the gospel. Had the apostles, and our reforming fathers acted as we have done, and are doing, we *ourselves* would have been groping in the darkness of heathenism. If any argument can be drawn from the example of *Christ—his apostles—of the primitive church—and of all reformers*, we have the strongest evidence in favour of missionary operations.

5thly. From the reflex action on our church. Such is the constitution of things, that duty and interest are inseparably linked together. *Duty is interest, and interest is duty.* To secure *our own* happiness and interest, we must promote the happiness and interest of *every one else*. The Bible tells us that "the liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered himself." "He that *giveth* to the poor, lendeth unto the Lord," "Prove me, now, herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, If I will not open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, until there shall not be room enough to receive it." Glance for a moment over our church; the Lord is evidently pleading a controversy with us. While we sinfully plead, as an excuse, the smallness of our number, God is making that number still *less*. He has "blowed upon our ordinances; the heaven over us is stayed from dew, and the earth is staid from her fruit," because our church is *practically* saying, "the time is not come, the time for the Lord's house to be built." The church is a *living, active* body. *She must act*, and if her energies are not made to bear on the world, they will, must react on herself. And the more they are pent up, the more they will break out in unhappy, angry contentions. But let the stream flow on in its natural, appointed channel, and no injury follows. The cause of the heathen is emphatically the cause of our church. Never, we think, will these contentions be allayed—never will the spirit of true, practical piety be revived, never will the inroads of the world be arrested, which has padlocked every pocket—sealed every heart—palsied every arm, and which is now feeding its insatiable appetite,

on the very vitals of our church, until she becomes in every sense a missionary church. We ask then, for the sake of our ever beloved church, that this be made the subject of serious, prayerful thought. It is an old proverb—but contains a great deal of truth, “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure;” and we think this, as a preventive to the troubles of our church, is both surer, and safer than any remedy.

6thly. A door is already opened in providence. *Ethiopia is even now* stretching forth her hands to God. *India* is willing to receive missionaries. In the *Turkish Empire*, where long the blood-red flag of the “Orphan of Mecca” waived—the Christian religion is tolerated. China is now asking for the oracles of God. The frozen lands of Labrador—Greenland and Siberia, are asking to be blessed with the “Son of Righteousness” and from the scorching fields of the West Indies, long borne down under the soul-crushing system of slavery, comes up the cry for “help.” A voice comes up from the Isles of the Pacific from the “ends of the earth,” imploring us for the Bible, and the gospel of peace. And they tremble, lest the message of mercy should *come too late*. Our Saviour looks over his *neglected* heritage, measured out to him by his Father’s hand—he sees it grown over with briers and thorns; and he asks us by our love to him, by all he has done and suffered for us, to labour *then* in his vineyard. If we refuse, where are our bowels of compassion? Where our love to the Saviour—the Bible—the souls of men? To these questions we tremble to return an answer. Grant that we can do but *little*, how can we reason from *little* to nothing, that because we can do but *little*, therefore we may do *nothing*?

And if our church acts at all, why not *now*? Will the number of the heathen diminish? Will they become better? Will the hearts of our people swell with benevolence, and their coffers, of themselves fly open, while almost every channel of benevolence is closed. One word in explanation, concerning our Society. It meets monthly—and half of each meeting is devoted to prayer for the heathen. We correspond with several Seminaries—and are just opening a correspondence with a missionary station in the West Indies. We receive a number of periodicals and papers, and have a small library—any books or pamphlets containing information on *the object of our inquiry*, will be gratefully received by the Society.

Yours, in the bonds of Christian love, on behalf of the Associate Society of Inquiry,

Cor. { R. J. HAMMOND, }  
Com. { J. FISHER, }  
      { JOHN MARSHALL. }

### ART. III.—*Revolution in the Maryland Hospital.—Progress in Public Sentiment.*

THE *Sisters of Charity* have left the Maryland Hospital. That charity of the diocese of Baltimore is extinct, so far as Mr. Eccleston and Pope Gregory XVI. are concerned; and the Archbishop must rectify his Directory for 1840.

We had the pleasure of hearing a minister of Jesus Christ preach the gospel of his grace, the other Sabbath afternoon, in the very establishment in which *Priest Gildea* so long reigned; perhaps in



the very apartment in which he sung mass for years. And the poor inmates, who had spent so many silent and solitary Sabbaths, have now the glad tidings of salvation proclaimed to them stately; and join in the social and public worship of that great physician of souls, who alone can effectually minister to a mind diseased, and heal the wounded and broken spirit.

This fact is full of interest. We record it with gratitude as a signal proof of the progress of public sentiment; and as a manifest token of the blessing of God, on the cause of public liberty and protestant Christianity. This important institution, belonging to the protestant commonwealth of Maryland, and the only one of the kind for the reception and treatment of the insane; capable of containing, when in full operation, a hundred and fifty patients; has been for years a *papal* institution, and is so recorded in the Almanac of the Archbishop. It is papal no longer. It is again open to all. It is no longer a mass-house; no longer a general receptacle for travelling or straggling priests and nuns; no longer a sectarian institution for the private purposes of a superstition, and the public advancement of a false creed; it is no longer the Pope's, nor the Archbishop's, nor Dr. Deluol's, nor Priest Gildea's.—But it is again the Hospital of the State of Maryland, for the reception and treatment of the insane; open to all; managed for the good of society; used only for the comfort and cure of the unfortunate deranged.

This, it must be confessed, is worthy of being called a *revolution*; and though it is happily accomplished by peaceful means and inures more especially to the benefit of a small class of unfortunate persons, yet it is not the less worthy of remembrance on those accounts; especially as the dignity of the state, and the self-respect of society were both involved in the matter. We hope soon to record a revolution at the City and County Alms House, which will be number two; and another at the City Infirmary, which will be number three. The first victory of the public sentiment is won: the next will be easier; and each one in succession easier still. We do not despair of seeing the prisons for women thrown open by public authority; nor even of hearing the gospel preached in the Cathedral.—(See 1 Cor. xv. 58.)

We will tell the story of this revolution as we have heard it; not intending to perpetrate a libel on any body; and hoping that Mr. Pitts, at least, will not prosecute us if we do, as he has appeared again on a protestant platform, in advocacy of a *protestant* orphan school.

The public supposed all along that the services of the *Sisters of Charity* at the Hospital, were gratuitous; and our public press has kept up this delusion, by constant puffs; deluded, perhaps, itself, or possibly acting on the modern principle, that any thing (that is not too protestant) may be printed, if paid for; a most sweet and facile mode of making money out of the evil passions of society, and propagating for pay, what is rejected from principle. But it now turns out, that this was all a delusion; that the public paid a full price for the services of these charitable sisters; and that Priest Deluol, who hired them to the Hospital, (by what right we know not,) received some five or six dollars per month for each sister; which probably made a total of seven or eight hundred dollars a year, paid by the state to this priest, for the *gratuitous* services of these poor nuns.

These facts open a very wide field of speculation, on many parts of this subject; and we commend them to the serious reflections of the community.

When the good sisters got themselves well located in their new quarters, and had turned off every protestant employed about the establishment, and filled every nook and corner, capable of holding an attache, with a stout papist, their own personal wants and claims began to be cared for. It was necessary to have some mode in going to mass in bad weather. *Presto*—the State of Maryland paid for an establishment and hired a man to keep and drive it. But then it was discovered, that the good of the institution required the Sisters to stay there, when the good of their souls required them to be at mass somewhere else. *Presto encore*—the State of Maryland fitted up a mass-house in the Hospital. Then it was discovered that these expenses and fixtures were useless without a priest. *Presto encore*—Priest Gildea became confessor in the establishment. After this, it was discovered that Priest Gildea could not be expected to work for nothing; and, therefore, the State of Maryland must, as they say in the west, “fork up” once more. But here there was a difficulty; for, first, it would sound rather odd when the accounts should come to light, to hear them read, *so much for the salary of Priest Gildea, as confessor to nuns, paid by the state*; and secondly, there was an old orthodox Friend, or Quaker, on the Board, who had qualms of conscience about paying religious teachers. So they beat the bush, and beat a gentleman who shall be nameless around the stump; and appropriated as a bonus to the nuns, for good conduct, the sum asked for as an appropriation to Priest Gildea! And now behold, the whole affair arranged; the Hospital set down in the Archbishop's tally, as his charity: and every vestige of protestantism ready to vanish from this papal den, supported by the public purse.

Now at this point our story divides itself. There are two modes of accounting for the revolution, which ended the dynasty of the nuns. We will state both.

“*Jeahurun waxed fat and kicked.*” So, as some say, did the nuns. They interfered with the management of the Hospital in all possible ways; they were hired for nurses—but became mistresses; they ruled every thing—and not always either wisely or moderately. Finally, they usurped not only the moral but even the medical treatment of the patients. In this state of the affair, Dr. Fisher, the resident physician, complained to Dr. Stuart, the consulting physician, president of the Board, &c. &c.; and the result was, that Dr. Fisher and not the nuns—left the establishment. Then Dr. Starr came in; and after a few months laid a written memorial before the Board, and left the place. On this, the Board and the nuns came to a parley; negotiated, dissolved, parted company; and Dr. Fisher returned to the establishment. This is the public talk of the town; and it is, we believe, true; but there is more true besides, and leads to the second story.

We happen to know something about the doings of these worthy sisters. Several persons came to us with statements, that we did not choose to hear alone. Some, we made repeat them in the presence of witnesses; some, we made reduce them to writing; some, we sent to the officers of justice; to all we said, go before the grand jury;—they must redress you;—we can't. After these things, and about these times, the nuns and the Board quarrelled and parted.

We blame the Board only for putting and keeping these nuns there; not for their personal acts while there. But we do confess, we are not without suspicion that the nuns would not have been so ready to evacuate the establishment, had things been a little different. They may have been most excellent, most innocent; traduced by former inmates, as well as by the Board which turned them out of it. We don't say; nor, if we may add with all civility, do we care. If they had been the best nuns that ever were—and that we fear is none of the best—they had no business there; and the public is heartily glad they are there no longer.

We should leave a wrong impression on the mind of the reader, if we allowed him to suppose that we attach any great merit to those who have turned out the nuns; or that any body supposes this act was done on account of the protestant feelings of those who did it. Not at all. The public sentiment demanded the act? one way or other the thing was inevitable; and the general joy at its occurrence, leads a confiding community to place the matter on a more elevated ground than it deserves. The thing is done; that is good, and we ought not to look too narrowly after the motives of good conduct. But public sentiment did the thing; and it will do more and greater things besides.

This community is a protestant community; this commonwealth is a protestant commonwealth. These sentences contain the essence of every reform demanded, here, against papism. They are words too long forgotten. Their potency begins at length to be felt.—*Breckenridge's Magazine.*

---

#### ART. IV.—*Original Letters of Mr. Francis Wodrow, a suffering Covenanter of Bothwell Bridge.*

WE are sure that all our readers will thank us for the following letters of an uncle of the historian. They afford a fine specimen of Christian magnanimity, and patience in circumstances peculiarly affecting. The author had been at Bothwell Bridge, 1679, and was one of those who, for *five months*, were imprisoned in the Greyfriars' churchyard, where peculiar hardships were their lot. It was on June 24th, after a lengthened and harassing march, twelve hundred prisoners were brought to Edinburgh, where the privy council gave orders to the magistrates "to put them into the inner Greyfriars' churchyard, with convenient guards to wait upon them, who are to have at least twenty for sentries in the night time, and eight in the day time; of which sentries, the officers shall keep a particular list, that if any of the prisoners escape, the sentries may assure themselves to cast the dice, and answer body for body for the fugitive."\* They were kept in the open air; and all night they were made to lie down, without any accommodation almost, upon the cold ground, where they had stood all day. Their allowance, procured by the kindness of Monmouth, who was really a kind-hearted man, was a barrel of ale among them all, and a loaf of coarse bread to each per day. The former of these comforts was soon withdrawn, and their bread was to be of weight only four ounces,

\* Proclamation of Council.

and even this was seldom given in full tale. "Towards winter," says Wodrow, "a few weeks before they were brought out of this place, some huts, made of deals, were set up for them, which was mightily boasted as a great favour." Many of these poor people escaped from time to time over the walls, and of those who remained in this strange kind of prison till November, two hundred and fifty-seven were carried under guard to Leith, and put on board a ship for foreign parts. After suffering great hardships from close confinement, a severe storm arose when off Orkney, in December. The vessel split asunder, and was lost. The prisoners had been put under the hatches, which the seamen, by order of the captain, were prohibited from opening; and, with the exception of forty, who got hold of boards of the ship and came ashore, the rest perished.\*—We cannot conceive a finer specimen of the triumphs of faith in circumstances of extreme distress than that exhibited in the following letters, written to near relatives by a young man under trials and privations which it required no common grace to sustain.

*For his loving and dear Mother, Margaret Buntine in Glasgow.*

LOVING AND DEAR MOTHER,—With my father, I say, reverence the Providence of our God who doeth all things weell, and can do nothing wrong; for whatsoever he doeth is weell done, and my soul sayeth Amen. It was not by force that I came out, neither against my will; but that word had great weight upon me, "Curse ye Meroz, said the Angel of the Lord, which came not up to the help of the Lord against the mighty," with the dire judgment that was lying on all ranks of the land. Now, if it shall be said I was not in a fit capacity for it; I answer, there are upon the other syde, I mean with the enemies, also feckless as I am. Now also consider, that it is neither by many nor by the strong that the Lord delivereth, for when his tyme is come he can save als weell by few als by many, by weak as by strong, as ye will find it in the 7 of Judges, anent Gideon with his 30,000, where the Lord counsellis him to change the 30,000 into 300, where ye see a proof of God to his people, and also glory to himself, by saving by soe few, and also for a proof in God's strength for weakness, when he is pleased to make use of them, as ye will find in 1 Sam. xvii. 44, concerning David with Goliath, where you will find how the young man overcame the great Goliath. But now concerning this matter I shall not insist. Loving mother, I must confess ye are trysted with very sad dispensations of Providence; what by one emergent and another, I confess it is even sad for you to want me, (especially now when I am past the worst, as we use to say;) being past my apprenticeship, and come to the years of discretion, I thought also to have somewhat been helpful to you, under God. But praise to him that has chose me out for this very end. But I am hopeful ye are content to give me up heartily to yt same God my father has suffered for already, and upon the same cause I am content either to suffer yet, by banishment or yet by death, whatsoever he shall tryset me with, therewith I desire to be content, through his strength; and now this is all the legacie I leave you, in this testament of myne, even the God of Abraham,

\* In the third volume of the new edition of Wodrow's History, the affecting tale is told at length, pp. 120, &c.

the God of Isaac and Jacob, and our covenanted God and Father, which ye and your children were given up to at my father's death. And now, my mother, you and I dare not say but God has been very kynd to us, and also he has fulfilled that word as concerning you, Isaiah liv. 5: "For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name;" for he is a father to the fatherless, and a comforter to the widow, and it is also said, "Cast thy fatherless children on me, saith the Lord, on me." And now I leave and commit you and your children to the great God. It is now very probable, my mother, that neither of us shall see another in the face again; and I now may be much afraid indeed of the breach of the fifth commandment, (O for the breach of it,) with the breach of all; and now I may be afraid of that which is imported thereby, I mean the threatening of it; for it is said, in the end of the command, "that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." And now what may be expected to come on the breakers, but to be cut off in the midst of their years? but, however, if he shall see it fit, I desyre to be content. There is a word now that we are to be banished upon Monday first: if it be soe, we can say nothing: the will of the Lord be done. He that has dissappoynted them many a time, can dissappoynt them yet also; we hear also that part of us is to get our indyement if not gotten already. However, God is over all, blessed for ever, and he has the ordering of them all in his hands, and he must give the command ere it be done, and devills and men both are but his servants to execute his will. And now, what shall I say, seeing it is our God, seeing it is our Father in Christ, it is our Master whom we serve, and the least outgate is through his strength; what need we fear? Truly if it were our enemy, if it were God that was against us, we might then tremble and be afraid to go on in our course and way; but seeing it is for his cause, and for his worship, and upon his account that we are taken, and also fotch in bound from Hamiltoune Moor to this kirk-yard, as malefactors and, as they call it, rebels, yet praise be to our God, we dare hold up our faces to him with boldness through Christ, and say, it was not our intention to rise as rebels against our king, or to wrong him in any thing that belonged to his just power and authority; but the reason of our rising was to suppress and bear down poperie, which is now so much connived at, if not allowed, by many in our land, with the extirpation of prelacie, which has done so much wrong and prejudice to the work and interest of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ; and now I am very much afraid for that woeful Rod of the Assyrians, which has been soe much threatened this long tyme by past, that is approaching and drawing near, according to those blessed prophesyings which we have heard in the fields, for accomplishing the sad judgments of our God, and that upon many accounts. 1. For a slighted gospel and undervalued ministrie, and a no less thing than a despising of a crucified Saviour. 2. There is the breach of covenant, breach of vows, bonds and obligations to the great God of heaven, and what shall I say more, obstinacie of heart, and little love to God and his work and people, and nothing but pryde and haughtiness, and a minding of earthly things. Let any pure and sincere Christian judge and see what these things call for at the hand of a holy and a heart-searching God, which cannot behold sin nor iniquity in his people; and now

whatsoever become of us, it is but little matter. But alace and alace for the borne doun work of our God in thee, O Scotland; we could easily submit to the will of our God, either to be banished or any other thing whatsoever he shall be pleased to call for at our hands, through his strength. But O for the borne doun work of God in the land. It would be the enjoyment of our hearts to hear or to see the work of God yet abounding in our land. We are very much afraid that the winter of affliction be not yet past; but if our God, in his wise providence and loving-kindness, doe not prevent it, we are afraid that the storm is but yet beginning; we say, if mercy prevent it not. O that he would return and work for himself, when there is none left, but shut up and the power of his people is gone. And now I can say no more, but (with my father) study to be a sincere seeker of his face, or else ye will be nothing at all. And also for my poor brethren, I would leave it on you that ye would be all of you sincere Christians, which, I grant, is sooner said than done; but yet study the use of the means, read and pray much, be obedient to your mother, and I shall leave my blessing upon you, and the blessing of him that dwelt in the bush be upon you all, your covenanted God and Father, his blessing be upon you all, and all the blessings of the bible be upon you; and if he shall call for it at your hands, let us all follow our father, or rather our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who has went before, and trodden the wine-press himself alone; he endured the cross, despised the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of God, and there shall all his followers be, when they have overcome and finished their course. Now I shall say no more, but leave you upon him who is God all-sufficient, and careth for the poor and needy, and loves all those who are left upon him. He is a good master to serve indeed, and this I desire to say by experience. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father be upon you and all the Lord's people for ever. Amen.

I am,

Your loving and affectionate Son,

FRANCIS WODROW.

From Greyfriars' Churchyard, 1679.

*For his loving Sister, Margaret Wodrow.*

LOVING AND DEAR SISTER,—I have my love heartily commended to you, and all my friends, showing you that I have my health prettie weell since I parted with you, (praise to God for it,) wishing to hear the lyke from you. I can say but little to you as concerning the obligations that's lying on me, and the tyes to God; they are innumerable, of which ye know partly yourself weell. I cannot say much, as I ought, concerning his name, but unto him be the praise for ever, for all his loving-kindness to me wards; and let angels and glorified spirits praise him, and my soul love and praise him who delyvered me out of more nor one or two dangers, and this last one you know of, which was not little grief of mind to me, how to be delyvered out of it; to him be the praise, who has delyvered me out of the present one also. Now I say no more, but remember me to my mother, brethren, and uncles, and to my aunt, and to all friends in Glasgow when ye go there; and ye may tell both I. W. and J. H. that I would have thought that they would not have been so unkind to me, in scarcely sending me word, either by word or

wryte from them; ye may tell them when ye go there, it seems out of sight out of langour.\* No more at present, but wishes the blessing of the Lord, and my poor blessing to be upon you. I rest, your loving Brother,

FRANCIS WODROW.

## ART. V.—*A Catechism on Presbyterian Church Government.*

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Discipline of the Church.*

I. WHAT is the Scriptural character of a Christian Church?

1. It is a society of persons separated from the rest of mankind, John xvii. 16: "They are not of the world." Acts xix. 9: "When divers were hardened, he departed from them, and separated the disciples. 2. Professing to believe in Christ. Acts viii. 37: "He answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."—To be sanctified by his Spirit. 1 Cor. 1, 2: "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth; to them that are sanctified;"—and to observe his ordinances. 1 Cor. xi. 2: "And keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you." Matt. xxviii. 20: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

II. By what means is this character to be preserved?

By the faithful exercise of a Scriptural discipline. 1 Cor. v. 7: "Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, (See context.)

III. What should be the conduct of a Church Court in exercising discipline?

It should be, 1st, *orderly*. 1 Cor. xiv. 40: "Let all things be done decently and in order." 2d, *Meek*. Gal. vi. 1: "Restore such a one in the spirit of meekness." 3d, *Solemn*. 1 Pet. iv. 11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 4th, *Impartial*. 1 Tim. v. 21: "Doing nothing by partiality."

IV. In admitting to membership in the Church, are the rulers bound to receive those *only* who are *really* saints?

That any man is *really* a saint, can be known only to God. It would, therefore, be absurd to make what *must be a secret to men*, the ground of their forming a judgment. (See Deut. xxix. 29.) Our Lord and his Apostles have taught us, that the *secret state* of the soul is not to be the subject of our judgment, when persons apply for membership in the visible Church. Christ sent forth Judas, an infidel and traitor, as a preacher, admitted him to his fellowship, and perhaps to partake of his supper, (see Luke xxii. 19, 20, 21;) and did not cut him off till he had proved his hypocrisy by an *overt act*. So did inspired Apostles to Simon Magus, (See Acts viii. 13, 23; see also Matt. xxv. 1, 2.)

V. What, then, entitles an individual to the communion of the church?

His giving a *credible profession* of faith in Christ. Acts xix. 18: "And many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds." (Acts viii. 12.) But the infants of believers are also to be regarded as members, and as having a title to baptism. Gen. xvii. 7: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after

\* Loving remembrance.

thee." Ver. 12: "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised;" compared with Acts ii. 38: "Repent, and be baptized; for the promise is unto you and to your *children*." See, also, Matt. xix. 14: "Suffer *little children*, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." 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*." Acts xvi. 15: "She was baptized and her *household*." 1 Cor. i. 16: "I baptized also the *household* of Stephanas." Acts xvi. 33: "Was baptized, he and *all his* straight-way."

VI. When is a person to be regarded as making a *credible* profession?

That man is to be viewed as making a credible profession of religion, who manifests an acquaintance with the leading doctrines of the Gospel, who declares himself a believer in these doctrines, who professes that his heart has been renewed by the Spirit of God, and who maintains a conduct and conversation becoming the Gospel. Rom. x. 10: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Acts xvi. 33: "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized." Luke iii. 8: "Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance."

VII. But did not the Apostles receive persons into the Church by baptism, without waiting for any evidence of the *credibility* of their profession?

All who then joined the Church, did so at the risk of liberty, property, and life; and this, of itself, was a most satisfactory evidence of their sincerity in making such profession.

VIII. Do the members of the Church, after their admission, continue subject to the authority of the Rulers?

Yes. Such authority on the one part, and obedience on the other, are most plainly sanctioned by the law of Christ. 1 Cor. v. 12, 13: "Do not ye judge them that are within?" "But them that are without God judgeth." Heb. xiii. 17: "Obey them that have the rule over you."

IX. For what offences are members liable to trial, and Church censure?

It would be wrong to subject a member to Church censure or even trial, for every misdemeanor; but they are to be rejected for:—

1. *Errors in doctrine.* Rom. xvi. 17: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the *doctrine* which ye have learned, and avoid them." Tit. iii. 10: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject."

2. *Immorality in practice.* 2 Chron. xxiii. 19: "He set the porters at the gates of the house of the Lord, that none which were unclean in any thing should enter in." Eph. v. 11: "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." See, also, Rev. ii. 20.

3. *Despising the authority, or order, or ordinances of the Church.* 1 Cor. xi. 2: "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." 2 Thess. 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, and not after the tradition which he received of us."

4. *Neglecting the public, domestic, or secret duties of religion.* Heb. x. 25: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is." Jer. x. 25: "Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the *families that call not on thy name.*" Matt. vi 6: "But thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet; and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret."

X. Do all offences subject the person to the same censure?

No. For as the degrees of guilt are different, so should be the punishment. (See Matt. v. xxii.) Hence some are to be *rebuked*. Tit. i. 13; "Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." Others *suspended* from the privileges of the Church. 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." Others *cut off* from connexion with the Church. 1 Cor. v. 13: "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Gal. v. 12: "I would that they were even *cut off* which trouble you."

XI. Does not Scripture attach a solemn importance to the censures of the Church?

Yes; for the sentence, when pronounced according to Christ's law, is ratified in heaven; and if the individual be wholly "cut off" from the church, he is delivered up to Satan, the god of this world, as a subject of his visible kingdom. Matt. xviii. 18: "Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." 1 Cor. v 5: "To deliver such a one unto Satan." 1 Tim. i. 20: "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme."

XII. What is the duty of those who have been judged worthy of censure?

To humble themselves under it—to submit to it, to repent and do their first works. 1 Pet. v. 6: "Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." Heb. xiii. 17: "Submit yourselves." Rev. ii. 5: "Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works."

XIII. Is it lawful ever to restore to the communion of the church one who has been suspended, or cut off?

Yes, it is. Whenever sufficient evidence has been afforded of repentance and reformation, he may be restored. Gal. vi. 1: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such a one, in the spirit of meekness." John xx. 23: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them."

XIV. Are any censures to be made public?

Yes, such as are occasioned by offences which from their magnitude and publicity, are calculated to bring scandal on the Church, 2 Cor. ii. 6: "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of *many.*" 1 Tim. v. 20: "Them that sin rebuke *before all*, that others also may fear."

XV. Does any sentence of the Church exclude an individual from hearing the Gospel preached?

No. It is to be preached to the guiltiest, (See 1 Cor. xiv. 25;) and it is especially the duty of such to attend on the ministrations of the word.

XVI. Is injury done to the people of God, by the neglect of discipline in the Church?

Yes. When the Church is not kept pure, godly persons will be deterred from joining it. 1 Cor. v. 11: "But now I have written unto you not to keep company; if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one, no, not to eat." 1 Cor. x. 20: "I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils." And those in the Church who are, or may become pious, will be obliged to separate from it. Rev. xviii. 4: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

XVII. Is injury done to the sinner by such neglect?

Yes. By it he will be confirmed in his carelessness, self-deception, and sin. Ez. xiii. 10, 22: "They have seduced my people, saying Peace, and there was no peace; and one built up a wall, and lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar." "With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." And as the last means appointed by Christ, to lead him to repentance is neglected, he is in great danger of finally perishing. 1 Cor. v. 5: "To deliver such a one unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

XVIII. Is injury done to the Church by this neglect?

Yes. 1st, By this countenancing of sin, the Church of Christ is made to appear as unholy as the kingdom of Satan. Jer. vii. 11: "Is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?" 1 Cor. xi. 21, 22: "One is hungry, and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God?" 2d. Sacred ordinances are prostituted. Ezek. xxii. 26: "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean." 3d. The Head of the Church is dishonoured. 2 Sam. xii. 14: "By this deed, thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme." Rom. ii. 24: "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles, through you." 4th. The Holy Spirit is grieved, and provoked to withdraw. Eph. iv. 30: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit." Gen. vi. 3: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Rev. ii. 5: "I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." 5th. The wrath of God is brought on the Church. Joshua xxii. 20: "Did not Achan commit a trespass in the accursed thing, and wrath fell on *all the congregation* of Israel? and that man perished *not alone* in his iniquity." 1 Chron. xv. 13: "The Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order." 1 Cor. xi. 30: "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep."

XIX. May not a Church so far apostatize by the neglect of discipline, as to cease to be a Church of Christ, and become a synagogue of Satan?

Yes. This has sometimes happened. Rev. ii. 9: "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." Rev. iii. 9: "Them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews." 16th verse—"Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

XX. What *benefits* may arise to the *offender* from the exercise of discipline?

By this he sees sin to be evil and shameful. 2 Thess. iii. 14: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." And if he receive the censure in a proper spirit, it has a powerful tendency to humble, reclaim, and edify him. 2 Cor. x. 8: "Our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification."

XXI. What benefits arise to the Church from the faithful exercise of discipline?

1. Hereby sinners are discouraged from hypocritically joining the Church, and the leaven which might infect the whole lump is purged out. 1 Cor. v. 7: Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump." 2d. The number of her true converts increased. Acts xvi. 4, 5: "As they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders, which were at Jerusalem: and *so were the Churches established in the faith, and increased in number, daily.*" Acts v. 11, 13, 14: "And great fear came upon all the Church, and upon as many as heard these things." "And of the rest, durst no man join himself to them; but the people magnified them. And believers were *the more added* to the Lord, *multitudes* both of men and women." 3d. Her holiness manifested. John ii. 16: "Take these things hence: make not my Father's house a house of merchandise." 4th. The honour of her Head vindicated. Ez. xxxvi. 23: "The heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you, before their eyes." 5th. And God's gracious presence and blessing secured. 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Rev. iii. 10: "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation."

XXII. But may not the offender, by the exercise of discipline, be led to forsake the preaching of the Gospel, and thus become more hardened?

As discipline is an ordinance of God, we must expect the *neglect*, rather than the *exercise*, of it to harden the sinner: but if, in his pride and obstinacy, he disregard the advantages which flow from it, when received in a right spirit, the rulers of the Church are not to be deterred from *their* duty, any more than the Minister of the Gospel, from preaching, because many are hardened by it, and have their guilt and danger increased. 2 Cor. ii. 16: "To the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other, the savour of life unto life." Jude 19: "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit."

XXIII. Are the rulers of the Church deeply responsible for the right exercise of discipline?

They who hold office by appointment from Christ, whose faithfulness will be followed by so many and great blessings,—whose negligence must be the source of such deep and lasting injuries to the Church, and dishonour to Christ, and evil to sinners—should feel themselves under a most solemn responsibility, in this matter, and must expect to be called to a most strict account, at the day of judgment, for the part which they act, in relation to it. 1 Pet. v. 4: “And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” Heb. xiii. 17: “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*.”

## CHAPTER IV.

*Objections to other Churches.*

I. Is not the Presbyterian Church properly denominated Protestant?

It is. Because, in common with the other Reformed Churches, it professes to adhere to the solemn protest which was taken by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, against the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome.

II. What are some of those errors in that Church against which the Reformed Churches protest?

They protest, among many other things, against the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy. Matt. xxiii. 8, 11; Eph. ii. 19, 20. They protest against the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. Acts xvii. 11; 2 Cor. i. 24. Against the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass. Acts iii. 20, 21; Heb. ix. 24—28; x. 12—14; Against the doctrine, that the good works of the saints are meritorious in the sight of God. Isa. lxiv. 6; Eph. ii. 8, 9; Rom. xi. 6: Against the doctrine of purgatory, and that prayers ought to be offered for the dead. Luke xvi. 22, 23; xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 John i. 7; Rev. xiv. 13. Against the doctrine, that saints, images, and relics, ought to be worshipped. Ex. xx. 4, 5; Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9. Against the doctrine, that the Scriptures ought not to be read by the laity. Deut. vi. 6, 7; Matt. xxii. 29; John v. 39. Against the doctrine, that celibacy and abstinence from certain kinds of meats, are connected with exalted piety, and superior sanctity of character. Lev. xxi. 10, 13; 1 Cor. vii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 3; iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 8. The Presbyterian Reformed Churches bear their testimony against these and many other errors of the Church of Rome, as being anti-Christian, and destructive to the souls of men.

III. In what light do Presbyterians view the Protestant Established Churches of England and Ireland?

They regard them as Churches of Christ; but, at the same time, so unscriptural in their constitution and administration, as to oblige them to maintain a separate communion.

IV. What is there in the constitution and administration of these Churches, to which Presbyterians object?

1. They object to the power and authority, in spiritual matters, which these Churches declare to be vested in the supreme magistrate, whether male or female. (See Act 26, of Henry VIII., chap. 1.) By which it is enacted, “that the king hath full power and authority to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical,

and reform and correct all vice, sins, errors, heresies, whatsoever." "And see also, in the 34th Article, in which it is asserted, that, whosoever doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, hurteth the authority of the magistrate." Matt. xxiii. 10; Eph. i. 22.

2. They object to these Churches, that, according to their constitution, the Parliament of the nation, consisting of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Quakers, Papists and Infidels, have the power of determining how many prelates and pastors they shall have; as exemplified in late Acts of the Legislature, in diminishing, to a great extent, the number of their Bishops in Ireland.

3. They object, that in consequence of this control and authority, which these Churches concede to the civil government in religious things, they are rendered incapable of reforming, purifying, or extending themselves, or correcting any errors or abuses in their system.

4. Holding, as Presbyterians do, that Christ has ordained in his word, all the institutions which his infinite wisdom judged necessary for the edification of his spiritual body, and has taught the best possible manner in which they are to be administered and observed, they object to the power claimed by these Churches, to decree rites and ceremonies in the worship of God, (see Article 20,) and to alter the mode in which he has appointed his own institutions to be observed. Prov. xxx. 6; Rev. xxii. 18.

5. They object to such ceremonies as the following, which these Churches have decreed, and which have no warrant in Scripture:—The numerous festivals appointed and observed by these Churches,—sponsors in baptism,—*the absurd and sinful* practice of sponsors making vows in the name of the child, and of taking on them obligations which are not intended to be fulfilled, and which parents alone can fulfil,—using the sign of the cross in baptism,—confirmation by a prelate,—bowing at the name of *Jesus*,—kneeling at the Lord's Supper,—the private administration of the Lord's Supper,—consecration of Churches, burying-grounds, and the sacramental elements,—the superstitious use made of the bread and wine remaining after the communion,—and the absolution of the sick. Matt. xv. 9.

As some of these ceremonies appear unimportant in themselves, why is the observance of them a ground of serious objection?

Because such observance encourages superstition and "will-worship;" is opposed to the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as the only rule of faith and practice; and upholds the unscriptural and pernicious principle, that men may innocently and profitably add to the institutions of Christ, and the terms of communion in his Church Col. ii. 20, 23.

6. They object to "The Book of Common Prayer," considering that the use of it tends to prevent the exercise of spiritual gifts, and induce formality and deadness in devotion; and that, in its general form and construction, it is imperfect and erroneous, containing useless repetitions,—unsuitable petitions,—lessons from the Apocrypha,—a confused and irregular arrangement of the prayers,—and bears so general a resemblance to the mass book, from which many of its prayers are taken.

7. They object to the exercise of Church government, and the power of ordination being vested exclusively in the unscriptural order of prelates. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

8. They object to the numerous unscriptural offices in those Churches;—as of archbishop, diocesan bishop, archdeacon, dean, prebendary, canon, vicar, commissary, chancellor, surrogate, and proctor,—offices never appointed by Christ, and first created by the Pope of Rome.

9. They object to the doctrine, that by water-baptism an infant is “regenerated,” “made a member of Christ,” and “the child of God,” Jas. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23.

10. They object to the extreme laxity of these Churches, in reference to the characters whom they admit to their communion and privileges; and to the circumstance, that any of her godly ministers, attempting to exercise a Scriptural discipline, are exposed to legal prosecution, and civil penalties.

11. They object to their power of inflicting and removing ecclesiastical censures being vested in and exercised by laymen, in what are termed bishop’s courts.

12. They object to the depriving the members of the Church of the right of choosing their own Pastors; and to presentation to Churches by patrons of all description of character and opinion.\*

V. In what light do Presbyterians view those Churches, called Independent, or Congregational?

They regard all of them who profess what are termed the doctrines of grace, as being also Churches of Christ; but object to their peculiar constitution,—the principle of which is, that particular congregations are churches independent of each other, and not subordinate to superior courts, and that all the members of the Church have authority to exercise government, and to vote in every case of discipline on which the Church is called to decide.

VI. Why do they object to this system of Church government?

1. It is inconsistent with the oneness of the Church, as founded on the *oneness* of her Divine Head,—her faith,—her baptism, and the whole system of her laws and ordinances; and with the description given of her in Scripture, by allusion to the human body. 1 Cor. xii. 12, 26, 27: to a kingdom, John xviii. 36: and to an army under one commander, Rev. xx. 9.

2. It is opposed to the constitution of the primitive Church. (See chapter 1, question 3, section 4.)

3. It confounds the distinction plainly expressed in Scripture, between the rulers of the Church, and those who are ruled. Heb. xiii. 17, 24.

4. Because of the disadvantages to which it is liable:

*First*, From the undue control which the people have it in their power to exercise over their Pastor. Should he, by faithfully preaching some truth disliked by them, or by reproofing some sin to which they are addicted, give any offence, or should the people, at any time, take a fancy for another preacher, he is liable at once to be expelled from his office.

*Second*, From the want of any Court of Review, to which an individual might appeal, in case of being aggrieved in judgment, through prejudice, or party feeling, or improper influence in the congregation of which he is Pastor or member. Acts xv. 2.

*Third*, From the inability of separate congregations to accomplish

\* A modified patronage exists in the Church of Scotland; but, in whatever degree it obtains, the Presbyterians of Ireland condemn it as unscriptural.

one of the most important purposes for which the church has been established on earth,—that is, to extend the kingdom of Christ. Independents, when making efforts to propagate the Gospel, are obliged to act, not in the character of a church, but as members of promiscuous societies.

*Fourth*, Because it is a system which, in some points, it is very inconvenient, if not wholly impracticable, to follow out. For example, in certain cases of gross offences, which are brought before the Church, such as fornication or adultery, the female members cannot without *great indelicacy and impropriety*, take a part in *hearing and judging*, as must be their duty, on the principles of Independence.

### CONCLUSION.

VII. What, then, are the general considerations which should attach Presbyterians, with zealous affection, to their own Church?

Its scriptural character, its freedom from those many weighty objections which lie against other systems, and the religious privileges and advantages which its members enjoy.

What are these privileges and advantages? Having the right of choosing their own Pastors and rulers,—freedom from despotic power on the one hand, and anarchy on the other, in the government of their Church,—the means and opportunities of bringing before the rulers of the Church, for investigation and judgment, unfaithfulness in Ministers and Elders, offences of Church members, and errors in doctrine,—the privilege and power of appeal from one Church Court to another, when their rights as citizens of Zion are injured or assailed; and such an ecclesiastical constitution and arrangement of their Church, that it contains within itself the capacity of reforming abuses and errors, and has the best machinery for extending the bounderies of the Redeemer's kingdom, and perfecting the body of Christ.

How should Presbyterians employ and improve these privileges? They should use them thankfully and faithfully for their own edification,—for bringing other Churches to conformity to the laws of Christ's house, and for prosecuting Missionary labours in their own land, and throughout the world, until all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God.

---

#### ART. VI.—*Remarks on the Correspondence between the Associate and Associate Reformed Church in 1822.*

This correspondence has been inserted, in compliance with the request of the person by whom it was sent forward for publication. The "advantage of its republication at this day," is not perceived by us, any farther than the information it may impart to those who were previously unacquainted with the historical fact, that such a correspondence occurred in the year 1822, between these two ecclesiastical bodies. What new causes or circumstances may exist *now*, different from those in operation in 1822, which might lead us to hope for a different result, we are not informed, and A. has not told us. That the "measures which have been taken by the Associate Reformed and Reformed Presbyterians, to prepare the way for a union of their respective churches," are to be regarded as a favourable circumstance, we have no evidence to believe; but many things

concur to impress us with the belief that the "Convention of the Reformed churches," has, by its action, already precluded all rational expectation of a scriptural union between them and the Associate Church.\* And the republication of this correspondence at the present time, will probably produce the same effect as A. ascribes to its first appearance, namely—"to leave the two bodies regarding each other with more unfriendly feelings than before."

Although the letter of our Synod stands unrepealed, yet, as it was not accepted by the other party, it can be no longer considered binding on us. It is a *dead* letter. Or, at least, it is so far dead, that a repeal or modification of it is entirely in the power of the Synod. It is not to be supposed, that a proposition, made in 1822 and rejected at that time, can be binding on the proposer in 1841. Its binding obligation, so far as it can be regarded in the light of a proposition, ceased the moment of its rejection by the other party.

This letter of our Synod, though excellent on the whole, and breathing a spirit of conciliation, which shows their great desire for union, is not wholly free from objections. Take the following as an example: "As, then, covenanting adds no new precept to the law of God, and the law of God does not require us to adhere to what we cannot *conscientiously approve*, no covenant engagements of ancestors can do it." The words placed in italic, may be construed into a rule of duty. The church abounds with professors of religion, who cannot conscientiously approve many of the requirements of the divine law. And this language appears to us, without any forced construction, to make conscience the rule for regulating the duty of covenanting. The law of God certainly requires a conscientious approbation of its precepts. If, then, the covenants of our ancestors were agreeable to that law, it requires of us a conscientious approbation of those covenants; nay more, an explicit assumption of them by our own personal act of covenanting. And we have said, by our public profession, that those covenants were scriptural, and the ecclesiastical portion binding on us. Therefore, persons who entertain conscientious scruples respecting the duty of covenanting, cannot make a consistent profession in our church. Why then talk of conscientious difficulties?

Besides, this letter would now require some additions, before it could be proposed as a basis of union to others, especially the Synod's Act respecting Slavery.

On the whole, then, we see no necessity for these discussions respecting unions with distinct ecclesiastical bodies as such. They are perplexing to the Church. They promise more than they perform. They look brilliant in the distance; brought near they are found mingled with much alloy. They rather dazzle than enlighten. They pervert true charity; they kindle false zeal; engender a worldly spirit, and tend more to the corruption than the purity of divine ordinances. What warrant have we from the word of God, to hold out one creed as a term of communion to *individuals*, and another to *ecclesiastical bodies*? Why not enter into a negotiation with every individual applicant for communion with us, and draw a compromise or basis of union, if you please, embracing some common ground, on which the church and the individual can meet and reconcile their differences?

\* That Convention proposed "Christian and Ministerial Communion between their ministers and members, under the authority of conventional law." That is, communion without union. Different ecclesiastical bodies testifying against each other in their avowed creed, and communing together under the authority of conventional law!



We have plenty of applicants on this principle. Why reject them? If the principle be right in the one case, it cannot be wrong in the other. We have set up a profession, and cordially invite to our communion all that agree with that profession, and we care not whether they come from Patagonia or Lapland, from China or the Rocky Mountains, singly, in company, or public bodies, the door is open to all that choose to COME IN AT THE DOOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.—Hérewith is forwarded to you for publication in the Monitor, the concluding part of the Correspondence between the Associate and Associate Reformed Churches in 1822, when the friends of union in these two churches were endeavouring to make up the breach by which they had so long been separated from each other. These endeavours, it is well known, were unsuccessful. How a correspondence which breathes such a Christian spirit, and from which it would appear that such a unanimity of views and cordiality of feeling existed between these two bodies, should have terminated without accomplishing any thing, the writer has not the means of ascertaining, nor would it likely be of much profit to your readers, to exhibit what might turn out to be nothing else than the weaknesses and mistaken policy of otherwise good men. But without entering into the question where the fault lay, that a correspondence which promised such beneficial results should have terminated without accomplishing any thing, unless, perhaps, to leave the two bodies regarding each other with more unfriendly feelings than before: might not the republication of this correspondence be of advantage to both churches at this day?

It is well known that the Associate Reformed and the Reformed Presbyterians, have for two years past been taking measures to prepare the way for a union of their respective churches, and, although they have addressed three sundry invitations to our Synod to take part in their deliberations, hitherto we have seen fit to refuse or evade accepting any such invitation. Is there not danger that we shall appear before the world as indifferent, if not unfriendly, to union in the Church of Christ? Is there not danger, of fostering such a spirit among ourselves, leading our people to think that we have no duty to perform in bringing together the dispersed of Israel into one; and is there no glaring inconsistency between praying that all the disciples of Christ may be *ONE*, and yet make no exertions that this desirable event may be attained? And this correspondence, evinces that we once considered union upon scriptural principles a desirable object, and here are the terms on which we propose to unite with the Associate Reformed Churches. Have we then fallen from these terms, or risen above them, or have we imbibed such a spirit since, that we are ready to say to our brethren, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou?" None of these things are to be supposed. Our last letter to that Synod, must be regarded as the terms on which we are willing to unite with them still; it stands to this day the unrepealed enactment of our church, holding out a solemn invitation to our brethren to become *one* with us, and a solemn declaration of the terms on which we can conscientiously unite with them. May we not then hope, that our brethren now proposing a union, will carefully view this correspondence, especially the concluding letter of our Synod containing the terms on which we proposed to unite with the Associate Reformed Church? For this purpose we would ask them to pub-

lish it in their religious papers, that the members of the proposed Convention may have it before them in their deliberations, or in framing an exhibition of principles for the United Church. And in the name of the torn, bleeding Church of Christ, we would ask them to weigh these terms carefully, and see if they cannot agree to them without any sacrifice of principle on their part. A.

The following is the correspondence referred to: it is taken from a pamphlet published by the Associate Church in 1822.

Philadelphia, May 23—29. Read a letter from Messrs. J. Riddell and Joseph Kerr, with an addition by Mr. R. Bruce, in regard to the subject of Union between the Associate Synod and the Associate Reformed Synod of the West. The consideration of said paper was made the order of the day for to-morrow, the 24th. The paper was again read, and after a brother had been employed in prayer for divine direction, the Synod resolved themselves into a committee of the whole. And the committee having reported that the whole paper had been the subject of consideration, the Synod appointed Dr. Banks, Messrs. Ramsey, Alexander Bullions, Peter Bullions and Heron, a committee to report on it for the consideration of Synod during their present session. On the 29th, the committee gave in their report, which was read and discussed, part by part. And the whole was read over as corrected, and after a brother had been employed in prayer, was unanimously approved.

The letter and report are as follow:

To the Moderator of the Associate Synod of North America, to meet at Philadelphia the 4th Wednesday of May, 1822.

The undersigned members of the committee, appointed by the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, to confer with the committee of the Associate Synod, relative to the Union of the two Churches, beg leave to state, that they have been deprived of an opportunity of giving you a more explicit declaration of their views, on the 2d, 3d, and 4th articles, of the basis of Union, in the manner you have asked it; and for this reason, that none of the members of your committee, but Mr. Bruce, attended our late meeting, which was called for this particular purpose. Therefore, with a view to lay before you in another way, what they believe are the views of their Synod on the articles in question, they transmit to you the following proposal. The bearing which it has on these articles is obvious, and, had you marked more particularly the aspects in which you wished to obtain a more explicit declaration of their views on these subjects, this communication might, perhaps, have been presented in a still more explicit form.

Their proposal is this. That the Associate Synod will receive the constitution and standards of this Church, comprehending the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms, larger and shorter, form of Church government and discipline, with the Directory for worship; and this Synod will receive the Testimony of the Associate Church, and agree that it shall be made a term of communion, so far as it may be understood. Provided the following parts be erased, viz. what relates to the controversy, concerning the purchase of the common benefits of life. Part 2d, article 9th, section 5th. And also part 1st, section 14th, wherein applicants for communion are required "to join

with" the late Antiburgher Synod of Scotland in certain testimonies, &c. This would require various and extensive reading, not within the reach of the far greater part, even of the Ministry, and altogether beyond the reach of the private members of both churches; and the erasure of this part will correspond with a principle laid down by the Associate Church, in their act approving the narrative, prefixed to the Testimony; wherein they declare, that "said narrative, from the very nature of the work, can make no part of their profession," &c. On this point, they further propose, that the Testimony be enlarged, by testifying against the Hopkinsian, and such other errors as the United Synod shall think proper—and as some have objected to the phraseology used by the Associate Reformed Church in speaking of psalmody, the Associate Synod shall have liberty to alter it, by using more unexceptionable language.

Should the first part of the proposal now made be acquiesced in, it will not be necessary to retain part 1st, section 16th of the Testimony, in as much as section 3d, of chapter 23d of the Constitution of this church accords substantially with the Testimony of your church on that point; therefore no qualifying clause will be necessary.

The information which the proposal as now stated gives you, with your answer to the following query, which is respectfully asked, will bring the expected union to an issue.

*Query.* Must a recognition of the principle, that the Church possesses the right of making covenants, in support of such principles, worship, or church order, as she may approve; and is the Church authorized, on the principles of descent, succession, or any other principle, to bind posterity to embrace her views, whether approved or not, or incur the guilt of perjury in case of refusal? And must the application of this principle, to the perpetual obligation of the national covenant of Scotland, and the league of the three kingdoms, be a sine qua non of union?

Your publishing in your printed minutes, this paper, with your judgment on the proposal, and answer to the query, it contains, and forwarding a copy to each member of this committee, is both requested and expected—and as you have published the proposed basis of union, and your own request of further information on certain articles from us, it will also be right to publish the views now given.

JOHN RIDDELL,  
JOSEPH KERR.

May 13th, 1822.

*To the Committee of the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, appointed to confer with the Committee of the Associate Church, relative to the union of the two Churches.*

REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,

Your letter of the 13th inst. has been laid before us, and the extracts from our minutes herewith transmitted, will inform you of the attention which it has received from us, and of our disposal of it. Its contents and spirit have given us the most unfeigned pleasure, and afford an additional evidence that the Lord is about to heal the divisions which have too long separated brethren.

With you we regret that two members of our Committee did not meet with you, that they might have been prepared to explain certain matters contained in your letter. We acknowledge with pleasure, that your statements and proposals go far to remove much of the difficulty we felt in ascertaining the precise sense, in which you un-

derstood the second, third, and fourth articles in the basis of union. The extent of this satisfaction will appear from the following remarks which we submit to you with that candour, regard for truth, and for the peace of the Church, which should characterize the proceedings of a court of Christ.

The first part of your proposal is, that we receive your Constitution. This, with the exception of the few articles which you have altered, we have verbatim et literatim received already, and have no objection to repeat it. The alterations to which we allude, are those made in the third section of the 23d chapter of the Confession of Faith—substituting “*authorizing*” for “*tolerating*” in the answer to the question, “What is forbidden in the second commandment?” and the phraseology which you use respecting Psalmody. We are not prepared to assert whether these be improvements or not, on the Westminster Confession of Faith; but we state with pleasure, that we perceive no tenet taught in them contrary to our received standards, and we do believe that there is no difference of sentiment between you and us on any part of the “Westminster Confession, Catechisms Larger and Shorter, Form of Presbyterial Church government, or Directory for worship.”—And what a pleasant consideration is it that there should be such an extensive harmony of sentiment between us, after a separation of forty years, and what encouragement to anticipate a happy union!

We mention this, that you may fully perceive that we have no objection on the ground of any part of our profession against accepting your Constitution. And it is impossible we can, as it and the Westminster Confession are one and the same, except in the articles specified. Notwithstanding, we would much prefer the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith itself, just as it stands, as the standard of the United Church. We are perfectly willing to co-operate with you, in new-modelling any article in the testimony which from its design must be altered, as errors and vices change; but we are very averse to alter the least part of that most venerable of all human productions, the Westminster Confession of Faith. The reasons that influence us are these, namely,—First, one alteration in it would prepare the way for others, till it would become mutilated, and perhaps utterly perverted. Secondly, retaining it in its present form, would go far to convince the world and the Church that divine truth, like its Author, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and that you and we are united in our profession of it. Thirdly, we would thus testify our union, with the numerous and respectable Churches of Jesus Christ which have received it as their standard, and prepare the way for their fellowship with us. These considerations have much weight with us, and others will occur to yourselves. Give both, we beseech you, brethren, a candid and impartial examination, and we flatter ourselves that on this matter there will be no diversity of sentiment.

The second part of your proposal respects your acceptance of our testimony. Your approbation of the general matter and form of that instrument gladdens our hearts, as it testifies your agreement with us in profession, and it will conduce much to facilitate the contemplated union. It would be very desirable that both bodies should coalesce without a single dissident—an attainment which has not been yet realized in the Union of Churches. On this account, we deem your proposal manly and wise, and what will prevent much labour, which

would have otherwise been indispensable in forming a testimony entirely new. You propose a few erasures from the testimony. These are happily very few, and we proceed to give our sentiments concerning them.

The first is the erasure of part 2d, article 9th, section 5th, respecting Christ's purchase of temporal benefits. This made no part of the *original* testimony of Seceders nor of the late statement of the principles of the Antiburghers in Scotland. As we profess to adhere to the same system of principles, this will convince you that we have no insuperable objection to the erasure of this article, from our terms of communion. On the other hand, as the omission of it might give occasion to disputes, hostile to the measure on which our hearts are set, and, as we hope to find your views of this matter the same with our own, we would much prefer a substitute in which the same truth may be exhibited in a more precise and definite manner, and we submit the following, of which the committees that may be appointed, may make a proper use in framing an article for that purpose, which shall be afterwards submitted to both Synods for their consideration, namely, "We declare also, that Christ has obtained complete and eternal redemption for his people. He has by his obedience to the death secured to them every spiritual blessing: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus;" it is through his blood that they obtain pardon of sin, and a title to eternal life, in their justification. It is through his blood they obtain sanctification, perseverance in grace, and eternal glory. Being united to Christ, the divine blessing rests on all their temporal enjoyments. They receive and enjoy the bounties of providence under the divine favour. The curse which is on the basket and store of the wicked, is, through Christ, graciously removed from theirs. The good creatures of God are sanctified to their use by the word of God and prayer—and it is through Christ that the enjoyment of temporal blessings is made subservient to their spiritual good, and to the glory of God. At the same time, temporal enjoyments themselves, such as food and raiment, in their earthly and perishing nature, and as the means of supporting animal life, are not to be considered as procured by the death of Christ."

You propose to erase part 1st, section 14th, from the Testimony, on account of the supposed impropriety of requiring an approbation of matters with which the generality of applicants for communion must necessarily be in a great measure unacquainted. We presume that both Churches consider themselves under obligation to recognise and approve the scriptural exertions of the Church in every age for maintaining pure and entire, the whole worship and ordinances of God—her past attainments, especially the scriptural exertions and attainments of the Church of Scotland and those of both branches of the secession. We wish to be distinctly understood, that we have no intention of requiring this approbation to be given in *conjunction* with any Church in Scotland; but only that the united Church approve those exertions and attainments she may deem scriptural and worthy of imitation. Let this principle be explicitly recognised, and we leave to yourselves the mode of recognition. Perhaps the most unexceptionable, would be to give a statement in the form of a narrative of those exertions and attainments which we ought to approve, and, in similar circumstances, to imitate. This may easily be effected

in a new narrative imperiously called for by the recent changes in the Churches.

You propose to extend the Testimony by condemning certain prevailing errors: this meets our cordial approbation.

You have permitted us to alter at our pleasure the language in which you express yourselves on Psalmody. This proposal satisfies us that your views accord with our well known sentiments on this subject. If the word "*merely*" were erased from the last sentence of the article respecting Psalmody in the Constitution, so as to read "no human composites," &c., it would express our views of the subject. But if the united Church adopt the Westminster Confession in the manner proposed by us, for the reasons specified, the article in the Testimony would express the doctrine of the united body on this matter.

The next part of your proposal is to expunge from the Testimony part 1st, section 16th, not because it expresses any sentiment different from your own, but solely because the same sentiments are expressed in chapter 23d, section 3d, of the Constitution. On a careful examination of your modification, and of our explanation, of said section, we ourselves perceive no opposition of sentiment. Yours contains, perhaps, one idea not recognised by us. You thus express it: "As the gospel revelation lays indispensable obligations upon all classes of people who are favoured with it, magistrates as such are bound to execute their respective offices in a subserviency thereto," (namely, to the kingdom of heaven,) "administering government on Christian principles, &c.

To satisfy you that there is here no opposition of sentiment between you and us on this subject, we extract the following quotation from a work which has been long known among us with general approbation. "The Christian magistrate ought to determine himself not merely by natural—but also by revealed or Christian principles, while all the concerns of earthly kingdoms, with all the influence that is competent to every civil station, so far as consistent with the nature thereof—should be subservient to the kingdom of Christ. And this is the case, as to all that countenancing and encouraging of the true friends of the Christian state—which he is very eminently and effectually capable of—with all the discountenancing and discouraging of the enemies of that state, which he is eminently and effectually capable of; without any encroachment on their natural or birth-right privileges upon religious accounts."

Gib's Display, vol. 1st, page 313, note, Edinburgh edition, 1774, of the authority of the present civil government.

If any thing farther were necessary to evince our perfect unanimity on this subject, all doubt is removed by your willingness, of which we have been informed by a letter from our member of the committee, to leave it to us to modify the article referred to in your Constitution, as we please. As we have already expressed a hope that the Westminster Confession will be received as it is, the article in the Testimony which you propose to erase, or something equivalent to it, would still be necessary. Instead, therefore, of its erasure, we would propose, that an article be framed by the Synod, when united, as the explanation of the united Associate Synod on the said article in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which shall embody the substance of the article in our Testimony, and of that in your

Constitution: which article, when approved, may be substituted instead of the article which is proposed to be erased.

The last part of your communication comes now to be considered.

This is contained in the following query:—"Must a recognition of the principle, that the church possesses the right of making covenants, in support of such principles, worship, or church order, as she may approve; and is the church authorized, on the principles of descent, succession, or any other principle, to bind posterity to embrace her views, whether approved or not, or incur the guilt of perjury in case of refusal; and must the application of this principle to the perpetual obligation of the national covenant of Scotland, and the league of the three kingdoms, be a *sine qua non* of union?"

To this query we are at some loss to give a satisfactory answer, as we are not sure if we fully understand it. On this account we deeply regret that our member of the united committee who attended your meeting is not present to explain your meaning, and that you yourselves have not exhibited it in the same precise and lucid manner as you have done the other parts of your proposal. At this moment, we are unable to find any of your individual or official publications concerning the matters to which it relates, except your Constitution, and the basis. We shall, however, as far as we do understand the questions, give you our views with candour on the subject.

You ask, "must a recognition of the principle, that the church possesses the right of making covenants in support of such principles, worship, or church order, as she may approve, be a *sine qua non* of Union." To this we answer in the affirmative. This she has not only a right to do; but in certain circumstances it becomes her duty. This is the truth expressed by us, and we think by you, when we both say, that "public covenanting is a moral duty, to be observed when the circumstances of the church require it." We apprehend, however, that it is on what follows that your difficulty rests, namely, "Is the Church authorized, on the principles of descent, succession, or any other principle, to bind posterity to embrace her views, whether approved or not; or incur the guilt of perjury in case of refusal?" This part of the query, taken as a whole, we have no hesitation answering in the negative. But it is necessary to distinguish. The covenant engagements of the church in past times are binding on posterity, so far as these are agreeable to the word of God, and suited to their circumstances, and no farther. This fact is, we think, clearly the doctrine of scripture, and is analagous to the operations of the public engagements even of civil societies. The law of God in the hand of the Mediator, which is the law of the church, binds her, antecedent to any covenant engagements, to the whole course of duty to which she can be bound by these engagements themselves. In other words, nothing can be rendered a duty by any covenant engagements, which was not previously required by the law of God itself. We therefore consider covenanting not as a transaction creating any new duty, but as a bringing of ourselves under a superadded and voluntary obligation to discharge what is previously our duty, by an explicit and formal and solemn acknowledgment of the duties required of us by the law of God, and a voluntary and solemn engagement of ourselves, in the strength of promised grace, to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, and to keep his judgments, and to do them. This we cannot but think is binding on the church in every age. As then covenanting adds no new precept to the law of God and the

law of God does not require us to adhere to what we cannot conscientiously approve, no covenant engagements of ancestors can do it.

The application of these principles to the national covenant of Scotland and the solemn league, explains to what extent we adhere to these instruments. They are the productions of fallible men, and were framed with a view to a particular state of the church. We approve of them only in so far as we judge them agreeable to the word of God, and consider ourselves as bound by them only in so far as they are or may be suited to the time and place in which we live. For a farther expression of the sentiments of this church on this subject, we refer you to part 1st, section 20th, 21st, 22d, and 23d of the Testimony, to which, so far as your letter states, you make no exception.

To yourselves, dear brethren, we feel much indebted for the manner in which you have stated your remarks and proposals, especially for bringing the matters in dispute within so narrow bounds. Present the statements which we have made in this communication to your brethren, and let them be candidly interpreted. A high regard for truth has long prevailed in all the branches of the Secession Church, and we trust will long continue. Let no principle of the religion of Christ be sacrificed in effecting our union. This would be too high a price for union, even in the Church of God. This would desecrate our union. Let the united Associate Presbyterian Church ever act, so as to justify their title to their proposed name. Our union ought to be not merely local and external, but in sentiment, in affection, and in practice. We do, however, beseech you to canvass the matter in the spirit of genuine conciliation, and, to enable you with the least inconvenience to bring our views before your brethren, we have instructed our clerk to furnish each of you with fifty copies of this letter, and the extracts from our Minutes relating to it.

"Now the God of peace and consolation grant us to be like-minded one toward another, according to Christ Jesus, that we may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and receive one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God.

FRANCIS PRINGLE, *Synod Clerk.*"

---

ART. VII.—*Shall the Ministers of Religion interfere in Politics?*

The following remarks are taken from the *Public Ledger*, a penny paper published in this city. It is seldom we meet with such sentiments from the secular press. We have no knowledge of the gentleman who conducts the *Ledger*, farther than he may be known by his editorials. But his paper has already won its way to popular favour, and appears to be daily gathering additional strength: he has attempted the right kind of reform in the newspaper press; has already done much to improve the morals of the community, and every friend of religious and political liberty, and the consequent happiness of the people, must ardently wish him success.

"We earnestly call the attention of the pulpit to this subject, for it is more immediately connected with the eternal interests of human beings than most clergymen seem to imagine. 'Sin is a reproach



to any people;' and we have the warrant of both revelation and experience, the word of God and the history of man, for saying that all national sins inevitably bring their reward. The Israelites sinned as a people, and the Almighty took away their republican liberty, and gave them the political bondage of monarchy for a punishment. They continued to sin, and he gave one portion of them to captivity and another to destruction. The liberated captives continued to sin, and he swept them from their father-land as a nation, and scattered them over the earth. Spain sinned as a nation, and fell from the summit of power to political insignificance and social anarchy; and her colonies, founded in blood, have waded through blood from despotism to disorganization. France sinned, and has passed through every modification of political mischief, from the tyranny of one to that of the million. The Creator operates by universal, infallible, and immutable laws, and will inflict the consequences of crime upon the perpetrators, as certainly through these laws, as through special interpositions. Now we ask any clergyman if a people do not commit a great national sin in tolerating an instrument of political corruption, that disseminates lies and false doctrines, leads those upon whom it operates into delusions about their political rights and duties, and excites all the evil passions to action upon those subjects where, in an especial manner, reason should guide, and love to God and man should govern? We say that the toleration of such an engine is a grievous national sin, and that its consequences will come in that general corruption which infallibly leads to political slavery, and to all those moral deformities which are its inseparable companions. Precisely such an engine is our political press, and hence the duty of the clergy to study, expose and denounce it.

"We shall be told that politics are not the province of the clergy, and therefore that their interference in this field should be repelled as destructive to liberty. Indeed! And what is liberty but individual moral government? What people are *free* but those who respect rights and perform duties? And how can rights and duties be understood, unless they are traced to their source, *the will of God for the happiness of man*? It would be strange indeed if civil government, the very instrument by which rights are to be protected and duties enforced, had no concern with those great moral principles upon which all rights and duties are founded; and equally strange if the very men whose duty is to teach these principles should be kept in ignorance of the very machinery through which they are applied to human affairs. In a republican government the clergy have no concern with politics!! As well might the teachers of this *wise* doctrine say that the clergy had no concern with Christianity; for republicanism and Christianity are synonymous, so far as the former extends. Christianity says, that the Creator gave rights and imposed duties, and prescribed republicanism as the best means of guarding one and enforcing the other; and hence the clergy, whose duty is to teach the principles and requirements of Christianity, ought to study and expound every thing that exercises any influence upon republicanism.

"We can see a wide difference between that interference of the clergy in politics which tends to an ecclesiastical authority, the government of the few over the many through the instrumentality of the church, and that which strives to teach the enlightened self-government which is the strongest guarantee for the equality of rights and

duties which God established for all. The one seeks to govern without right; the other to warn against unrighteous government. The one seeks to enslave the human mind, the other to liberate it. The one leads to tyranny, the other to freedom. "But shall our clergy engage in the strifes of partisan politics, and contend for the success of political favourites with all the rancour of interested politicians?" By no means. But they should warn the people against these very crimes. They should show that rancorous passions and selfish motives are always criminal, and especially so when carried into *politics*, the very machinery for protecting rights and enforcing duties. They should show that *politics*, rightly understood, require every man to love God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himself; and consequently forbid every thing which can impair this love, which can bring into action any feelings which reason and revelation condemn, every thing which leads to false doctrine, to hardness of heart, and contempt of God's word and commandments. Tried by such tests, what will be the fate of our partisan newspapers? And if they cannot endure the trial, are they not instruments of mischief? And if they are instruments of mischief, are not the clergy, who, as teachers of Christianity, are trustees of liberty, bound to examine, expose and rebuke them?"

---

ART. VIII.—*The Ten Virgins*.—Matt. xxv.

The luminaries mentioned in this parable are in the original (*lampadas*) and that word in our translation is rendered *lamps*. I need not pretend to inform any classical scholar that (*lampas*,) is not what ordinary English readers understand by a *lamp*; what we call a lamp being *luchnos*, in Latin *lucerna*: but (*lampas*,) signifies a *torch*.

This, however, being well known, a question may occur, how the oil was applied to such an instrument, or luminary as A TORCH?

Now, what occurs in India presents us with a ready answer. When we are going to travel at night, through unfrequented places in the country, where, keeping up a light, is very important, we do not trust ourselves to a lantern, as in a town or station; but a man is hired, who carries in his hand a kind of torch, having a large head of tow, or other bibulous substance; and in his left a *vessel*, (the *aryuor*, *angeion*, Mat. xxv. 4,) out of which he keeps occasionally pouring oil upon the lighted tow. This makes a large strong flame, much stronger than that of the wick of a lamp. The blaze brightens the whole path, and defies the power of rain or wind to extinguish it.

Before I was set to thinking, by observing this, I remember sometimes inaccurately quoting Holy Scripture, by exhorting the people of a congregation to have oil in *their lamps*. I believe I was not singular: whereas, if we look into Matthew, we find no such expression; but it is, there, "oil in their *vessels with their lamps*."

The principal use of this criticism is, that it rescues the figure of this awful parable from a great degradation, to which, in the present form, it is subject, from the misapprehension that a mere English reader has of it. We know that it is the will of our blessed Lord, and of the Holy Spirit, in this, and in other parts of the Scriptures, to picture that terrible event, the day of judgment, in some of the grandest descriptions that can strike upon the feelings of the read-

ers or hearers; as in Mat. xxv. 31, &c.; 1 Thess. iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 7, 9. If, then, we imagine the persons to be lying down, as is usual in those countries, with the dress they happened to have on, in order to take some sleep, and all at once the great cry or shout of many voices to be set up, and ten such torches to be ignited together, making whole streets, and the houses in them to reflect their light, and these joined, as I conclude, by others of the bridegroom's friends; here is a striking scene of such a kind as must have forced the attention, and thrilled the nerves of the hearers who understood the allusion. The whole representation is in harmony with the grand descriptions of the same subject in the holy word.—*Dub. Chris. Mag.*

#### ART. IX.—*Voluntary Associations.*

In the number for October last, it was proposed to discontinue the discussion of this knotty question, because all the writers were on one side; nothing new appeared to be offered, which led to the belief that most of our readers were either tired of the subject, or regarded it as uninteresting and unedifying.

An old friend and patron has sent us a few of his thoughts on the subject, which will be found below, under the signature of C. We have also, received a well written paper on the negative of this question, which will appear in the next number.

As to C's. *rally* of the editor, he would remind him that he gave "no pledge to sustain the negative single-handed;" (see Vol. 16, p. 499,) that he was forced to yield a reluctant assent to the affirmative, overpowered by superior numbers and *verbiage*, if C. will have it so, and not an ally, nor a companion in arms to stand by him; and that he expired (when he could do nothing else,) declaiming against the expediency of voluntary societies, unless in extraordinary circumstances. (See number for October, p. 237.) Now, we appeal to all military men if it was soldier-like in C. and other *best writers* of the main army, to lie snugly housed in their cantonments till the vanguard, consisting of a single individual, was killed off by "boys and old women!" We have no disposition to restrict the freedom of discussion; and if C's. arguments should only prove equal to his confidence, we have no expectation ever to see him among either the "slain" or "vanquished;" but anticipate a rich intellectual treat for the readers of the Monitor.

To be a little more grave, we consider the subject very important, and desire the reader not to be guided by any opinions either of the editor or others. Every Christian is bound to investigate for himself. Our *prejudices*, if any please to call them such, and long habits of thinking, are against these societies; and yet the writers on the affirmative side adduced arguments which *seemed* to establish the position, that such societies may be warrantable in extraordinary circumstances; at least, we could not answer them with any degree of self-satisfaction. If others can accomplish what the editor failed in, they shall not be deprived of the privilege by him. If a heathen was

commissioned to preach to Jonah when fleeing from duty, may not God employ voluntaries to preach to apostatizing churches? How far those examples, drawn from the stupendous miracles employed in making and confirming divine revelation, are applicable to our circumstances, now the canon of scripture has been closed, is a problem not easily solved; but do not both these cases involve the same principle? that is, are not the efforts of these societies and the preaching of the heathen mariner alike? If not, wherein lies the difference?

*September, 1840.*

DEAR SIR,—I am displeased with one admission that the editor has made, namely, that the advocates of societyism have the best of the arguments on their side, or something to that amount. Now, I think that it would be correct to say that they have the most *verbiage* on their side; and though it may be true, that they have the most arguments on their side, I think they are adduced for the proof of erroneous propositions. I think that the editor has given us some solid scripture arguments, and for this reason, I think them better than many which are not scriptural. Now I have been led to think that all their arguments are based on this very erroneous supposition, namely, that men, without voluntary associations, are not organized for action on any moral and civil questions. Now they certainly will not deny that men in civil society are organized for acting on civil questions: neither can it be denied but that every denomination of Christians are already organized for acting on moral questions.

It will not be denied that these are divine institutions, and if so, then their adaptation to answer the end for which they are designed ought not to be questioned. Both the church and the state have all the necessary officers; these officers have laid before them all necessary directions for the discharge of all the duties of their office; they have divine authority for acting in their own sphere. Again; these officers have laid before them the motives by which they should be actuated in receiving their office, and in the discharge of the duties thereof. Again; they have before them all the necessary penalties to deter them from neglecting the duties of their office. Then we may say, concerning the church, First, that it is a divine institution. Secondly, that all her officers are divinely appointed. Thirdly, their duties are assigned them by divine wisdom; and directions for the discharge of those duties also. Fourthly, they have divine authority for acting in their office. Fifthly, they have placed before them divine motives and divine penalties to urge them to faithfulness. Sixthly, they have divine favour and the divine presence promised to them in the faithful discharge of their duty: "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Now here is much that can be said for divine institutions, which cannot be said for those of man. We wait not to draw the contrast; each one can do this for himself; and when the contrast is made, then we may say concerning the divine institutions, they are faultless, they are all-sufficient, they are perfect, they are holy. But of the human, they are faulty, they are insufficient, imperfect and unholy; because they come in competition with divine institutions; they are instituted on the presumption that the divine institutions are insufficient, that they need the help of human institutions. It is on the presumption that divine institutions will get all out of gear, and that human institutions must help them out of the difficulty. Now I do not believe that God will be helped thus.

Let us judge of their comparative excellency from the institutions themselves, before we say any thing of their comparative usefulness, and in judging of their excellency, let us not forget to take into consideration their respective origins and sanctions. Now we know that the design for which the church was given was to glorify God, and sanctify his saints. But we have great reason to fear that voluntary associations were instituted for the glory of man, and of course, for the corrupting of the saints.

I am becoming more and more convinced that the only way to decide this perplexing controversy is, always to remember that God's institutions are divine, spiritual, life-giving, and derive their character from his own glorious character: all man's institutions are human, carnal, have at least something deadly about them, because they derive their character from his character. As corrupt and carnal, he carries about with him a body of sin and death, and all he does and says, is corrupted with it; then all human institutions are necessarily sinful, unless the authors be sinless.

Thus, I think we may say of all human institutions, as well as of all men, they were "shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin," and we may certainly look for them to bring forth the fruits of sin, and receive the wages of sin; they shall not continue, but the church and the saints shall be co-existent; not, it is true, as now organized, but it will be a church while there are any saints to be sanctified. Then you may see from this, that the first objection that I have to voluntary institutions is, that they are of human origin, and their character cannot be purer than that of their authors. (And if you should think any of these remarks worthy of a place in the Monitor, it is my intention to give you a number of other kindred objections.)

Now, we know that there is much corruption found in the church, but we know that it, as an institution, is holy; then the corruption found in the pale of the church, must have its origin in its members. Then, if the church, as an institution, be sufficient, spiritual, and divine, all attempts at reforming these corruptions, ought to be made by way of acknowledging its sufficiency, &c., and searching first, for the cause of these corruptions; and secondly, for the proper remedy. First, searching for the cause of corruption, such as intemperance, slavery, &c. Now it is plain, that these corruptions find their way into the church, and protection in it, by the unfaithfulness of its officers, receiving into, and tolerating in their communion, members who oppose some scripture doctrine, or some Christian duty; thus introducing into the church discordant materials, which makes it impossible for them to be of the same mind and the same judgment. Now if Christians were perfectly joined together in all things, then error could never find its way into, nor protection in the church; and when church officers cease to strive earnestly, in a scriptural way, for attaining this great end, then corruption will assuredly find protection in the church. Then, if it be true, that receiving and tolerating in the church, those who oppose any scripture doctrine or duty is the cause of all her corruptions, then the remedy is plain; simply removing the discordant materials, and then what is left will be of the same mind and of the same judgment. Now, sir, is this the way societies propose to reform the church, by admitting into their societies none but those who are faithful, and true witnesses for every scripture doctrine and duty? Is it true, that they will receive none but those who agree in all things, who speak the same things and mind the same things?

or, is it true that they receive all those who agree in only one thing, as in temperance or abolition, though they may disagree in all things else? And do they thus expect to become the salt of the earth, and the light of the world? Do they set the church a pattern of unity in all things that is worthy of her imitation, when they have, acting as one, in their society, the Calvinist, Arminian, Socinian, Universalist, Papist, Infidel, and Atheist. If the church cannot imitate them in one of their fundamentals, without breaking down all her hedges and towers, and ceasing to be a church,—First, how do they expect to reform her? or do they intend to teach the church a lesson of care by their reckless daring, and thus reform her? Does not societyism rest on the same foundation that error does? A mass of discordant materials striving to act in concert; an attempt at uniting discordant materials was the cause of the disease. And a still greater combination of discordant materials is offered to us as the remedy. Now, sir, I know that it is considered among some physicians, that what will kill will cure: yet, though this may be true in medicine, I cannot believe that it is in morals. The advocates of voluntary associations appear to become alarmed at the work of excision, when other scripture means of reformation fail; it is supposed, that unless the great mass of mankind can be enlisted on the side of morality and religion, that their opposition to vice and irreligion will have but little weight: they rely more on the amount, than on the kind of opposition they will array against immorality. Now, the only salutary example is that which is consistent throughout, and spiritual; and when the church throughout, in all Christian duties is consistent and spiritual, it will act as the salt of the earth, as a city on a hill: then, “one shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight.” It is this kind of example and opposition that we ought to be seeking after: that which is scriptural and consistent, for it is this kind that will be sanctified. It may be replied, that societies have never proposed to stand in the place of the church. This we know; but societies do contemplate the church as fallen, and unable to arise, and kindly offer to raise her from the ground and place her on her feet; if she cannot then stand, that they will prop her up, and they have placed so many props around her, as almost entirely to hide her. Thus, she is represented as weak, and they as mighty, she is represented as comparatively useless, they as very useful. Now, the reason why these societies wish to stand as props around the church, is that they might rob her of her glory; and while societies are stealing the glory of the church, men are stealing the glory of God. Thus, societies hold up the church to the world as an invalid; though the scriptures represent her, as “clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners.”

Nov. 1840.

I was very sorry to see, in the October No., an announcement of your conversion to societyism. And, also, that you now propose to close the discussion. Now, is this right? If you have been benefited by the discussion, if you have been convinced of an important error, and persuaded to embrace an important truth, never stop it while there are any destitute of the benefit you have received; for I am sure that there are hundreds, and perhaps, thousands, that are not yet converted. You know, that some meadows are much more easily irrigated than others, and, of course, it would not be right to shut the

mollifying sluices off from them all at the same time, lest those that are very dry and hard might never be mollified, and you may rest assured that it is even so with the readers of the Monitor: many of them are "*very dry*," and perhaps, greatly hardened with prejudice, and you should be patient with them. If you have done well in continuing the discussion so far, I think it is too soon to become "*weary* in well doing;" 'it looks too much as though you were for monopolizing all the good of the discussion.' It was my intention, also, to have given my opinion after older and more experienced men had spoken, and it was my intention to show the whole of the foundation on which my opinion rested.

And, now, I would ask, have not you prevented me from receiving a great benefit? If I had exposed all the foundation on which my opinion rested, and it be a rotten foundation, I know it would have been a great pleasure to some of the advocates of societies to have demolished it, and let my opinion rest on the ground, where it ought to, if it be based on a rotten foundation. And, then, I too, as a matter of course, would become a convert: this appears to have been the manner in which the editor was converted.

I do not feel at all satisfied to see the discussion stop here, because I do not believe that our best writers have yet even taken up the subject: there has been nothing yet, but some slight skirmishing between the vanguards; the shock of the main battle has never yet come on: if we could provoke some of our best writers to come into the field, and they are beaten off, then, a victory would be worth having. Now, the editor knows better than I do, that it is very hard to get them to write on such subjects; and that it is almost impossible to beat back such inexperienced scribblers as I would be. I think that the editor knows that the vanguard in this battle was composed of old women and boys. I admit that the negative of this question was badly sustained: the editor did not attempt personally to discuss the subject: he, however, at different times made some editorial remarks that I was well pleased with. I did once hope that the editor would have undertaken the defence of the negative, and if he had, I did confidently expect to see victory perching on his banner. But to my great disappointment, he struck his banner before its folds were half unfolded to the breeze.

Now, sir, these are only my views of the matter; I thought it unreasonable to send you a letter, and not write something: you know that every body *thinks* it is their privilege to dictate to an editor, but that it is the editor's privilege to pay what attention he pleases to them. If you should ever open your paper for the discussion of this question, you may expect to find me in the field, either among the slain, victorious, or vanquished. C.

---

#### ART. X.—*Salvation by Baptism.*

1 Peter iii. 18—22.

"FOR Christ, also, hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God—being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which, also, he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the

ark was a preparing." For an explanation of this part of the passage, the reader is referred to the last Number, which explanation he is requested to peruse before reading what follows. The Apostle proceeds, "wherein (that is in which ark) few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him."

This latter part of the passage has been supposed to be embarrassed with difficulties not less great, and to countenance errors not less dangerous, (though of a different kind) than the former. It is important to unfold, plainly and simply, its meaning, which will best remove the supposed difficulties and confute the noxious errors.

The Apostle having spoken of the building of the ark, says, "In which (ark) few, that is, eight souls were saved by water;" that is, *were carried safely through the water,\** the ark in which they were, being borne aloft on its surface.

The next words, correctly translated, read thus:—"To which (water) the antitype baptism, now saveth us—(not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer towards God, of a good conscience)—through the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

1. Baptism is the *antitype* of the deliverance of Noah and his family by water. The pattern after which a thing is made is called (*τυπος*) a type; and the thing formed according to it is (*αντιτυπος*) the antitype. Hence (*τυπος*) a type is used to denote a thing intended by God to represent some other; and hence the water of the deluge (not the ark) is said to be a type of baptism, and baptism its *antitype*.† Noah and his family "were saved by water;" but it was by means of entering the ark; and they would not have entered it had they not believed God's word, that the deluge should come, and that the ark should save them who entered it. Just so baptism "saves us;" but it is only through our entering into the true ark Christ Jesus; and this we will not do, unless we believe God's word, that we are exposed to ruin, and that Christ will certainly and effectually save all who trust in him.

2. This baptism includes two things; the one *outward*, the other *inward*; the one the putting away of the filth of the flesh, the other the answer towards God of a good conscience. The conscience is naturally a bad conscience; it is polluted, it is guilty, and it torments. The application of the blood of sprinkling, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost give it peace and purify it. Then it is a good conscience. This is what God requires; this is what baptism represents; this is what he who is baptized professes to have received.‡

\* "Thus, Acts xxiv. 24: 'ἵνα ὡς βαψαντες τοῦ Παυλοῦ διασωσῶμεν πρὸς Φελικᾶ; that they may bring Paul safe to Felix, &c."—MACKNIGHT.

† "The relative *α* being in the neuter gender, its antecedent cannot be *κιβωτος* the ark, which is feminine, but *ὕδωρ* water."—MACKNIGHT.

‡ "Ἐπιρωτάω, from which *ἐπιρωτημα* is derived, signifies always to ask a question, not to answer it. See Matt. xxvii. 11; Mark xv. 2, 4; Luke xxiii. 9; John xviii. 21. And *ἐπιρωτημα* signifies not the asking of a question, (which is *ἐπιρωτησις*) but the thing asked. And the thing asked is whether he who is baptized has a good conscience with respect to God: and a good conscience is from faith unfeigned. See 1 Tim. i. 5; Heb. ix. 14, xx. 22. In baptism there is a profession made of faith and a conscience."—THOMPSON. See Schleusner and Parkhurst on the word.



3. This baptism saves us, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Not the application of water to the body; or the mere receiving the outward rite. This the Apostle takes especial care to guard us from supposing, by saying, the baptism which saves is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the thing required by God, namely a good conscience, that is, one sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, and renewed by the Holy Ghost.

This it does "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." He died to make atonement for sin; his resurrection is the evidence that it has been accepted; that "he is able to save even to the uttermost all who come unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for" them. As risen, he sends down the Spirit from on High; he sheds down on us abundantly, the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; thus have we what God requires; thus are we saved. And he is gone into heaven; he is at the right hand of God; all created beings are subject to him. He is able to carry on the work he begins; to defend his people from every enemy, support them in every emergency; and accomplish in them "all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power." 1 Thess. i. 11.

Let no one rest in the outward rite or the external profession. The pardon and renovation of the soul, by the blood and Spirit of Christ are every thing: and all who possess these, are safe; as surely as Christ died and rose again. Δ.

#### ART. XI.—*The Office of Deacon.*

In the last number we barely mentioned a work recently published by the Rev. James M. Willson, of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Cherry Street, and promised to furnish our readers with a more extended notice for the present number.

We have read the work with attention and interest. It is free from sectarianism; purely Presbyterian; displays a high degree of industry and research; comprises more valuable information, compressed into the compass of 76 pages, than is to be found in many ponderous octavos. As a book of reference, it is intrinsically worth ten times the amount charged for it, and should be in the hands of Presbyterians generally. Yet, we have no expectation that the author will derive from the sale a remuneration of his actual expenses, to say nothing of his labour. It is however a way mark, set up in the night season; and when a brighter period shall have dawned upon the Church, its value will be better appreciated.

The divine appointment of the deacon's office is demonstrated; its nature pointed out; the unscriptural innovation and dangerous tendency of substituting trustees in the room of deacons exhibited; the due subordination of deacons to the ecclesiastical courts proved; and the whole concluded with a few observations respecting the qualifications, choice, admission, and ordination of deacons. While these avowed objects of the author are executed with fidelity, there is an incidental result produced, scarcely less valuable to those who have been called in the providence of God to exercise office in the church, namely, a complete history of the deacon's office, or rather a history of the corruptions, innovations, reformations, and defections of the church respecting this office.

In relation to the dangerous tendency of substituting trustees for deacons, we can truly say, we have witnessed monstrous evils resulting from the practice, in more than one denomination of Presbyterians. It has convulsed, divided, and scattered more congregations, and destroyed the peace, support, and usefulness of more ministers than any other single cause with which we are acquainted. We have, while writing, our eye on several congregations deeply afflicted by this strange anomaly. It is a monied interest, chiefly swayed by carnal men, and held as a rod *in terrorem* over the head of ministers and sessions, to coerce them to an acknowledgment of the superiority of monied interests to the spiritual interests of the church, and to refrain from the just exercise of discipline, except against the poor and defenceless. The payment of a small amount to the funds of the church enables the most worthless characters to control her affairs. And all this among the descendants of the Reformers!

According to this scheme, when a session becomes obnoxious to the profligate, they can pay a small sum, enlist with them others of the same stamp, even papists and infidels, obtain a majority of votes for trustees; and on this monied representation, vote out minister, session, and people. Like the money changers in the temple, take possession of the house of God, with this difference only, the church has surrendered the power conferred upon her by the Lord Jesus Christ, to drive them out! She puts a lever into the hands of wicked men for her own overthrow! She says to the world, we hold our privileges from you! We acknowledge allegiance to you! Come, rule over us whenever it suits your caprice, your interest, or your anger!

Nothing of this kind occurs in the ordinary affairs of life. The church is a family. Are strangers permitted to interfere in the private affairs of families? The church is a nation, a community governed by laws, peculiar to herself. Are aliens permitted to interfere in the affairs of other communities? Why then in the church? Mr. Willson assigns the most plausible answer we have met with, page 43:—"There is great difficulty in ascertaining at what time regularly organized boards of trustees first took their present position in the Protestant churches. In the United States, they were probably formed at a very early period. It is certain they made their first appearance in cities, where most corruptions begin. Pride and worldliness operate more powerfully in cities. There is a class of men to be found in most city congregations, that is, (or was,) almost unknown in the more retired country congregations. Men of active business habits, industrious, and influential; but who with these characteristics and habits, are lacking in that spirituality that would fit them to undertake a sacred office by solemn ordination. They may make very good trustees, and it may be thought prudent to render them useful. Or, there are men who do not even make a profession of religion, yet they are rich, and possess influence. The trusteeship will exactly suit them: it forms a kind of *neutral ground*, neither belonging to the world nor to the church, where both may meet, and harmonize pleasantly together."

Mr. W. adopts Dr. Miller's translation of Acts vi. 2: "It is not suitable that we should leave the word of God and devote ourselves to *pecuniary affairs*," which is supported by the use of a word derived from the same root, Mat. xxi. 12; xxv. 27; Mark. xi. 15; Luke xix. 23. This translation though free, is undoubtedly correct. Would not the following be more literal? "It is not suitable that we should

leave the word of God to serve *money tables*." Either way the sense is the same, but we prefer the latter, because more literal. Parkhurst says, *τραπεζίτης*, from *τραπεζα*, denotes a public banker, consequently the latter word, (the one used Acts vi. 2,) denotes the table of a banker, or money changer. The Greek writers often apply the word in the same sense. This translation then is supported not only by the legitimate use of *τραπεζα*; but also by the history of the circumstance which led to the appointment of deacons. Acts iv. 34; "They brought the price of their possessions." Acts v. 2; "Kept back part of the *price*," consequently, "the daily ministration," (Acts vi. 1,) must have been money, which consisted of the price the disciples had received for their possessions. And, although the complaint of the Grecians was the occasion for the appointment of deacons, it is evident, their office extended to all the pecuniary affairs of the church; for it was *common* stock they distributed. The argument here drawn from the context, is not used by Mr. W. in his Book, nor have we met with it elsewhere. It, however, appeared to us worthy of notice, and is presented for consideration. What force it may possess, if any, is left with the reader to judge.

---

I send you an extract from the writings of Thomas A'Kempis, which I am sure will interest your readers. VIATOR.

"I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and acknowledge my infirmity. How small are the afflictions by which I am often cast down, and plunged in sorrow! I resolve to act with fortitude, but by the slightest evil am confounded and distressed. From the most inconsiderable events, the most grievous temptations rise against me; and while I think myself established in security and peace, the smallest blast, if it be sudden, hath power to bear me down.

"Behold, therefore, O Lord! my abject state, and pity the infirmity which thou knowest infinitely better than myself. Have mercy upon me, that I faint not; that the deep may not swallow me up for ever! So apt am I to fall, and so weak and irresolute in the resistance of my passions, that I am continually driven back in the path of life, and covered with confusion in thy sight. Though sin does not obtain the full consent of my will, yet the assaults of it are so frequent, and so violent, that I am often weary of living in perpetual conflict. My corruption and weakness are experimentally known: for the evil thoughts that rush upon me, take easy possession of my heart, but are with difficulty driven out again.

"O that thou, the mighty God of Israel, the zealous lover of faithful souls, wouldst look down with compassion on the labours and sorrows of thy servant, and perfect and fulfil his desire of re-union with thee! Strengthen me with heavenly fortitude, lest the old man, this miserable flesh, which is not yet brought under subjection to the spirit, should prevail and triumph over me; against which I am bound to struggle, as long as I breathe in this fallen life.

"Alas! what is this life, which knows no intermission of distress and sorrow! where graves are laid, and enemies rise behind and before, on the right hand and on the left! while one tribulation is departing, another cometh on; and before the adversary is withdrawn from one conflict, he suddenly sounds a new alarm. And can a life thus embittered with distress, thus filled with corruption, and subject

to such a variety of evils, be the object of desire? Can it even deserve the name of life, when it is continually teeming with plagues and pains that terminate in death? Yet it is still loved and desired; and many place their whole confidence in it, and seek their supreme happiness from it. Those only who live to God, in the continual exercise of faith and love, of patience, humility, resignation and obedience, obtain the conquest of the world; and enjoy those divine comforts that are promised to every soul that forsakes all to follow Christ; and those only truly discern how grievously the lovers of the world are mistaken, and in how many ways they are defrauded of happiness, and left destitute and wretched.

**FLOGGING—not IN THE ARMY.**—We have heard a good deal about flogging in the army, and flogging of the negroes, but the flogging in British prisons appears to have been entirely overlooked. The system is at once cruel, inhuman, and demoralizing. Let the philanthropic reflect upon the following case, which we take from the *Birmingham Messenger*: “A fine healthy boy who had offended his master by attending a wake and neglecting his duty, was brought before the magistrates at the police office, and for that offence he was sentenced to be imprisoned one month, and be well flogged. On the morning his imprisonment expired, he was tied up and most inhumanly flogged, and then turned out of jail to roam where he pleased. On his arrival his distracted mother put him to bed, and he did not rise from that bed for *fifteen days*. *His life was despaired of*. A surgeon attended him one month, and he received for his attendance from this boy’s relatives, who are poor people, the sum of *six pounds six shillings!*—*Leeds Times*.

**SOCIETY ISLANDS.**—*Influence of Missionaries.*—Captain Harvey, of a whaling ship, who visited Tahiti in May, 1839, bears the following testimony to the highly improved social condition of the people:

This is the most civilized place I have been at in the South seas; it is governed by a queen, daughter of old Pomare, a dignified young lady about twenty-five years of age; they have a good code of laws; no spirits whatever are allowed to be landed on the island; therefore the sailors have no chance of getting drunk, and are all in an orderly state, and work goes on properly; no boat allowed to be on shore after nine o’clock; constables at different stations to put up all stragglers; and offenders are compelled to work on the public roads. The island is a complete garden; fruit of every description wild in all directions, common property to all. Good beef two pence per pound; oranges, the finest I have ever seen, four shillings per thousand; in fact a child, as soon as it can climb a tree, is quite independent of its parents. It is one of the most gratifying sights the eye can witness on Sunday in their church, which holds about 5,000, to see the queen near the pulpit, and all her subjects around her decently apparelled, and in seemingly pure devotion. I really never felt such a conviction of the real good of missionaries before. They are well dressed in bonnets after the fashion of some years back when two abreast could not go through the Temple bar. Their attire is as near the English as they can copy.—*Miss. Chronicle*.

*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, or removing them at his pleasure: and this (oftentimes) by very unlikely means, and overruling things: accordingly, Seir being given to Esau, and Arnon 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 others' spirits, 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? This providence reaches 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 the head are all numbered and under the conduct of the providence of God.

*Queries.*

ARE private members who have left the communion of the Secession Church, and joined another body of professing Christians, proper and legal subjects of censure? and are the sessions required by the word of God and the standards of the Secession Church to exercise discipline on them? If so, what degree?—The editor's own, or any of his brethren's answers to these queries will oblige one of your subscribers.

ANTI-EXCITEMENT.

INTELLIGENT and judicious men differ on these questions. Consequently, it may be thought bold in us to give an answer; and in doing so, we do not intend to be understood either as declaring the practice of the church, or as excluding any other answer that may be offered. Persons leaving the communion of the church and joining another body of professing Christians are subjects of censure: Not of excommunication from the visible church; but of suspension from the body which they have left, for the following reasons:

1. They violate their solemn covenant engagements with the body they leave; and to a greater or less extent their covenant with God, according to the amount of his truth which is abandoned by such a step.
2. Breach of covenants is an offence of no ordinary magnitude.
3. To sessions it belongs to "admit applicants," "inflict censures;" and, consequently, to declare judicially who are in full communion; therefore, they are bound to censure this breach of covenants, by an act of suspension; and also to declare judicially, what is fact, that those who have gone out from us are no longer of us.

These principles are as applicable to higher courts as to sessions.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The editor can assure the young gentlemen of the Seminary that his heart beats in unison with theirs respecting the importance of "Foreign Missions;" and though his anticipations are somewhat less sanguine, the ardour which stimulates them to the production of articles of such decided excellency, as their last paper undoubtedly is, cannot fail to exert a powerful influence in rousing the flagging zeal of others. The more intelligent and pious among us have long lamented the carnality of the church; as well as her supineness in maintaining and disseminating her principles both at home and abroad. And many who have abandoned the pursuits of the world, yea, and its enjoyments too, in the hope of contributing something to the common effort of the church, are constantly borne down with such a load of opposition within and without, arising from the ignorance, depravity, and error of the present period of the world, that they are unable to discover any favourable signs of a speedy termination of our captivity. The cry of Edom's children still goes up like the shout of men victorious in battle—"Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof." Whether or not, is the present movement in favour of *foreign* missions, at the fountain head, an indication of Divine Providence, that a pure dispensation of gospel ordinances is to be taken from us and given to others?

---

Statements like the following, are generally very justly regarded with suspicion. This statement, however, is to be relied upon. The fact was elicited by ample testimony, given in a court of justice; and the name of the person referred to was John George Esher.—ED. RELIG. MON.

The Sabbath School Journal says, "On a late Sabbath morning, an infidel in Philadelphia was heard to deny, in the boldest terms, the existence of a God, and to declare he had no fear of such a being. In the afternoon of the same day, he received a fatal wound as he was expelled from a tavern, and was then heard to exclaim, 'Oh God! have mercy upon my poor soul!'"

---

MARTYRDOM IN MADAGASCAR.—A recent London Evangelical Magazine gives the melancholy intelligence that sixteen of the persecuted Christians of Madagascar, who had for a long time succeeded in concealing themselves from their pursuers, had been apprehended, and that nine of their number were cruelly speared to death on the 9th of July. Among them were Raminahy, the wife of Davis, one of the refugees now in England, and Paul and his excellent wife, of whom mention is made in the "Narrative of Persecutions in Madagascar."

---

A learned clergyman in Maine, was accosted in the following manner by an illiterate preacher who despised education: "Sir, you have been to college, I suppose?" "Yes, sir," was the reply. "I am thankful," rejoined the former, "that the *Lord has opened my mouth to preach without any learning.*" "*A similar event,*" replied the latter, "took place in *Balaam's* time, but such things are of rare occurrence at the present day."

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

MARCH, 1841.

---

ART. I.—*Family Worship.* (No. I.)

Joshua xxiv. 15: "But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

THE circumstances under which these words were spoken by Joshua, are worthy of notice. Having conducted the tribes of Israel in triumph to the promised land, and distributed to each tribe its portion of the inheritance, we are told in the preceding chapter, that when he "*waxed old and was stricken in age,*" he "*called for all Israel, and for their elders, and for their heads, and for their judges, and for their officers.*" And what was his object in calling together this vast assembly? Was it that he might recount in their presence the glorious achievements that had been performed by him, and receive from them acclamations of applause? Was it that he might instruct them merely in the civil affairs of their infant commonwealth? No; this good man had a higher, and holier object in view. It was to recount to them the wonderful works of God, and to give them a farewell exhortation to devote themselves wholly to his service. Who can read this, and the preceding chapter, without admiring the fervent, yet unostentatious piety of this aged servant of the Lord? How urgently does he press upon them the claims of Jehovah to their love and service; and when narrating the glorious triumphs that had attended their march into the land of promise, how careful is he to withhold himself from their minds as the object of their gratitude, and to ascribe the glory of their victories wholly to Jehovah! "Ye have seen all that the Lord your God hath done unto all these nations because of you: for the Lord your God is He that hath fought for you." This idea he repeats again and again in the same chapter, and in this chapter he addresses them in the name of Jehovah, as though he himself had had no instrumentality in the conquest of their enemies: and it may be observed that he is equally careful to withhold from them the praise of their victories. He would no more flatter their pride, than he would exalt himself; and, therefore, he declares to them in the 12th verse, that it was "not with their sword, nor with their bow," that they had overcome their enemies. Having taken a review of the wonderful dealings of God towards them, and referred them to the rich inheritance which God had given them,—to the land for which they laboured not,—cities which they built not—vineyards and oliveyards which they planted not,—he solemnly enjoins upon them the duty of serving the Lord. "Now, therefore, fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity and in truth, and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other

side of the flood, and in Egypt; and serve ye the Lord." After this injunction upon all to serve the Lord, fearing that there might be some before him whose hearts were averse to this service, he solemnly appeals to them, if any such there were (as, alas! there were no doubt many) to choose, that day, between the service of the true God and the service of false gods.—"And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served, that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell." He proposes to them the service of the great God, who had led them with his own arm from the land of bondage,—who had fought for them,—overcome all their enemies,—and blessed them abundantly, and the service of those gods which could not hear, nor see, nor save;—and calls upon them to make a final choice. But he assures them that, whatever their choice might be, his choice was already made. "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." Here you will observe that Joshua not only declares that he himself would serve the Lord, but also that his house should serve him; that is his household, his wife, children, and servants. Now we cannot suppose that Joshua had any power over the hearts of the members of his household. It is the province of Almighty God alone to change the heart. What then does he mean when he declares that his house should serve him? He could mean nothing else, but that they should keep up the formal and outward worship of God. Although he had not power over their hearts so that he could cause them to render to God a *spiritual* service, yet he had, as the absolute governor of his family, authority and power to enforce the *outward act* of worship; and this authority and power he here resolves to exercise, knowing that it was the means which God had appointed, and in the use of which he could look to him for his blessing.

Brethren, you have on a late occasion made a solemn, and, I trust, a deliberate and sincere choice whom you would serve. This decision has been in favour of the living and true God. With some of you this choice was made publicly for the first time, with others it was the renewal of a choice previously made. In accordance with this choice, I called your attention, formerly, to the duty of walking with that God whom you have chosen as your God. But need I remind you that the obligations which you came under, bound you, not only to serve him yourselves, but also with your house. Surely you have not made this choice as you should have done, unless each of you has said with Joshua, "As for me and *my house*, we will serve the Lord."

The subject, then, to which we propose to call your attention, is that of family religion and family worship. It is a subject in which we feel a deep interest being fully persuaded that we can never have a true revival of religion in the church until Christians are brought to the practice of family religion and family worship. The grounds which we have for this persuasion, you will discover in the course of our remarks. These remarks have been principally suggested by a treatise on this subject by the learned and pious John Howe;—a treatise from which we have not been ashamed to borrow freely, as it is not our object to present what is new, but what may be profitable.

In the farther prosecution of this subject we shall,

I. Make a few preparatory remarks, and

1st. *We observe, that the obligation of worshipping God in the*



*family presupposes an obligation to worship him in secret.* This, we presume, will not be denied. The relation which we sustain to God as *creatures* is the foundation of all other relations, and the formation of other relations can never take away this original and fundamental relation;—and, consequently, the obligations that arise from this relation cannot cease to exist by the addition of other obligations;—for while the relation that gives rise to these obligations remains, the obligations themselves must remain. As every member of the human family is a distinct creature, and as he retains his individuality throughout all the various relations of life, so must he carry with him those obligations which are binding upon him as an individual creature. Thus, in these words of Joshua, there is a recognition of this original obligation. He does not say, As for my house they shall serve the Lord, but, “As for *me* and my house, we will serve the Lord.” He would serve the Lord as an individual, and in addition to this he would see that his house should serve him. You are not to infer that the service which you render to God in a family capacity, releases you from your obligation to serve him in an individual capacity. And we wish you to bear in mind that it is to such as worship God individually, that we shall address ourselves on the subject of family religion. To prayerless persons we have nothing to say on the present occasion, but to repeat the words of our Lord, “Enter into thy closet; and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret; and thy Father who seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.”

2nd. *We include in the term family, all the members of the same household, whether transient or permanent.* It is true that the natural relation existing between the members of the same family, lays a foundation of obligation for family worship, yet it will by no means follow from this, that there is no obligation resting upon those who may not be natural members of the family; for there are many other considerations, besides that of relationship, that bind us to the duty of family worship. And these considerations, in so far as they are applicable to persons dwelling together in the same house, impose upon them the same obligations. Now, there may, perhaps, be some present, who are living in families of which they are not naturally members. Such persons, we would remark, are included in the word *family* as used by us. And we shall consider such persons to be under the same obligations to engage in the worship of God, when observed in families where they are residing, and to exert their influence to secure its observance where it has not been observed. And we consider the head of such a family as much authorized to require its observance on the part of such persons, as if they were natural members of the family: they are members of the same household; and the resolution of Joshua was, that he and his *house* should “serve the Lord.”

3rd. *We observe that the silence of the scriptures respecting the circumstances of any duty, is not sufficient to absolve us from the performance of that duty, when its substance is enjoined.* For instance, if it be plain from the scriptures that family worship is a duty, then we are not at liberty to omit it, because we are not told precisely how often we should worship God, or at what particular time, whether before or after breakfast, or, if we may not be able to sing with a melodious voice, whether this circumstance will justify its omission or not. Now, we say that ignorance respecting the particular circumstances in which

a duty should be performed, will not render its performance the less binding, where the substance of the duty is plainly revealed, according to this principle we should not perform any outward duty, because there is no duty which we perform in which every circumstance connected with it is mentioned in the scriptures. Nay; according to this principle we should never love God, because we are not told how often in the day our minds should be engaged in acts of love, and how long our minds should be in this state at a time.

4th. *We observe, that where the substance of a duty is enjoined in the scriptures, or is apparent from reason, the circumstantialia are to be regulated by our own understanding.* It is given to us in the 112th Psalm as characteristic of the good man, that he orders his affairs with discretion. Now, this discretion is to be exercised about the circumstantialia of spiritual duties, as well as temporal duties, and we are under the same obligation to exercise this discretion, as we are to perform the duty itself; for the one is included in the other. For instance, if we are satisfied that family worship is a duty, then we are bound to study in the performance of that duty every circumstance that will most contribute to the edification of those who are engaged in it.

5th. *General rules must be understood as including particular cases.* When we find such a rule in the scriptures, we are under the same obligation to apply it to all those cases, which naturally or inferentially come under it, as if such cases were particularly specified. It is not necessary that a duty should be enjoined in the scriptures in so many words, to render it binding. All that is necessary is that the general rule there laid down, by which spiritual duties are enjoined, includes in it the particular duty. The Bible is addressed to us as *intelligent* beings: it supposes us to be possessed of understanding and reason, and it requires us to exercise these faculties. Whatever then, is fairly deducible from the scriptures, is as binding upon us as if it were commanded in express words; for there is scarcely any duty, respecting which, the circumstances of time, place, and situation, are particularly specified; and, consequently, if this were a sufficient excuse for neglect of duty, there are few, if any duties, which would be performed. These remarks we have made in anticipation of an objection that is often urged against the arguments which are adduced to prove that obligations are resting upon Christians to keep up the worship of God in their families.

Having made these few remarks, we shall endeavour

II. *To prove the duty of family worship.* And here we shall apply to two sources of proof; the law of nature, and the written law. Let it not be supposed that we appeal to the law of nature because we deem the written law insufficient to establish this duty. By no means. We believe the duty is plainly taught there. But we appeal to this law, that those who neglect it, may see that they are condemned by a *twofold* law; and that the very heathen will rise up in judgment against them. Nor are we to disregard the law of nature. It is stamped with the same authority as the written law; and where it speaks plainly its voice is to be heard with the same attention. By what other than this law was it that mankind were governed for more than two thousand years? And are we to suppose that there was no sin in the world before the delivery of the law on Sinai? Surely not. Nor are we to suppose that this law of nature was repealed by the written law. It still possesses the same autho-

rity, and still obligates us to the same duties. The written law supposes those to whom it is given to be in possession of the law of nature. Thus, the apostle, in his epistle to the Corinthians, appeals to their understanding and reason for the confirmation of what he declared to them. "*I speak*," says he, "*as to wise men, judge ye what I say.*" It is then brethren, as such, that I would address you on this subject; while I appeal to the law that is written upon your own hearts, for the proof of this duty. And this obligation appears,

1st. *From the infinite excellence of Jehovah, as an object of worship.* If you refer to Nehemiah ix. 5, you will find that it is declared, that the glorious name of Jehovah is "exalted above all blessing and praise." From this, then, it plainly appears, that our praises can never be in proportion to the divine excellence. Though we were to praise him with all our hearts, and though our time were continually employed in his praises, he would still be exalted above them; for his excellence is infinite, while our praises are but finite. But what are we to infer from this? Is it that we are not to praise and bless God at all? surely not. But we infer that we are to praise and bless him, according to the *measure of our capacity*. The infinitude of his excellence calls for the most exalted praises of which we are capable, in every capacity in which we may exist; if in every capacity, surely in the family capacity. Let us suppose, then, that you have endeavoured to the utmost of your capacity to worship God in the closet, and in the sanctuary. Has your homage, permit me to ask you, been in proportion to the excellence of that being who is the object of this homage? Surely not. He is exalted above all blessing and praise. Are you not bound, then, to add to these praises which you have rendered to God in the closet, and in the sanctuary, those of your family? for until you do so your praises are not according to your capacity. Now, does not the light of nature reveal the great God to you in the character of a most excellent being, and are you not taught by this light, that that being ought to be worshipped in your family, in a *family capacity*?

2d. *The reasonableness of this duty may be clearly seen from the dependence of families, as such, upon God.* We are all dependent upon God for our individual existence. "In him we live, and move, and have our being;" and does not this individual dependence upon God, lay a foundation for individual homage? But are we dependent upon him only in our individual capacity? Does not the same God who preserves the being of a husband, preserve the relation of a husband? and does not the same God who preserves the being of a wife, preserve the relation of a wife? and so of parents and children. Now, if our dependence upon God as individuals calls for homage and praise, surely our dependence upon him as husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, calls for the same, and, therefore, there is an obligation resting on those who are the heads of families, to render to God in a family capacity the homage and praise which are due unto him.

3d. *The obligation to worship God in the family appears from the nature of man, as a social being.* None will deny that the worship rendered by a creature must be according to the nature of that creature. Man, then, being possessed of a social nature, his worship must also be social. But here we may be told, that the public worship of God in the sanctuary is answerable to this; and that therefore family worship is not required. To this it may be replied, that the relation

of a family is the first relation in which man exists as a social being; indeed, the relation itself is prior, in the order of nature, to all other relations, and, therefore, has prior obligations. Our first parents could worship God, as social beings, in no other way than in a family capacity, and can we suppose that the obligation to worship him in this way could cease by the adventitious formation of societies, so long as the natural qualities which gave rise to this obligation would continue? By no means; the very nature of man, then, as a social being, shows the duty of family worship.

4th. *The obligation to worship God in a family capacity appears from the fact that families are of Divine constitution.* The family relation, brethren, is a *distinct* relation, established by the God of nature. It is "He who setteth the solitary in families," and, therefore, to him is due the worship of families. But how can this debt be paid in any other capacity than a family capacity? It cannot be paid, nor will the payment be accepted by God, in any other way. Families are moral persons; and as such stand in a distinct moral relation to God, and therefore owe him distinct homage; and we might as well suppose that the worship which one individual renders to God, will be reckoned to another, as to suppose that the worship of the individuals who compose the family, offered in an individual capacity, will be reckoned to the family as such. Is there not honour due from the members of a family to the head, as the head of the family? but God says, "If I be a father, where is my honour, and if I be a master, where is my fear?" He claims to be the Founder and Preserver of all the families of the earth, and, therefore, he claims from them that homage which is his due.

5th. *We infer the duty of family worship from the great design for which families were instituted.* And what was this design? Was it merely that the earth should be inhabited? No, it was that his name and his praise might be preserved, and transmitted from age to age. If this was the original design of the conjugal relation, it will certainly appear that it was the design of the family relation; for the former is the foundation of the latter; and that such was the design of the conjugal relation, is evident from Malachi ii. 15: "Did he not make one?" that is, one for one, or one couple. "Yet had he the residue of the Spirit," that is, to impart life to others, had he been so pleased. "And wherefore one?" "that he might seek a godly seed." From this, then, it plainly appears, that the design of God, in separating mankind into distinct families, was, that they might be nurseries of religion: this was the original design of their formation. He could, for he had "the residue of the Spirit," have created ten thousand human beings; but he would create but one couple, that he might have "a godly seed." Now, are we not to infer the duty of family worship from this express design? Can we suppose that the formation of mankind into families was designed by the God of nature for the promotion of godliness, and yet God is not to be acknowledged in families, by regular acts of worship? The supposition is absurd in the highest degree. Are there any in this house who do not worship God in their families? To such persons we would say, you are acting in direct opposition to the end for which families were instituted, and you have no ground to expect the blessing of God upon your families; you have no right to expect piety in your children, and the eternal salvation of their souls.

6th. *The duty of family worship appears from the relation of*

*the several parts of the family to each other.* We have seen, that the relation which families, as distinct societies, sustain to God, obligates to family worship. But not only does this obligation arise from the relation which the family, as a moral person, sustains to God, but also from the relation in which they stand to one another. There is a mutual connexion between the several parts of this moral person: and does not this connexion lay a foundation for family religion? Does the family, as a whole, enjoy the favour and protection of an indulgent Providence? Should not the gratitude of all be expressed? Or, is any member of the family blessed with prosperity, and shall not all the members of the family rejoice in it, and unite in offering up the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to the God of families for his mercies? But where is the family who has not ground for praise and thanksgiving? Is not the very relation itself a blessing, as we have seen? And so long as this relation lasts, so long should the kindness of God meet with our thankful acknowledgments. The blessings of God, then, to the family, or to any of its members, call for gratitude and praise. But are there no family blessings to be invoked? Are not the constant favour and watchful guardianship of the God of families ever needed? and, if needed, can they be looked for without prayer and supplication? How many sins against God are daily committed in the family, and are not these sins to be confessed? How often are members of families chargeable with treating one another unkindly, or with leading one another into sin by an evil example or advice; and are not these things to be acknowledged, and a pardon to be pleaded by the family as such, at a throne of grace? But in addition to those grounds of family worship, which are common to every family, there are many families who have trials and temptations and afflictions, that are peculiar to themselves: now all these peculiarities present special calls to the performance of this duty.

7th. *The obligation upon heads of families to keep up the worship of God in their families, appears from the fact, that their families are sacred trusts committed by God to their care.* Children, we are told, are "the *heritage* of the Lord:" and shall we not infer that the great Proprietor, who has given this heritage, will require its cultivation? Yes, parents, the responsibility of that relation in which you stand to your children is great indeed. Remember that the eternal interests of their souls are committed to your care; God has given you absolute power over them, and, think you, does he not require you to exercise it in such a way as shall most promote his glory, and their everlasting good? And can you exercise it in this way without keeping up regularly the worship of God in the family of which he has made you the head and guardian? If you, then, believing husbands, have any regard for the important trust that has been committed to you as heads of families;—if you desire that she whom you have vowed to love should be a partaker with you of the grace of life;—believing wife, if you desire that he upon whom you have set your tenderest affections should be brought to a saving interest in Christ;—parents, if you would have those children whom God has given you, to be translated into the "kingdom of God's dear Son;"—masters, if you have love for the souls of your servants, and if you would not bring upon you the blood of their souls, let me exhort you, let me beseech you, to endeavour, to the utmost of your capacity, to maintain the

worship of God in your families. Such are some of the rational grounds upon which we would found the duty of family worship. You will observe that we have not appealed to the scriptures directly for proof;—we have reserved this for another occasion, as the scripture proofs to which we wish to call your attention are so abundant that our time would not permit us to give them, at present, a fair examination.

We have considered the character of God as the most excellent of all beings, and, consequently, the most worthy of all praise in every capacity in which it is possible for man to exist,—we have referred you to that dependence which we have upon God as families,—to the social nature of man,—to the divine constitutionality of families,—to the great design for which they were instituted,—to the relation which the several parts of a family sustain to each other,—and, in fine, we have adverted to the relation which the head of the family sustains to all its members, as their trustee. Do not these considerations show us clearly the obligation resting upon every head of a family to say with Joshua, “As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord?” If there were nothing in the scriptures or the subject, would not such a resolution appear to be highly reasonable? What, then, brethren, are we to think of those who neglect the worship of God in their families,—shall we call them Christians? Ah! I know not how they can sustain the character. I do not wish to pronounce sentence upon any man, but how will such a character stand the test of that law, which is written upon their own hearts? How will that family, where the worship of God has never been observed, compare with the families of the poor heathen, upon whose darkened souls the Bible has never shed its heavenly and divine light? Will not these children of nature rise up in judgment, and condemn professing Christians; for, though their gods were idols, yet we find that they had their household gods, which they called *Lares*, and *Penates*. Such were, no doubt, the gods that were taken away by the daughter of Laban; and such were, no doubt, the carved image, the ephod, terraphim, and the molten image, that were in the house of Micah. These domestic gods are to be found in the houses of all modern Pagans of whom we have heard. Not only have these deluded heathen gods which they publicly adore, but each family has its own deity, to which *domestic* adoration is paid. Now, shall the degraded son of nature, who worships stocks and stones, have his household god, and shall the worshipper of the living and true God be without his? Does not the voice of nature cry out against it? Their family religion, it is true, is an idolatrous religion, but, though idolatrous, it shows us that family religion is the dictate of reason and nature,—as the worship of idols shows us, that the idea of God is natural to man, and not the result of revelation. With these few remarks we shall dismiss the subject for the present, hoping that you will lay the things which you have heard seriously to heart;—and that you, who are heads of families, and who have hitherto neglected this duty, will do so no more? but resolve, in dependence upon divine grace, with Joshua of old, “As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.”

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—*A Sermon of the Rev. Thomas Hamilton.*

Heb. x. 31: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

THIS proposition, so replete with terror, stands in an epistle, of which the design was to display the glories of the gospel. It is found in the practical part of that epistle, where the object of the inspired correspondent of the Hebrews was, to enforce the improvement of the riches of divine grace; which teaches us that the heralds of the cross, by making known the terrors of the Lord, are to persuade men, that it is no less their duty to discharge the artillery of heaven, than to blow the gospel trumpet; to direct them to listen to the thunders, and contemplate the flames of Sinai, as well as to invite them to come to mount Zion, the city of the living God, to Jesus the mediator of the covenant, and the blood of sprinkling. He, into whose lips grace was poured, who was anointed to proclaim glad tidings to the meek, sometimes spoke in legal thunders. He proclaimed, not only the acceptable year of the Lord, but the day of vengeance of our God. It was he, who said to the scribes and pharisees, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" The unquenchable fire and gnawing worm are repeated thrice in the compass of six verses. Fear is a most powerful spring of action, and though its influence in religion is not to be supreme, yet it is proper to indulge it to a certain degree. Let sinners therefore in Zion be afraid, let fearfulness surprise the hypocrites. "Let us all fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into rest, any of us should seem to come short of it through unbelief." The apostle having explained the excellency of the Christian profession, from its nature, author, and privileges, exhorts the Hebrews, in this chapter, to hold it fast: verse 23: "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith, without wavering." He enforces steadfastness in the faith, from the consideration of the awful judgment which would overtake apostates, verse 26, 27: he shows that their punishment would be in proportion to the excellency of the privileges despised, and the glory of the mysteries renounced. And to show that he was not uttering idle things, he cites the words of the God of vengeance himself, verse 30; as an inference, then, from the whole, he makes the declaration, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." By the hand of God, we are to understand, sometimes, his authority; hence the promises of the Father, concerning his Son. "His arm shall rule for him; I will set his hand in the sea, his right hand in the rivers." Sometimes the hand of God denotes his mercy: Zech. xiii. 7: "And I will turn mine hand upon the little ones;" that is, his hand of mercy would be extended to those whom Christ represented, when the sword of justice was sheathed in his bowels. Sometimes it denotes his power. "The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength;" "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord;" and sometimes it denotes the vengeance of God, or an exertion of his power, to execute the dictates of his justice, as in the text. It is proper to remark, that most generally, when the justice of God is intended, the hands of God are spoken of. Sometimes temporal judgments, as immediately inflicted by God, are denoted by his hands. "Let us fall," said David, "into the hands of the Lord, and not into the hands of man." Sometimes, spiritual and eternal judgments are intended, as in the awful declaration under consideration. By falling

"into the hands of the Lord," we are to understand, subjection to his vengeance. To be "hid in the hollow of" God's "hand," is to enjoy his protection. To be "gathered in his arms" as a shepherd, is to enjoy his love, sympathy, and fellowship. But to fall into his hands is to be "punished with everlasting destruction from his presence, and the glory of his power." It is proposed to make some observations concerning "falling into the hands of the living God," and then prove the truth of the proposition, that "it is a fearful thing to fall into his hands."

I. It is proposed to speak about "falling into the hands of the living God; and I shall take notice of the *import*, the *time*, and the *necessity* of impenitent sinners "falling into the hands of God."

1. It imports that God is their *enemy*. Man, at his creation, as he possessed the divine image, and was obedient to the divine will, was the object of the divine favour. But having lost the image and rebelled against the authority of God, he has rendered himself obnoxious to his vengeance. "God is angry with the wicked every day." "He hates all the workers of iniquity." His soul loathes them, considered as polluted, and burns with indignation against them, considered as guilty creatures. This abhorrence and displeasure flow from the purity and justice of his nature. He must cease to be what he is, before he can be pleased with them. It implies that he has *proclaimed* his displeasure. He is actually at war with them. The threatenings of his word; the frowns of his Providence: the reproofs of his deputy in their souls, namely, conscience, are evidences of his hatred. But ah, notwithstanding, they often presume upon his reconciliation with them; they put an erroneous construction upon the language of his law and of his providence; they speak peace to themselves, when God says "there is no peace to the wicked." It imports that he is a *vigilant* as well as an avowed enemy. Though he may permit them to carry on a warfare with him, yet his eye is fixed on them for evil. He is waiting until that time shall come, which will render their falling into his hands most for his glory. They may imagine that he is unobservant, "The Lord seeth not," "The Lord hath forsaken the earth." But let them know, that "his eyes run to and fro through the whole earth, beholding the evil as well as the good;" "his presence fills heaven and earth," he observes all their doings and their movements. He hears all their idle, vain, and blasphemous words. He perceives all the emotions of their hearts; the secret ebullitions of pride, enmity, and rebellion. It imports that he is a *fierce* enemy; his vigilance over his enemies is the vigilance of the lion and the leopard. Hos. xiii. 7, 8, "Therefore. I will be unto them as a lion; and as a leopard, by the way, so will I observe them:" the eye which observes them, flashes with anger, and nothing prevents him from swallowing them in his wrath, but his long-suffering patience. It imports that he is a *wise* and *active* enemy; his enemies do not fall into his hands by chance, as sometimes one enemy falls into the hands of another; but they fall into his hands in virtue of his wisdom and power. "He is wise in heart, and mighty in strength; who hath hardened himself against him and prospered?" Though his enemies may go on in rebellion against him, for a great while, yet God so overrules and controls them, that they will undoubtedly fall into his hands at last.

2. *When* do sinners fall into the hands of God?

1st. At their birth. They "are conceived in sin, and brought



forth in iniquity." They come into the world under the imputation of the sin of their federal head and natural stock, Adam. Hence, they often fall from the womb and the cradle, into the hands of God.

2nd. In life. Sometimes they feel, in a certain degree, the vindictive grasp of God's hands in this world. They are rendered terrors to themselves and to all around them. As saints experience the joys of heaven, on earth, so reprobates sometimes feel the pains of hell, before they reach the abodes of everlasting darkness. Witness Cain, Saul, Judas, and others.

3d. At death. Then they fall more fully into the hands of God. In their birth they are exposed to his hands. In life, they sometimes get strokes which deeply wound their spirits; but at death they fall into his hands: they are cast into hell; they are "driven away in their wickedness:" they are "punished with everlasting destruction."

4th. At the last day: then their whole persons will fall into his hand. At death their souls will fall into his hands, but at the great day their bodies as well as their souls shall feel its stroke. The body that was born, died, and mouldered in the grave under the sentence of the divine law, will now be subjected to the full execution of it; and the soul, now united to the body, will feel more sensibly the pressure of God's avenging hand.

5th. Through eternity: as there will be an endless progression in sinning, so will there be in suffering: consequently, sinners will be for ever falling "into the hands of the living God." The grasp of his hands will become closer, and their weight heavier through eternity.

3. There is an *absolute necessity* that impenitent sinners should "fall into the hands of the living God."

1st. For the satisfaction of Divine justice. Sin is a debt, the punishment of it is a payment of the debt: this payment the justice of God demands from all sinners, or from their surety.

2nd. For the honour of his divine majesty. "God is a great God, and great king, exalted above all gods: he is clothed with honour and majesty," notwithstanding sinners do not reverence and fear him. He issues commands and denounces threatenings; but they refuse to obey or to fear. Now he is determined, that if they will not obey him, they shall fear him. He will be glorified either by them, or upon them; if they will not honour him actively, they shall do it passively.

3rd. For the conviction of sinners. In this life they are often entertaining and indulging doubts concerning the truth and importance of divine things: they would now fondly hope that there is no God; that the Bible is false, and that there is no future state of retribution. To convince them, therefore, of these truths, they shall "fall into the hands of the living God." They shall not be left to doubt whether there be a God, and whether the threatenings of his word shall be realized or not; whether the representations which ministers gave of the torments of hell, are true or not; whether the soul be valuable, or an interest in Christ important, and necessary; whether sin be an exceeding bitter thing, and all the pursuits and pleasures of this world vain. All the doubts which they cherished concerning these points will be removed, when they "fall into the hands of God."

4th. For humbling their pride. Their hearts are full of pride, enmity, and rebellion against God: "they set their mouths against the heavens;" they surely say as Pharaoh did, "Who is the Lord? I

know not the Lord, neither will I obey his voice:" they say, therefore, unto God, "Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." They refuse to submit to his law, his grace, or his providence; they "strive with their Maker;" God is therefore resolved to subdue them. Those proud and rebellious hearts which will not submit to his word, shall be broken by his power; and though they will never cease to oppose and hate him, they will cease to despise and slight him: they will form a just estimate of all his perfections; they will know the greatness of his power, by feeling it; they will fully appreciate his favour, from the want of it; they will see the purity and justice of his nature, in the flames which will eternally surround and devour them.

5th. For a warning to others. Thus, "he spared not the old world, but brought in a flood upon the world of the ungodly, and turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes," making them *an example* unto those who after should live ungodly: they were "set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," the sufferings of the ungodly will be an everlasting monument of divine justice, when "the smoke of their torment shall ascend up for ever and ever.

II. It is proposed to illustrate the truth of the proposition, namely, "that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God;" which will appear from the following circumstances.

1. From the impression which the apprehension of falling into the hands of God, has produced upon the mind. How great the impression which this apprehension produces upon the *convinced* sinner! The mind which was formerly sunk in deep security, it fills with awful solicitude: the conversation which was vain and frivolous is now solemn, and taken up in anxious inquiries how to escape "the wrath which is to come." The countenance which wore the aspect of levity, is now clothed with solemnity, and bespeaks the deep concern of the mind: he would give all that he possesses, he would give the treasures of the universe, were they his, to have security against his "falling into the hands of the living God." The enjoyments of life become tasteless, the pleasures of sin terrible; sleep forsakes his eye, joy is a stranger to his heart, and his spirits are drunk up with the arrows of the Almighty. "He is chastened with pain upon his bed, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain, so that his life abhorreth bread, and his soul dainty meat," "His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen, and his bones that were not seen stick out." How strong the impression which this apprehension produces upon the *deserted saint*! Though believers are the dear children of God, yet are they sometimes left to conclude that they are the objects of his displeasure. Accordingly, they "write bitter things against themselves." "The pains of hell take hold upon them;" in their apprehension God's "wrath lieth hard upon them;" his "fierce wrath goeth over them." They are "afflicted and ready to die;" while they "suffer God's terrors, they are distracted." "Deep calleth unto deep, at the noise of God's water spouts; all his waves and billows pass over them." This was the situation, sometimes, of David, Heman, and Job. How fearful the impressions which the forebodings of *reprobates* sometimes produce upon their mind. Though surrounded by friends and cheerful companions, though they have access to every temporal source of pleasure and amusement, though loaded with honours and rolling in afflu-

ence, they have been filled with horror. Hence, when Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, "Felix trembled." How terrific the impression which an apprehension of falling into the hands of the living God produces, even upon the devils: they "believe and tremble," under an idea that their doom was approaching sooner than they expected, they said to Christ, when on an errand of mercy in our world, "*Art thou come to torment us before the time?*" The prospect, the distant prospect of the wrath of God makes these powerful and haughty fiends to tremble. Now, if the apprehension of God's vengeance produces such terror, how fearful must it be to fall under it!

2. From the impression which the *partial* infliction of his wrath produces upon the mind. There have been some instances of persons being not merely under apprehension of wrath, but under wrath itself in this world: for example, Cain, Judas, Spira, Voltaire, and others. Cain declared that his punishment was greater than he could bear. Judas was so full of remorse and wrath, that life became intolerable, and, therefore, he "chose strangling and death rather than life." Spira expressed a desire to be in hell, that he might know the utmost of what he was to suffer. And Voltaire is stated to have been so full of the fury of the Lord in his last moments, as to render it impossible even for his infidel companions to remain in his apartment. If, then, it be so fearful to fall into the hands of God in this world, what must it be to fall into them in the world to come? If a few drops of wrath produce such effects, what must be the influence when "God will rain snares, fire and brimstone, a horrible tempest upon the wicked?" If a few sparks have such power, how awful will the energy of that fire be, which will burn to the lowest hell? Ah! the wrath which God inflicts upon sinners now, is mercy compared with the wrath which is in reserve for them. It bears no more proportion to it than the drop of the bucket does to the ocean; than the gentle dew to the torrents of rain which fall from the opening clouds, or the zephyr which fans the grass, to the tornado which overturneth the oaks and the cedars. Oh! sinners "flee, flee from the wrath which is to come." God is now willing to embrace you in his arms. They are extended. Fly to them before you fall into his hands.

3. From the impression which the full infliction of his wrath produces upon the damned. They are represented as "weeping, wailing and gnashing their teeth." These are expressions of no common pain or misery. The wretched victims of Divine justice not only weep, which is the usual effect of sorrow in this life, but they wail, which indicates pain; pain which is not to be signified by the falling tear, or the countenance of grief, but proclaimed by lamentation and crying; they not only wail, but gnash their teeth in unutterable anguish.

4th. From the nature and degree of the wrath which will be inflicted upon those who fall into the hands of God. With regard to the nature of it, it is impossible for us fully to understand it. "Who knows the power of his wrath? According to his fear, so is his wrath." We know that it is Divine, consequently it must be wrath worthy of God. The wise man says, "The wrath of a king is as the roaring of a lion." How dreadful then must be the wrath of the King of kings! With regard to the degree of his wrath, it will be

*intolerable.* This appears from the *figures* by which it is represented. It is compared to fire, to a furnace of fire, to a lake of fire and brimstone, to a tempest of fire. One of these figures gives us a fearful idea of the wrath of God, but when they are all taken together, how overwhelming is the representation! Fire, which produces the most acute sensation of pain. A furnace of fire, which contains an intense degree of heat. A lake of fire, which will not be drained or exhausted. A tempest of fire, which burns and heats upon those exposed to it with resistless energy. "And who can dwell with everlasting fire, or with devouring flames?" Sinners who refuse to abandon those courses which lead to hell, are accustomed, in prospect of it, to clothe themselves with courage and resolution, to bear its torments as well as they can. But this shows that they have carnal and absurd ideas of the punishment of hell, as well as of the happiness of heaven. However great their pride and courage, their hearts will become like water, like wax before the fire, the moment they fall into the hands of the living God. "Can thine heart endure," says God, "or can thine hands be strong in the day that I will deal with thee?" The intolerable nature of the punishment of hell appears from its being compared to an eternal death or dying. The body never dies but in consequence of disease which it cannot bear, under which it finally sinks, after having struggled and groaned in ineffectual efforts to support itself. This is some representation of the case of the soul in hell. It will strive to bear up under the heavy hand of God. It will groan and weep and lament. But as there is no proportion between its strength, and the weight which it is under, it will sink and die. This death of the soul does not however, imply annihilation of it. It will never lose its being, nor perception, nor consciousness. In this respect it will be always dying, but never dead. The intolerable nature of the punishment of hell will appear from the circumstance of its excluding every kind and degree of comfort or relief. If our pain is great, yet if we enjoy some cordials or support, it is the more easily borne. The pains of death may be mitigated by such means. But there will be no merciful ingredient in the cup of the Lord's fury. It will be pure unmingled wrath. There will be an absence of all comfort or relief. There shall be no intermission or mitigation; "They shall be tormented day and night." The furious tempest will never cease or abate; the fiery billows will never, for a moment, sleep or cease to roll. The enraged furnace will never suspend or assuage its fury. There will be no cooling stream nor fountain, no, not a drop of water to cool their tongues, or quench their thirst, or revive their sinking hearts. There will be none to whom any complaint may be made, or from whom any sympathy may be expected. None to shed the friendly tear or utter a consolatory word. All friendship and sympathy will be extinguished for ever. Nay, on the contrary, there will be an eternal exchange of the most bitter reproaches and curses between the nearest relations and those who were the most affectionate friends in this world. There will be *no hope* of intermission, alleviation, or end of their torments. There is nothing which tends more to support the mind in distress than hope; the hope that serene and happy days will yet come. But all hope will be banished from the breasts of the *damned*; which leads to the remark that the dreadfulness of falling into the hands of God appears,—

5. From the *duration* of his wrath. Those who fall into the hands of the living God will never get out of them. If there were any assurance that after a lapse of millions of ages, they would be released, how would it cheer them! But all the prisoners of justice are prisoners of despair. Never, never will the hand of God be removed from them! They will eternally sink under its pressure. After as many millions of years have passed as there are stars in the heavens, drops in the ocean, leaves on the trees, or grains of sand by the sea shore, their torment will be as far from an end as when it first commenced. Oh! overwhelming thought. For if they obtain a release it must be

1st. By their making satisfaction to Divine justice. God has declared that he "will by no means clear the guilty." The utmost farthing of penal debt must be discharged before liberty can be proclaimed to the infernal captives, and "the opening of the prison to them that are bound" by chains of darkness. But this satisfaction they will be unable to make. They are under a natural inability to sustain the penalty of the Divine law, and under a moral inability to obey the precepts of it.

2nd. By overcoming the omnipotence of God. But this, it is needless to say, will be impossible. "Do we provoke the Lord to anger, are we stronger than He?"

3rd. By eluding his grasp and making their escape from his hands. But this will be impossible. Malefactors have sometimes made their escape from the hands of the executioners of justice, and from the place of confinement. But none will be able to escape from the hand of God, for it is omnipotent, or elude the eye of God, for it is omniscient. They cannot unlock their prison, for Christ has the keys of hell and death, and shutteth and no man openeth, they cannot break their prison, for its walls are stronger than walls of brass, and are surrounded by an impassable "gulf."

4th. By God's relenting, and setting them at liberty. But God will not let them go until they have paid the utmost farthing of the debt for which they have been arrested. In doing this, he would act inconsistently with the character of a righteous judge, who should never allow his compassion to subvert his justice. Will not man permit God to treat his enemies, when they fall into his hands, in the way that they would treat theirs? "If a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away?" No; yet they repine at the conduct of God, in confining his implacable enemies when they fall into his hands.

6. But all the examples and proofs which have been given of the truth of the proposition, only faintly exhibit the Divine displeasure, when compared with the sufferings of the incarnate Son of God. The blood that he sweat in Gethsemane, the groans and cries that he uttered on Calvary, display the terribleness of falling into the hands of the living God, more than all the pains of hell for ever. If the wrath of God made an infinite Person cry out, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" how fearful must it be! "If such things were done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

From the view taken of this subject, we may see—

1st. The evil nature of sin; were it not an exceeding vile thing in its nature, its punishment could not be so exceeding bitter.

2nd. The happiness of the people of God. Instead of falling into the hands of God, his everlasting arms are placed underneath them for their support, and around them for their protection. The hand of God is lifted and stretched out for their defence against all their enemies.

3rd. The love of God, in sending his Son into the world to rescue his enemies from the hands of Divine justice. He lets sinners go, and lays hold on his Son, his only Son, his beloved Son; O what grace!

4th. We see the heinous nature of unbelief, which casts contempt both upon the wrath and the love of God; despises both the threatenings of the law, and the promises of the gospel.

5th. We see how great is the insensibility of sinners. Notwithstanding all the intimations which God gives of their danger, yet they remain secure. Some indulge the hope of shunning the wrath which is to come, without any warrant for such a hope.

### ART. III.—*Voluntary Associations.*

MR. EDITOR,—It has been interesting to witness the late discussion in your periodical on the subject of voluntary associations. I looked on in silence, believing that you were fully competent to sustain the negative; until the October number, received a short time since, informed me that you had arrived at the conclusion, that they are warrantable. With all my high estimation of yourself, and of those who have supported that side of the question, you must allow me to dissent from your decision. And if it be consistent with your plan, you will permit me to state my reasons for an opposite opinion.

There are many who like myself cannot with their present light accord with your conclusion. Discussion may bring us to see eye to eye.

Besides, it is in vain to cover up the elements of discord in a community. The word of God, the divinely sanctioned practice of the church in past ages, the lamentable effects of it in shattering some religious societies in our own times, are so many testimonies against such a pernicious course. But it is by no means plain to me that the discussion of this point will either enkindle or perpetuate strife.

Further, the magnitude of the subject requires more investigation; being one of the most important of those questions that are now agitating the world. With your permission, therefore, I will proceed, confining myself, for the present, to the arguments used in the affirmative.

Numerous definitions, or rather descriptions, of voluntary associations have been given by those who advocate them. These descriptions are all characterized by one feature—a frittering down of the principle on which they rest to a mere nothing—at least until it becomes so little, as to be almost intangible. Now if they are such *harmless nothings*, where is their utility? Is not this the very method by which Lot pleads for the devoted city, “Spare it for it is little?” It forms the apology of Ephraim, in the midst of all his apostacy and idolatry, “In all my labours they shall find no iniquity in me that were sin.” It is this kind of reasoning that saves many a right eye, and many a right hand from the burning flames to which they should be consigned. But does not this description contradict the assertions which many periodicals have made, of the omnipotence

of such institutions, in correcting the evils with which society has been perplexed? Are not some of your own correspondents chargeable with this contradiction, in first placing them on a level with "log-rollings" and "house-raising," and afterwards ascribing to them the mighty influence of arousing the British nation to abolish slavery, and the United States to abandon the use of intoxicating liquors? If they are of the same nature with a log-rolling, or house-raising, we would, surely, find them conducted in the same manner. But what page of history records the constitution, and laws, and names of presidents, vice presidents, secretaries, and lecturers of a log-rolling, or house-raising? When did men, acting rationally, meet and adjourn from day to day, and from week to week, and from year to year, sending out lecturers and stump-orators to awaken the sympathies of the community for the purpose of rolling logs, or raising houses? If societies are no more than this, we had better take the good old way, which the western pioneers have always followed; and the logs will be rolled, and the houses raised, while we are talking about it on the newly invented plan.

The parallel that is drawn between these institutions and joint stock companies is very defective. The latter, being chartered and regulated by civil law, are directly the reverse of societyism. They are state institutions. Were men to start up, and under the pretence of the state's being insufficient for accomplishing these objects, organize themselves, and exercise *assumed* privileges, they would be a specimen of *natural* societyism. Such societies have existed. But have they been generally beneficial? The history of the west, and of the world, if we are not mistaken, will answer *no*. It will tell of their having monopolized the land trade in the west, so as almost entirely to prevent the poor man from procuring a home; until legislative enactments, to some extent, put it beyond their power. And still, by going in advance of the emigrants, and by purchasing *indirectly* large quantities of land, and retailing it at enormous prices to the poor settlers, they exercise a very pernicious influence. The principle, too, is of general application. Admit it, and what may be the consequence? Our farmers, mechanics, and merchants may all organize for the purpose of enhancing the value of their various commodities, each endeavouring to extort from the other; and thus will every conflicting principle of human nature be aroused; and every little neighbourhood will be *constituted*, and *officered*, and arrayed in the habiliments of petty warfare. Such companies have the power of extortion, and are therefore unscriptural—they monopolize, and are therefore opposed to equal rights—they are aristocratical, and consequently anti-republican. Were these even justifiable, they would utterly fail to present the true nature of societyism, the one proposing merely a *natural*, the other a *moral* object. Would that voluntary associations were nothing more than individuals uniting their strength in a proper way, for the attainment of a natural end! But from their almost unbounded popularity—from the resources they may command—and from the achievements of which they boast, it is evident, that they threaten to cast into the shade the heaven-born institutions of God, and to inflict on society calamities more deplorable than those which they propose to remove.

It would be difficult to define voluntaryism, since neither its *genus* nor *species* is found in either church or state. Claiming paternity from neither of these divine institutions, it has sprung up beyond the limits

of both, in the wide and wild field of human conjecture, which neither the precepts of God's laws, nor the promises of his glorious gospel illumine. Nor is a definition necessary. We may learn its nature from its operations. When we turn our attention to a voluntary association, we see a certain class called officers supposed to be vested with certain powers—another class called members over whom the former preside—a constitution and laws by which all are governed—and certain moral ends for the accomplishment of which they combine. Here, in short, we find every element of formal organization.

It is with societies as they have existed, and still exist, that we have to do, and not with a mere abstraction, or with some association that might be formed on correct principles. Nor is it of importance which of these we select. Tract, Bible, Sunday School, Temperance, and Abolition societies, having a common origin, must stand or fall together. Neither is it the object contemplated about which we would contend. We freely grant, that the ends proposed by these institutions are among the most noble that ever engaged the energies of intellectual beings. But the controversy respects the means by which these ends are to be attained. It will certainly be admitted that God, in his word, not only points out the work to be done, but the means by which it is to be done. He not only commands us to pray, but fills our mouths with arguments. If he enjoins the remembrance of his Son's death, he puts into our hands the symbols of his body and blood. Does he require obedience to the powers that be, he specifies the very circumstances of that obedience.

Such being the state of the question, the first point to be settled is, whether these voluntary associations are a divinely sanctioned means of effecting the noble ends which they contemplate? In proof of the affirmative, your correspondents direct us to Matt. vii. 12; Heb. xiii. 3; Jas. i. 27; Prov. xxxi. 8, 9; xxiv. 11, 12; Rev. xix. 17; Prov. xxvii. 5, 6; Tim. v. 22; Heb. x. 24. This class of texts urges on us important duties. Were these acted out by men, in their appropriate spheres, the tyrant's sceptre would be broken, the slave-holders lash drop from his trembling hand, and the poor slave would open his eyes on a cloudless day of unconditional emancipation. They point out the objects which societyism aims to accomplish; but they do not directly reveal the means by which these objects are to be gained. Now all agree that these objects ought to be accomplished; and only differ about the means by which they are to be attained. And as these texts do not tell us *how* we are to remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them—*how* we are to visit the fatherless and widows—*how* we are to open our mouths for the dumb—*how* we should reprove sin in our neighbour, it is fairly a *petitio principii* or begging of the question, to advance them in settling the controversy. This is precisely the method pursued by the advocates of human psalmody. Because the duty of praise is urged in various parts of the Bible, they conclude that human songs may be used in God's worship as well as those which are divine. Their conclusion, too, is quite as logical and sound as that of those who argue, that because slavery should be abolished, voluntary associations as well as divine institutions may be employed in doing it.

It will be unnecessary to take up these texts separately, as any one may see, by a brief examination, that they embrace substantially the same general principles; and if, as we have seen, they will not



afford a warrant for societyism collectively, they cannot do so separately. As a specimen, however, of such proof, examine more particularly one of these: Jas. i. 27, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." Like the others, this text cuts through the centre of every system of oppression. But does it tell us *how* we are to visit and relieve the wretched victims of it? Does it tell us directly or indirectly, that it must be done by tract, temperance, or abolition societies? Not a syllable of it points to such institutions. While it urges the duty, it leaves the *manner* to be determined by other parts of the same glorious revelation. Elsewhere the scripture directs us to prayer—to preaching—to contribution—to consolation—to pleading with our Mother as means of their relief; but those parts of the Bible which recognise voluntary societies, as hand-maids in this exalted work, have yet to be developed. Again, this precious portion of God's word defines the duty which it embraces as constituting the very essence of practical religion. If, then, it includes societies, they must be religious ordinances. Pray tell us, then, whether they belong to the public or private exercises of God's worship? Religious ordinances, too, are peculiar to the church. Is not this a new kind of church? Having only one term of communion, it admits those, and only those, to its fellowship, who accede to that one item of faith, without respect to their moral character: otherwise, though they might be profane, or idolaters, or Sabbath-breakers, some branches of the church have thrown their doors wide open to all persons, who are in good standing in their own society; but this new church unites in its pure religious worship, not only professed Christians of every name, but the world in all its glory of deism, infidelity, and atheism. Thus the temple of God no longer frowns on that of idols, but righteousness and unrighteousness, the mosque and the meeting-house, church and cathedral, light and darkness, Christ and Belial, are united in the closest brotherhood.

Our Lord's history of the good Samaritan is adduced, by some of your correspondents, as a warrant for voluntary associations. This was related by the Saviour, in reply to the lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbour?" It shows conclusively that our benevolence, instead of being confined to the unfortunate of any particular tribe, or nation, or clime, or colour, should embrace in its ample range, the vast expanse of the human family. But how it shows that this benevolence should be exerted through the medium of societyism, is to me a mystery. So it appeared to your correspondent: and he changes it to another case entirely, before it could be made to bear on his argument. The writer accordingly *supposes* that there had been ten, or twenty men, which the Samaritan single-handed could not have relieved—he is *supposed* to go and operate on the sympathies of the neighbourhood—they are *supposed* to assemble, to appoint a president, secretary, and purser; and thus panoplied, to repair to the scene of action. All this looks plausible; yet it lacks *one thing*, and that, in searching for a divine warrant, is *every thing*—it lacks the signature of Jesus Christ. He has not related such a tale in all his works. It is a mere fiction of fancy. Is it then candid to make a *supplement* to our Lord's history, and attempt to pass it off for the history itself? Had our Saviour introduced the case of a multitude of sufferers greater than the Samaritan could have relieved, his directions would,

no doubt, have been very different from that of drafting constitutions, appointing presidents, vice-presidents, secretaries, and pursers. Casting his eye over this huge globe, and beholding millions torn by spiritual, as well as natural thieves, he says not to his disciples, "Go and form voluntary societies," but "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Now *suppose* the Samaritan had acted on the combination plan. He comes, looks on the sufferer, and in the true spirit of unbelief says, "A lion is in the way." Distrusting the power of God's promise, he thinks he can do nothing without a company organized with all the formality of constitution, officers, and by-laws. Away he goes to act on the sympathies of the neighbourhood; but, unfortunately, for every one that he enlists on the side of compassion, he arouses one or more in opposition to the good work: the little community go to war, the one party endeavouring to go to the sufferer's relief, the other throwing obstacles in their way; and the poor fellow is left to die through the opposition which his own friends had stirred up in forming a society for his relief. A happier incident, illustrative of the principle opposite to that of societyism, could not have been selected. The magnanimous Samaritan lights upon a victim of misfortune. Without the tumult of a voluntary association he goes to work, and his efforts, by the divine blessing, are crowned with success so great as to encourage all others to "go and do likewise."

To this it may be replied that what one, in his individual capacity, has a right to do, all may unite in doing. Suppose, for the present, this position be granted. It only proves that individuals have a right to do what they have a right to do. The question is not whether individuals may act, or whether they may act in unison, but whether they may *voluntarily organize* to effect a moral object.

But it may be said, that organizing is mere form. It is just such form as we have in both church and state. And the organization of either of these is as simple as that of an abolition society. If the state has its officers, so has the society. Has the one its constitution and laws? so has the other. Does the state hold its county, state, and congressional meetings? so have societies their county, state, and national conventions. It is to be feared that this very circumstance is a snare in which many are in danger of being entrapped. They are so simple, and so nearly resemble divine institutions, where can there be any harm? So perhaps thought Nadab and Abihu with respect to offering incense, until the flaming wrath of God revealed their error, when it was too late for repentance? When Satan fails to seduce men entirely from the practice of religion and morality, he endeavours to lead them to rest in something that very nearly resembles them, though the real difference may be wide as the space which separates earth and heaven. And the nearer the resemblance, the greater is the danger of deception. An eminent historian says that "Julian the apostate, convinced of the mighty efficacy of preaching the gospel, and yet desiring its suppression, appointed preachers of infidelity through the various provinces of his empire." In every age the temple of idols has been erected near to the temple of the living God. The ark was once in the hands of the Philistines. It was not a resemblance, but a reality. What harm was it for them to carry it about? Might it not have united their energies, and inspired their courage, as well as that of the Israelites? It was out of place, in wrong hands, unaccompanied by a divine warrant, and the avenging

angel has perpetuated, by his ravages, the remembrance of their wickedness to all succeeding generations. If these institutions, therefore, be not from heaven, we should beware, lest, being seduced by them into the camp of the enemy, we fall beneath his plagues.

T. S. K.

ART. IV.—*Statement of the Associate Session of Xenia, to the Congregation under their Inspection, of their Authority from the Church and the Church's Head, for exercising the Discipline of the Church on those who offend by what is usually called, "occasional hearing."*

DEAR BRETHREN,—By the injunction of Zion's King, it is made our duty, not only to profess our faith in God, as our God, and our acknowledgment of him as our Lord, but to maintain firmly this profession when made. Heb. iv. 14, "Let us hold *fast* our profession;" x. 23, "Let us *hold fast* the profession of our faith *without wavering*." It is a matter, then, of the utmost importance, that we be correctly informed in relation to every thing inconsistent with such maintenance of our profession, and avoid it. The practice of attending upon the dispensation of the word in other churches we cannot but regard as being of this character, and, therefore, to be avoided, and, by instruction, exhortation, and the exercise of discipline, restrained. However, as a diversity of opinion prevails, to some extent, respecting the impropriety of this practice, and, to a still greater extent, respecting the warrant or authority from the church, for the exercise of discipline upon the offender, we have deemed it a duty, called for by the cause of suffering truth, to make to you a statement of the authority we have from the church and the church's Head, for exercising discipline upon those who offend in this matter.

We are constrained to believe, that if they who are involved in difficulties respecting the impropriety of this practice, would trace these difficulties to their origin, they would find them originating in the want of a thorough and deep-felt conviction of the *importance* of the truth and the maintenance of it, and of the *warrantableness* of our separation from, at least, some of the churches around us; we shall, therefore, in the first place, attempt the establishment of this position, viz., that the Associate church is in a state of *warrantable* separation from other churches.

Here three questions present themselves for our consideration, viz.:

I. Are there any points of difference between the principles of the Associate church and those of other churches?

II. Are those principles, which *distinguish* the profession of the Associate church from that of other churches, *true*—the principles of the Bible?

III. Does the denial, by other churches, of these *distinguishing* principles of our witnessing profession, or their refusal to embrace them, warrant our separate organization and the continuance of it; or should those principles have been made matters of forbearance, and should we, for the sake of union, *have gone*, or *now go* with them in their abandonment of them?

I. Are there any points of difference between the principles of the Associate church and those of other churches? This question,

it is plain, must be answered in the affirmative. It would be altogether inconsistent with the limits which must be set to this "statement" to attempt pointing out the difference, in principle, between the Associate church and *all* other churches, or even *many* of them. It must suffice to state *some* of the points of difference in principle between the Associate church and one or two of those whose profession approaches nearest our own. Among these we select the Reformed and Associate Reformed churches.

The Associate and Reformed churches differ chiefly on the following points, viz.:

1. The subject of magistracy; and here the primary difference respects what is necessary to the *being* of a magistrate. The Reformed church maintains that a due measure of Scriptural qualifications is necessary to the *being* of a lawful magistrate—that the infidelity of a ruler, in a nation where the light of the Gospel has been generally diffused, makes void his authority, and, consequently, that such a magistrate is not to be owned as a lawful one, or submitted to in his lawful commands, for conscience sake. It is true, a branch of this church has lately admitted the lawfulness of submission to the government of the United States, but in so doing they deny any change of principle, but profess to have discovered that this government, with its toleration of slavery, sabbath mails, &c., &c., is *such a scriptural government* as their principles require. The Associate church, on the contrary, maintains, that though this due measure of scriptural qualifications is necessary to the *well being* of a magistrate, yet it is not necessary to his *being* as such—that a person invested, by the consent of the people, with a right to rule over them, and, so long as he is countenanced by the majority of the nation and does not endeavour the overthrow of the civil and religious liberty of the nation, *is*, though destitute of this due measure of scriptural qualifications, a lawful magistrate, and to be acknowledged as such by obedience to his lawful commands for conscience sake. The difference between these churches in relation to what is necessary to the *being* of a lawful magistrate, when truly carried out, exhibits them as differing, on the subject of magistracy, in several other particulars, such as the *fountain* of the magistrate's authority and his duty or power *circa sacra*.

2. The subject of faith. The Associate church maintains that there is an *assurance* in the very nature of faith, as distinct from the assurance of sense, or the assurance that we are already partakers of grace. But the Reformed church, while they maintain that an assurance of sense may be obtained, are silent on the important question—whether there is assurance in the essence or nature of faith; or their sound is so indistinct or uncertain that it cannot be understood. Since our brethren of the Reformed church *must* have known that this was a matter of controversy in the Christian community—that this was a principle opposed by the great mass of professed Christians, their refusal to appear openly and closely on its side is to be regarded as an appearance against it, according to that word of our Lord, "He that is not with me is against me."

3. The extent of Christ's purchase. The Reformed church maintains that Christ purchased temporal benefits for believers. The Associate church maintains that Christ purchased the divine blessing on the temporal enjoyments of believers, or the gracious ordering

of them to their spiritual good and the glory of God; but denies that temporal enjoyments themselves, such as food and raiment, in their earthly and perishing nature, and as the means of supporting animal life, are purchased by Christ's death.\*

The Associate and Associate Reformed Churches differ chiefly on the following points:

1. Testimony bearing. Though the Associate Reformed Church seem to agree with us that it is the duty of the church to appear as God's witness, yet they differ from us in regard to what constitutes a *faithful, fixed testimony*. The Associate church maintains that, as testimony for the truth supposes that truth is in controversy, a stated testimony, to be faithful, must not only contain an assertion of truth, but be opposed directly to the perverters and despisers of the truth. The Associate Reformed church maintains that a stated testimony is all that it ought to be, when it contains a mere assertion of truth, and, accordingly, they have nothing for a "fixed testimony," but an amended or modified copy of the "Confession of Faith;" they even regard a fixed testimony, when opposed directly to the perverters and despisers of truth, as extremely dangerous—they believe there is solid ground to fear that, in the present unhappy contentions which divide the church, it would be used by too many as the rallying point of party, and would inflame those wounds in the body of Christ which it should be our study and prayer to have speedily and thoroughly healed. Farther, the Associate church maintains, that a testimony, to be the testimony of a church, must be made a term of communion, and, accordingly, have made their testimony a term of communion in *all* cases. The Associate Reformed church makes what she calls her "fixed testimony" a term of communion in *some* cases, but not in *all*. The evidence of this will appear in the fourth point of difference.

2. The extent of Christ's purchase. The principle of the Associate church on this subject is as stated above in the third point of difference between us and the Reformed church. The Associate Reformed church has, on this subject, no avowed principle at all; the discordant materials of which this church was composed, finding they could not agree about this article of truth, agreed to lay aside a public and joint profession of it, and thus did, as a church, what they could to bury it.

3. Psalmody. The Associate church testifies in favour of the exclusive use of the scripture Psalms, and requires such use of them in the worship of God under all circumstances. The Associate Reformed church, in her constitution, prohibits the use by her "churches" or congregations only, of compositions *merely* human, and lays her members under no restriction at all in this matter, when worshipping in any other than an "Associate Reformed church." Nor do they, in their "Act" or "occasional testimony" on this subject, make the substitution of devotional songs, composed by un-

\* The author might have specified a fourth point of difference, namely,—

4th. The Associate church maintains, that, while Christ's kingly power, as Mediator, extends to all things, and is absolutely unlimited, he, nevertheless, exercises this power mediatorially to the church only. But the Reformed church maintains that this power is exerted mediatorially to the whole world as such. That is, she confounds all distinction between his *mediatorial* government of the church and Pagan nations, or Anti-Christian powers. [See an excellent article on this point in the last number, p. 385.—ED. REL. MON.]

inspired men, in the place of the scripture, *songs censurable in any but ministers and congregations*: this act we cannot regard as containing any thing more explicit, on this subject, than their Constitution, which prohibits the use of uninspired songs only when worshipping "in Associate Reformed churches," or congregations.

4. Communion. The Associate church has always declared, openly and explicitly, against *occasional communion*. The Associate Reformed church never has. In their original constitution they required an approbation of the principles exhibited in the Confession of Faith, &c., as a term of admission to only "*fixed communion*," which plainly implied they would allow a communion with them *occasional*, or not fixed, and that this communion could be had without an approbation of the principles exhibited in the Confession of Faith, &c. In the act amending this Constitution (which act is still in force) a change of language, it is true, is used in expressing the "terms" of admission into this church; it runs thus: "The terms on which any person or persons shall be admitted as a member or members of the synod, or as a member or members of any congregation under the inspection of synod, are an approbation of the principles exhibited in the above-mentioned Confession," &c. If it had been really the intention of this church to disallow of occasional communion, it is plain that the most *obvious* and *easy* amendment of the article about communion would have been made by striking out the word "*fixed*." This, however, was not done, but the article was amended so as to read as above; and must not every person notice it as remarkable, that though the change of phraseology is very great, the very same idea is still expressed. The admission of "a person or persons as a member or members" of a church, is just an admission of them to *fixed* communion, and, consequently, still provides for occasional communion. So much for their admission of others to communion with them. Farther, they say something about the practice of going themselves into occasional communion with others. In their original constitution they say—"as occasional communion, in a divided state of the church, may produce great disorders, if it be not conducted with great wisdom and moderation, they esteem themselves, and the people under their inspection, invariably bound, in all ordinary cases, to submit to every restriction of their liberty which general edification renders necessary." In the act amending that Constitution the matter is made no better. They say "they do not consider themselves as left at liberty by this part of their Confession (chap. xxvi.) to hold organical communion with any denomination of Christians, that is inconsistent with a faithful and pointed testimony for revealed truth," &c. This implies that they regard organical communion, with at least some other denominations, as consistent "with a faithful and pointed testimony for revealed truth;" and, besides, as we are not told what is meant, or they mean by *organical* communion, and as they do not declare with what "denominations," or whether with many, or any of them, the holding of this "*organical* communion" is "inconsistent with a faithful and pointed testimony for revealed truth," we cannot but regard this amendment as altogether indefinite.

5. Public covenanting. The Associate church maintains that public religious covenanting is a moral duty, and, consequently, a

duty under the New Testament dispensation, that it is seasonable in the present divided state of the church, and in other seasons than seasons of persecution, and that the obligation of covenant engagements descends upon the church in after times. The Associate Reformed church, it is true, declare, in their original constitution, it is a moral duty under the gospel dispensation, yet they have cast all notice of the subject out of the Confession of Faith; in their act concerning the religious connexions of the synod, they say nothing about the morality of the duty, they never practise it, and have tolerated in their ministers, not only the denial of its morality, but the representation of it as a Judaizing observance, and all from both the pulpit and the press. Further, so far as we are able to gather their sentiments respecting the seasonableness of the duty, they regard it as seasonable only in times of persecution. Again, they consider the obligation of covenant engagements, by the church, as descending only upon the natural offspring of those who enter into them.

II. Are these principles, which *distinguish* the profession of the Associate church from that of other churches, true—the *principle of the Bible*? This question, it is also plain, must be answered in the affirmative by every person who has intelligently and candidly embraced the profession of the Associate church. The proof of the *truth* of these distinguishing principles, it is evident, cannot be attempted in this “statement,” nor does it properly belong to it, for we are now addressing *seceders*—persons who have professed *these* as *their* principles—persons who have made this profession under the character of *witnesses*, and are, therefore, bound to declare *nothing but the truth*. Addressing persons, then, who, we are in charity bound to believe, admit, or ought to admit the *truth* of our *distinguishing* principles, we may safely, and fairly too, answer this second question in the affirmative, and take the correctness of this answer for granted.

III. The only question remaining to be settled is this, namely, Does the *denial*, by other churches, of these *distinguishing principles* of our witnessing profession, or their refusal to embrace them, warrant our separate organization and the continuance of it; or should these principles have been made matters of forbearance, and should we, for the sake of union, *have gone*, or *now go* with them in their abandonment of them? The affirmative of the former member of this question, and the negative of the latter, being the same, we assume, and humbly conceive our support from the Word of God is abundant. Rom. xvi. 17. “Mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.” 2 Thess. 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, and not after the traditions which ye received of us.” Prov. xxiii. 23. “Buy the truth and sell it not.” Surely we are taught by these passages that however desirable peace and union may be, yet, when sought at the expense of truth, the sacrifice is too great, and cannot be made. We would direct your attention to only one other passage. Phil. iii. 15, 16. “If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.” In these verses there is noticeable,

1st. The subject matter which the injunction respects—grace in the heart, but also and especially the doctrines of the Word. This is plain from the mention that is made of a something about which there might be a difference of opinion—persons might be “otherwise” or differently “minded,” and, therefore, evidently principally designs the *truths* of the Word.

2d. An admission that there are truths, about which members of the church are “otherwise,” or *differently* “minded,” or, which is the same thing, that the church is not yet perfect in her attainments.

3d. An admission that in relation to *such* truth forbearance *is* to be exercised. This admission, however, we are not to understand as an admission that the church *may* stand still; she is to press toward perfection; this very passage assures her that God will still be giving her further and further attainments of unanimity about truths respecting which her members had been “otherwise minded;” it is her duty, then, to believe and earnestly to seek that the Lord will, in due time, bring her to these attainments, and if any will obstinately and perseveringly stand still, the church must leave them and go forward.

4th. An implied declaration that the church has already made the attainment of unanimity to *some* extent. “Whereto we have already attained.”

5th. A declaration that the truths thus “attained” are to be *maintained*, and forbearance *is not* to be exercised respecting them—“Let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.” To set this last in a clear light, if possible, we would refer you to Rev. iii. 11. “Hold *that* fast which thou *hast*.” Rev. ii. 25. “*That* which ye *have already*, hold fast till I come.”

Here our arguments might close, were it not that we are met with the impious distinction of truths into important and unimportant, or essential and non-essential, and the plea that the church’s attainments only in important or essential truths are to be maintained, and, for the sake of peace and union, forbearance ought to be exercised in relation to those unimportant or non-essential. “But we have not so learned Christ.” It is not the relative importance of a particular truth, or set of truths, or the special connexion which they may have with our salvation, that constitutes them truths to be maintained by the church. If they be only matters of divine revelation, which the least truth and every truth is, then, whether their connexion with our salvation be near or more remote, they ought to be made matter of the church’s profession, and maintained by her when once attained. This we think plain, for the following reasons:

1. *Every truth bears the stamp of God’s authority.* Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. “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.*” Deut. xii. 32. “What things soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.” But, according to the principle we are now opposing, the church is bound to observe, not the *all things God has commanded*, but only the all things essential to salvation. According to this principle, man’s chief and highest end is his own salvation, and if it was not for the essential connexion of some of these truths with his salvation, *none* of them would be worthy of being maintained—no



matter what becomes of the glory of God, the honour and authority of the laws of Christ, and the purity of the church. In opposition to this principle we are to regard, not man's salvation, but the authority of God as the primary reason for receiving and maintaining *any* truth revealed in his word; and since this is stamped upon *every* truth, and is despised in rejecting the least as well as the most important truth, the church may not, must not, nay, cannot neglect maintaining any one of them, when attained, without incurring the judgments of God. Shall an earthly sovereign be offended when his authority is in the least slighted—when the propriety, the reasonableness, the profitableness of his commands must be inquired into before they will be obeyed; and shall not He who is "King of kings and Lord of lords," be offended, when his authority is regarded by his creature-man, only when and so far as it is conceived by him to be conducive to his own interest? The end of Nadab and Abihu, who presumed to offer strange fire upon God's altar, teaches us what a holy jealousy God has for his own authority, and that his injunctions are not to be disregarded and despised with impunity. But it is the duty of the church, and highly becoming her, to be found not only not slighting the authority of God, but entertaining a fervent zeal for the honour of his authority. What can be more reasonable, or more becoming the professed followers, worshippers, servants of God, the bride, the spouse of Christ, than to be exceedingly jealous for the Lord God of hosts: but how can it be said of her that she is thus jealous for the Lord, unless she maintains the whole truth, seeing the authority of God is stamped upon it, and is honoured or despised just as the whole truth is, or is not maintained? But does not this seem to be idle reasoning? Does it not seem to be foolish trifling, to attempt proving that God *ought to be obeyed*? that his authority *ought* to be regarded *in all* things? It is ground of humiliation and lamentation that such is necessary; for it is denied to be the church's duty to maintain the whole truth, though it has for its authority a *thus saith the Lord*. Horrible sentiment! and can be accounted for only upon the ground of the woful depravity of human nature. Let us see to what this principle would lead us. We are told that "Paul shaved his head in Cenchrea," Acts xviii. 18, and the number of *knives* brought up from Babylon to Jerusalem by Sheshbazzar, upon the return from captivity, was just *twenty-nine*. Ezra i. 9, 11. If there be any unimportant truths, one would suppose these two to be of that class. Does it not, then, necessarily follow, from this principle, that forbearance should be exercised towards the person who would not admit, or might deny *these* truths or facts? Nay more, that the church, for the sake of peace and union, ought to chime in with this person in his non-admission or positive denial of these truths, or at least cease to assert them? Should it be objected that this consequence does not follow, for these are *evident or plainly revealed truths or facts*, and exercising forbearance in such a case would be direct toleration of direct partial infidelity; it is replied, that the principle which distinguishes truths into essentials and non-essentials, and pleads for the exercise of forbearance in regard to the non-essentials, admits that these non-essential truths *may* be "evident or plainly revealed truths," and contends not only that forbearance should be exercised towards those who will not admit them, but that it is the duty of those who know them to be "evi-

dent or plainly revealed truths," for the sake of union, to drop their profession of them. Would not this, just as evidently, be toleration of partial infidelity? Nay, would it not be the very adoption of partial infidelity? We cannot close this reason without an *extract* strikingly proving the utter unwarrantableness and error of this distinguishing of truths. "Though it may be admitted that some doctrines of the gospel are relatively of greater importance than others, yet they are individually essential parts of a perfect system. If some doctrines may be regarded as the foundation of the Christian system, while others constitute the different parts of the superstructure, it should be recollected that the superstructure is no less essential to the completeness of the building than is the foundation."

2. *The truth is unspeakably valuable.* Divine truth is the immediate ground of our hope for eternity, and a means of our sanctification and consolation. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." "This word of thine my comfort is in mine affliction." On all these accounts the truth—every truth is unspeakably valuable. But the principle we are now opposing represents that such truths only as are deemed essentials are worthy being maintained, and that all others are of minor or little importance and needed not. And is it indeed true that God ever revealed to his church a truth of so little importance, or so unprofitable, that it is unworthy being maintained by her? The psalmist was far from thinking so. Psal. xix. 10. "More to be desired are they (the judgments of the Lord) than gold, yea, than *much fine gold*;" cxix. 72. "The law of thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver." Beside, let us beware of impeaching the wisdom of God; let us not so presumptuously contradict the express declaration of Him in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge—"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is *profitable* for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. It is true, indeed, that maintaining the *whole* truth is not *absolutely* essential to salvation, so that he who may not maintain *some* of them cannot be saved: but we may not, therefore, reject any one truth as unprofitable, for it is equally true that the rejection of any truth, just as any other sin, endangers salvation. We would not be understood as denying the perseverance of the saints; we use the same form of expression which Paul used when speaking on the same subject. 1 Cor. iii. 12, 15. "Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Does not the apostle, when he states that the person who receives and holds the foundation, and builds thereon, wood, hay, stubble, shall be saved, *yet so as by fire*, have allusion to the extreme danger of the person who escapes out of his house when in flames around him?

3. *The relinquishment of any truth by the church exposes her to great danger of further defection, and even final apostacy.* A temptation may be presented to the believer long, and in very different forms, before he may comply with it; but when this first temptation has been complied with, though it may have been with

reluctance and fear, every person must know how easy it is to comply with a second, how much easier to comply with a third, and how much easier still to comply with a fourth, a fifth, &c., until he is, for a time, led captive by Satan at his pleasure. So it is with the church. Though it may be with reluctance and fear that she relinquishes a single truth attained in her profession, yet with how much less reluctance and fear will she relinquish a second, how much easier will it be for her to relinquish a third, and how much easier still to relinquish a fourth, a fifth, &c., until, ere she is aware, she is wandering and lost in the mazes of error and delusion. The relinquishing, by a particular church, of one truth, and another, and another attained, soon acquires the force of habit; and, besides, God may leave her to relinquish a second truth, a third, a fourth, to hasten, to go headlong into apostacy as a judgment for her first relinquishment of a single truth. "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believe not the truth." And here facts come in to the aid of our argument. Time was when Christ had but a *few* things against the primitive churches, they had let go but a few of his truths; but what was the consequence of this *beginning* in a backward course? where are those churches now? With the relinquishment of a "*few*" truths they did not stop, but went on and on in their backward course, and now are whelmed in thickest moral darkness. The moral darkness which broods over those countries first visited with the light of the Reformation is the fruit of the same course of letting go by *little and little* until the whole of that glorious light was put out.

4. *It is necessary to the church's discharging the important duty of transmitting the truth to posterity.* "He hath established a testimony in Jacob and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers that they should make them known to their children, that the generations to come might know them, even the children who should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children;" and the important reason given for this duty is, "that they might set their hope in God and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments." Psalm lxxviii. 5, 6, 7. It is surely no trivial argument in favour of the church's maintaining her attainments in the truth, that with it is closely connected the eternal welfare of millions yet unborn. It is indeed true that "where there is no vision," or where ignorance, error and delusion reign, "the people perish;" and as the least defection from attainments in the truth is so remarkably calculated to induce further defection and even utter apostacy; it is no difficult matter to see how awfully the relinquishment of *any* truth attained, endangers the eternal welfare of future generations, and even those not far distant. As, then, the church would esteem the redemption of the soul as precious, and as she would be innocent of the blood of unborn myriads, she lies under the most imperious obligation to maintain her attainments in the truth, that she may transmit it, pure and entire, to them as the means of their everlasting salvation.

5. *Our own comfort is a reason why we should maintain our attainments in the truth.* This is a reason which applies not so particularly to the church in her collective capacity as to her individual members. What comfort did Moses lose by not believing

the Lord, "to sanctify him in the eyes of the children of Israel?" For this he was not permitted to enter the promised land. Because Eli failed in the due exercise of parental and official authority, such evil came upon him, even in his old age, as made the ears of those who heard it to tingle. A professor's neglecting to maintain the truth is also a sin, and though it cannot bring him, if a believer, into condemnation, it may make him go halting to the grave, go continually under the hidings of God's countenance. The maintenance of truth must, therefore, be, on the contrary, a gracious source of comfort in life, and especially in death. How comforting to the Christian, at this trying hour, to reflect that he has not denied Christ's name—has not dishonoured him in this respect before the world—has been faithfully contending for his authority, and the honour and authority of his laws. Notice with what composedness of mind Paul speaks of his death, when just before him: 2 Tim. iv. 6. "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." Whence this peace—this composedness in the immediate prospect of death? He adds, verses 7, 8, "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."

6. Finally, we deem it our duty to add, that we are bound to maintain all our attainments in the truth, *by the solemn covenant engagements under which we are laid to do so*. Though the churches, generally, have abandoned the principle of the morality of public religious covenanting, and, almost universally, the practice of it, yet the obligation of the covenant engagements of the church, in former times, to be faithful to the cause and testimony of Jesus, now descends upon them, and, whether willing or unwilling, they are bound by them. But still the obligations under which *we*, as a church, are laid by this means, to be faithful to that cause and testimony, are peculiar, because of our open avowal of the descending obligation of the covenants of ancestors, and of the morality and present seasonableness of the duty; and because many of us, in our own persons, have, with our hands lifted up to the Most High God, *promised and sworn* "by the great and holy name of the Lord our God," "that during all the days of our life we shall *continue steadfast in the faith, profession, and obedience of the true reformed religion, in doctrine, worship, presbyterial church government, and discipline, as the same is held forth to us in the word of God, and received in this church, and testified for by it*." We, then, as a church, are bound by solemn covenant engagements to maintain all our attainments in the truth, and, among these, those very truths which distinguish our profession. It is not assumed that these covenant engagements bind us to maintain truths we were not previously bound by the Word of God to maintain; but having, as we humbly conceive, proved that, by the Word of God, we *were* bound to maintain *all* the truths attained in our profession, and even those which distinguish it, we do assume that our covenant engagements bind upon us, by an additional cord, the duty of maintaining these truths: and surely *he* who is disposed to remember the day he stood before the Lord,—*he* who knows the nature of an oath, and fears it, —*he* who knows that God will plead the quarrel of his covenant, will not say of this cord that it is weak, or make light of this reason.

The position we are endeavouring to establish, it will be recollected, is this, namely, *That the Associate church is in a state of warrantable separation from all other churches.* It will also be recollected it was shown there are *points of difference between the principles of the Associate church and those of other churches*, and that we took it for granted that the *distinguishing* principles of our profession are *true—the principles of the Bible*, which, it was conceived, we might fairly and safely do in an address to persons who have professed these distinguishing principles as *their* principles. That we are bound, as a church, to maintain *all* the truths we have attained in our public profession, and, amongst these, those truths which are *distinguishing*, we think we have proved: and, surely, if the authority of God, which is stamped upon every truth, is to be regarded in *all* things; if the *whole* truth is unspeakably valuable—more and better far to us than thousands of gold and silver; if the relinquishment of a single truth attained, so fearfully tends to further defection, and even apostacy; if it is a duty to transmit the truth, pure and entire, to the generations yet unborn, as the means of their everlasting salvation; if comfort in life, and especially in the trying hour of death, is at all worth having; if we should fear the oath of God; if any, or all these things be true, it must be admitted that it is *proved* that it is our duty to maintain *all* our attainments, as a church, in the truth, even those which are distinguishing. We think, then, the conclusion is irresistible, that *our separate organization and the continuance of it is warrantable*; for, while other churches deny, or will not embrace these principles which distinguish us from them, there remains no way of our maintaining these attainments, but by separation, continued separation from them.

(To be continued.)

#### ART. V.—*United Secession Church of Scotland.*

MR. EDITOR.—SIR:—In the Religious Monitor for January, in noticing an article on “Psalmody,” extracted from the United Secession Magazine of Scotland, you say that the United Secession “is verging rapidly to the wildest kind of latitudinarianism.”

When in my native land, I belonged to the communion of that body, and it now numbers among its members my nearest and dearest earthly friends; for this and other reasons, I feel a deep interest in its purity or declension, its prosperity or adversity.

I will, therefore, thank you to give, in your next number, your reasons for making so serious a charge, both for information to myself and that I may warn those whom I love in the flesh and the spirit, that they be not swept along in the same current of error.

I wish you to understand distinctly that I do not endorse the sentiments of the article referred to, or coincide with the unscriptural and untenable arguments of its writer. Yours, &c., N. R.

#### *Reply to N. R.*

N. R. misquotes us by substituting the word “is” for the phrase “appears to be,” thus imparting to our language a force which it will not bear. Having omitted a qualifying phrase, he is the more easily able to construe our words into a “serious charge.” Again, why is “verging” substituted for “diverging?” These words are not synonymous. And if they were, it is better to let every man speak

for himself, when this can be done. We did not say, nor do we now say, that the *United Secession* is *actually* involved in the wildest kind of latitudinarianism; but we do say, after a deliberate examination of such of her publications as we have been able to obtain, of her ecclesiastical polity, and of the reports of intelligent persons recently from that country, that she *appears* to us to be diverging rapidly towards that point. Happy will it be for the Protestant cause, if these things should, in the end, prove to be only *appearances*. Gladly would we receive substantial evidence, sufficient to demonstrate that our fears are groundless; not only for the sake of that church, but, also, on account of the influence she must necessarily exert, for good or for evil, upon the cause of sound principles in America. Is N. R. unable to discover any cause of alarm in the promulgation of "unscriptural and untenable" arguments by the standard work of that body? Is he altogether consistent? He assumes that I have made a serious charge, desires my reasons, and yet wishes to be distinctly understood not to "endorse the sentiments of the article" on which my remark was chiefly founded. He assumes too much in the first instance, and requires too much in the second; unless it is to be supposed that unscriptural tenets furnish no cause for alarm. It is probable, however, that N. R. has not duly reflected upon the importance of this matter, and that his note is rather the result of sudden impulse than of deliberation.

We shall, therefore, give our reasons, not to support a "serious charge," for we have made none, but for the language we did use.

REASON I. The article in question, entitled "Church Psalmody." The following sentiments are either directly expressed or clearly implied in that article: 1. The Book of Psalms belong to a dispensation which has passed away. 2. It is as incongruous to confine the church to a definite book of praise as to a set form of prayer. 3. A scripture psalmody is one of the *accidental* forms of religion. 4. A scripture psalmody was not used in early times. 5. The Relief, Independent, and other churches who have adopted human compositions, to the exclusion of the inspired songs of Zion, are not chargeable with innovation. 6. Every reason that can be urged for the use of the Psalms of David in praise will apply with nearly equal force to other books of Scripture. 7. That the Psalms were *chosen* by the Old Testament church, consequently they could not have been imposed by Divine authority. 8. That the Old and New Testament dispensations are so different, that the same book of praise is unsuitable to both. 9. That the contentings of the fathers of the Secession were mere "dissensions." 10. The Psalms, through misconception, lead to feelings not well pleasing to God. (Why then permit the people to read them? Wherein does this sentiment differ from the church of Rome?) 11. Does not advocate the entire discontinuance of the Book of Psalms in worship, bad as they are. 12. Great excellence in *not a few* of the Psalms. 13. But this excellency leads parents to impress them on the minds of their children. 14. And, being once familiar to the mind, they cease to excite any appropriate feelings. 15. This cannot be the case when we worship with other denominations who use human compositions. Thus we have, within the compass of three pages, this long catalogue of heresies and absurdities. It has not a parallel in any thing with which we are acquainted, except the famous and often refuted preface of Dr. Watts. And if N. R. will point us to the same number

of absurdities in the same space, in any other respectable religious periodical, either in Britain or America, we will certainly acknowledge the obligation. Is there, then, no cause for alarm?

But, says an objector, is it candid, is it fair to hold a large body of Christians responsible for the sentiments of a single anonymous and irresponsible scribbler? Certainly not; unless the whole body make itself responsible either by connivance or approbation. How stands the case in the present instance? The article in question appeared eighteen months since, without note or comment; during all this period not one among the numerous readers and learned correspondents of the Magazine have taken the alarm. Neither has the editor, or the writer been called to account by the judicatories of the church, so far as known to us. What then is the irresistible inference? Either the whole body winks or approves. And even N. R.'s note, *prima facie*, is evidence of dissatisfaction with us for refusing, in like manner, to connive or approve.

REASON II. That church has not only laid aside a testimony for present truth and against opposing errors, but is now engaged in casting aspersions upon the fair fame of those who, in a former age, regarded these duties as obligatory upon the Christian church. See the act adopting their present testimony, in which they expressly refuse to make that testimony a term of ministerial and Christian communion. The contentings of the fathers of the Secession against the errors of their own time are also characterized as "unseemly strife," by which "the charities of life were violated," "the sanctuary profaned," "family devotion marred," and "the exercise of pious feelings interrupted." They were men "living and acting under the most pernicious influences." "It is against these influences I throw out these animadversions, and not against the men, and shall, therefore,

' No farther seek their merits to disclose,  
Or draw their frailties from their dread abode.'

These pernicious influences are diminished and diminishing. The *growing* tolerance and charity of the Secession church strikes every observer of past and present times, and reference is seldom made to the denomination, without a compliment to this effect being paid to it." *United Secession Mag.*, Sept., 1840, p. 514. The article from which the foregoing extract is taken, is entitled, "The proposed Union between the United Secession and Relief Churches. Letter Sixth."

It is not to be supposed that the fathers of the Secession church were more destitute of "frailties" than others, but that they were more distinguished in this respect than their modern defamers, we are unable to believe. But the writer expressly disavows the application of these "frailties" to them as men, but to the "pernicious influences under which they lived and acted." With what consistency this distinction is made we are unable to perceive. For, if these influences, whatever they may have been, affected not the men, then why mention them in connexion? If they did affect them injuriously, this, of itself, is to be taken as one evidence of their frailty. But the context and the subject under discussion show us, at a glance, what is intended by these "pernicious influences," namely, the spirit of that day, which was roused by those men, in defence of fixed principles of religion and resistance to all opposing errors; and these

"influences" were developed, cherished, diffused, chiefly through their instrumentality; consequently it is perfectly idle to attempt, at this late day, a separation between those men and the influences under which they "lived and acted;" if the latter were evil, the former could not have been good. The distinction, then, is a mere *ruse*, to blind the minds of those whose attachment to the fathers of the Secession cannot be shaken.

REASON III. The compliments paid to the United Secession for this *growing* toleration, by Independents, Baptists, &c., is an evidence of her approximation towards them, and, consequently, of her latitudinarian spirit. It will scarcely be contended that those bodies are now more friendly to the principles held by Erskine, Fisher, Moncrief, Wilson, Gib, and others of a similar stamp, in the present, than they were in the past century. If any should think so, they are certainly mistaken. It is the toleration of men in her communion who oppose the *exclusive* spirit of early Seceders, who connive at, or adopt\* human compositions in the praises of God, and who maintain, practically, the principle that we may hold communion with those from whom we differ, provided they do not restrict our liberty; or, in other words, the church may receive into her bosom such as deny some of her avowed principles, if they will allow her still to *profess* them, and thus present to the world the spectacle of a house divided against itself. And yet they say, by this arrangement, the church loses nothing. She surrenders nothing. She does not, indeed, judicially repeal any of her principles; but she permits them to become a dead letter, opens the door for the instruction of her people in error; and paves the way for such a breach as lately took place in the General Assembly, or a total subversion of her constitution. That such is the true state of the case, we have evidence, if evidence were needed, in the same number of the Magazine from which we have already quoted, p. 525. "The Methodist Conference has met, for the first time, in New Castle. With many of its modes of procedure I am *highly delighted*, and I should like very much were the Secession Synod to adopt several of the Conference measures." "In conducting a Presbytery we might be instructed by the practices of the English Independents." "Hoping you will find room in your miscellany for these *two hints*, I remain yours." The things with which the writer was highly delighted, were, indeed, things of expediency; but why so delighted with measures of expediency adopted by Methodists and Independents? Do their principles lead to more expedient measures than those held by the Reformers? But who can question the sincerity of the compliment paid to their growing toleration, by those whose measures have so greatly delighted the United Secession? Methodists and Independents will, hereafter, probably regard them in somewhat the same light that the Roman Catholics do the Oxford Tract writers. They compliment them for the rapid strides they are making back into the bosom of the mother church, while they think they have a few remaining prejudices.

It is no secret to American Seceders that a relaxation of their peculiar principles and expressions of delight, on account of the sayings and doings of Methodists and Independents, would call forth like

\* We have been informed that some ministers in that church make a free use of human compositions; but cannot vouch for the accuracy of this information. If wrong, we should like to be corrected.



complimentary notices to *their* growing toleration. The operation of cause and effect is presumed to be the same on both sides of the Atlantic. And we know, at least, several Seceder ministers on this side, and the same remark is believed to be applicable to most of them, who prefer living and acting under the influences, call them pernicious or otherwise, which so distinctly marked the fathers of the Secession to all the compliments and all the possessions the world has power to bestow. Nay more, they will suffer all the evil the world has power to inflict, sooner than surrender those "influences."

They have learned from the lively oracles of God, that their inflexible adherence to truth, and determined resistance to error, were nothing more than the Head of the church has required from his people; and experience has taught them the value of these principles in the day of adversity. If, then, you have any regard for their most cherished inheritance, any sympathy for their spiritual joys, pardon their fears and their jealousies.

REASON IV. The United Secession no longer maintains the binding obligation of the covenants of our ancestors, but has laid aside the duty altogether; or, for aught we know to the contrary, has buried it among other "pernicious influences," which so strongly marked the period of the Reformation, and several subsequent periods. On this point we shall not dwell, for it is presumed it will not be denied.

REASON V. The United Secession has erected no barrier against the lax administration of the seals of the covenant, especially the Lord's Supper. Communion should be the effect of agreement in views of divine truth, and mutual affection for each other. But the fundamental principle on which that church now proceeds is, first, communion, as the means of union. How is it possible that the mere outward participation in any divine ordinance, can bring persons holding contradictory sentiments to agreement? and without agreement, how can there be love? The plea urged, is, that "they must treat each other's peculiarities with tenderness, and manifest respect for the opinions and practices they cannot adopt."\* This principle was introduced in the formation of the Union, and is now insisted upon in their proposed union with the Relief. But how far is this principle to be extended? Beyond things of indifference or expediency? Every sound theologian must answer in the negative. Then it is wholly inapplicable to the purpose for which it is used. None will surely contend that the matters of difference between the various denominations are nothing more than matters of indifference or expediency. We have seen that their differences draw much deeper. They affect not only the beams of our chambers, but, in some instances, remove the chief corner stone. Is it nothing to remove the inspired songs of Zion from the Lord's house? and this is likely to prove the first great public step of the United Secession church.

In conclusion, some may think we have devoted too much room to this subject; but it will be seen that we were called upon to give our reasons, and what we have written has been with reluctance in answer to that call. We had much rather see this important matter discussed by other and more able hands. If we have sounded a false alarm, it was certainly not intended; if true, it is worthy the serious

\* Dr. Jamieson, East Linton.

attention of the church, lest the same leaven that has crept into the Union, and which is at work among us,\* should leaven the whole lump, and we should find ourselves suddenly and unexpectedly despoiled of the fair inheritance of our fathers. It seems to us that on the subject of psalmody, the Secession church in the United States can never yield her present position; and this position can only be maintained by jealous care and unceasing vigilance.

Some will be ready to ask, is there to be no exercise of Christian forbearance; no tenderness towards the peculiarities of others; no respect for opinions and practices which we cannot adopt? The reply is, that Christian forbearance must be applied to its legitimate objects. Personal interests, personal feelings, things indifferent, and questions of expediency, must all be sacrificed on the altar of our common Christianity. When this sacrifice has been made, it will not be difficult to learn the path of duty. But the malady of this age appears to consist, in some measure, in an inverted order of things. Those things which ought to be laid aside, are made causes of division, schism, strife, and every evil work. Pride, love of pre-eminence, private ends, party spirit, drink up the spirits and exhaust the energies of the church. To obtain an advantage against a brother, merely to become, in turn, the victim of a like advantage, seems to be the element in which many live and act. So, on the other hand, those things which have been instituted by the Head of the church, to be diligently observed to the end of the world, readily yield to the plea of toleration and charity. Men have become niggard in their own things, but lavish in the things of God, Mal. i. 8, iii. 8. When God brings back again the captivity of Zion, the reverse of all this will then be seen, acknowledged, acted upon. But now, if it be well with our own dear selves, there is little sympathy with the suffering members of Christ's body. If our coffers be full, we say to the hungry, be ye fed; to the naked, be ye clothed; and to the cold, be ye warmed. If men make a fair show in the flesh, they hold the uppermost seats in the synagogue. The persons of men are held in admiration because of advantage, and the value of a man is estimated by the amount of his possessions. And the value of God's people, in the eyes of many in the church, is in proportion to

\* Several years since application was made, we believe, by the late James M'Dougal, of Argyle, to the American Bible Society for Bibles containing the Psalms in Metre. This application being unsuccessful, Mr. M'Dougal then requested the privilege of purchasing the Bible from them in sheets, that we might publish the Psalms, and bind them with those sheets, for the use of our own people, and for general distribution by our church. This request shared the same fate as its predecessor. There appeared such a manifest incongruity in paying money to an institution which so pertinaciously refused to permit a Metrical version of the Psalms to be circulated with the Bible in any case, while we could not conscientiously lay aside those Psalms, that the Synod formed themselves into a Bible Society, and adopted rules for procuring and distributing the Bible with the Psalms. But this plan of Synod has received little or no countenance in several sections of the church, and appears to be opposed in others. Why this opposition? Is it a secret dislike to a Scriptural psalmody? If singing the praises of God, in the words of inspiration, be a means of grace, and as much a divine ordinance as reading the word, or hearing it preached, then the obligation to circulate the Psalms in a form in which they can be sung, is as much a duty as the circulation of other portions of the inspired volume. A friend writes thus—"I am in ——— congregation, and last Sabbath several resolutions of Presbytery were read in favour of contributing to the American or some other Bible Society. I have just finished writing a memorial to be presented to this session, and another for the Presbytery, declining to contribute to the A. B. Society, with a prayer for each of those bodies to carry into full effect the Synod's rule on the subject of Bibles." Is not the leaven, then, at work among us? Let others judge.

the influence they may be supposed capable of exerting in the community, or the weight they may give to the church in the estimation of the world. Thus the church is depressed and afflicted by those things after which the Gentiles seek.

Carnality is, doubtless, at the bottom of this evil; but it is perpetuated and greatly aggravated by the application of this false standard to the people of God. They are not measured by the measuring reed of the word. So the laying aside any divine institution may be traced to the same carnality: namely, a mistaken estimate of its value. What will be its influence on the community, appears to be the all-absorbing question. It seems, then, that the ordinances of God are subjected to the same treatment, in the world, as his people, and for the same cause; that we are required to manifest respect, not civil respect, which all men owe to each other, but *religious* respect for principles and practices which we cannot approve, because of advantage. In like manner, also, we must tolerate innovations upon divine institutions which we cannot adopt; and, for the same reason, —advantage.

But the example of those who refused in their day to tolerate any thing for which they could not find a warrant in the Scriptures, is rather to be imitated. Such persons cannot yield those divine ordinances, to which they have been indebted for enjoyment of the present time and hope of the future, of which the inspired songs of Zion are not the least part. "The word of the Lord is right, and all his works are done in truth." "His *praise* shall be continually in my mouth." "Because thy loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall *praise* thee." "*Praise* is comely for the upright." "*Praise* waiteth for thee, O God, in Zion." "Enter his courts with *praise*." "Declare his *praise* in Jerusalem." "Who can show forth all his *praise*?" "Before the gods will I sing *praise* to thee." "*Praise* is comely." Is any in distress? "Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord." Is any afraid of the enemy? "Thou hast lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me." Is any weary of the cares and trials of life? "Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage." In this book there is balm for the wounded soul, and cordials for those that are ready to faint. Call us, then, what you will, treat us as you will, this Book we cannot surrender.

#### ART. VI.—*The Roman Catholic Claim.*

*Report of the Special Committee to which was referred the Petition of the Roman Catholics to the Common Council, relative to the School Fund.*

Since the memorable defeat of the Roman Catholics on the 11th of Jan., 1841, a desire has frequently been expressed that the Report adopted by the Board of Aldermen might be more widely circulated. To extend the great truths imbodyed in that document, and for the purpose of making one or two additional remarks, we give the report entire, and commend it, not merely to the perusal, but to the study of every American citizen. This Roman Catholic claim is destined to be a political question of absorbing interest. In their

publications, issued around us, they are constantly declaring that they shall never cease to agitate the subject, until they carry their points. It is therefore of the highest importance that the public should be put in possession of those views and facts that may be essential to a full and fair understanding of the nature and bearings of the question.

The Special Committee, to whom was referred the Petition of the Catholics, for a portion of the School Fund, together with the remonstrances against the same, presented the following report thereon, which was, on motion, accepted, and the Committee discharged, on a division called by Alderman Graham, Jun. In the affirmative, the President, Aldermen Balis, Woodhull, Benson, Jones, Rich, Chamberlain, Campbell, Hatfield, Jarvis, Smith, Nichols, Graham, Cooper, and Nash—15. In the negative, Aldermen Pentz—1. And 1000 copies thereof ordered to be printed, with the vote taken on the report.

### REPORT.

In pursuance of the instructions contained in the resolution, they employed two entire days in visiting the public schools, accompanied by a Committee of the petitioners, and also of the Public School Society, with a view to ascertain if any defects exist in their organization; and after a thorough scrutiny, in which all parties participated, your Committee not only failed to discover any thing strikingly defective in the system, but became strongly impressed with a conviction that the public schools, under their present organization, are admirably adapted to afford precisely the kind of instruction for which they were instituted. It is deemed essential to the welfare and security of our government, that the means of mental cultivation should be extended to every child in the community. The rising generation are destined to be the future rulers of the land, and their happiness can only be secured by such an education as will constitute them an intelligent community, prepare them to guard against the machinations of demagogues, and so to exercise the rights and franchises of citizens, as not to deprive themselves of the invaluable privileges which are their birthright. That the public school system, as now organized, is calculated to effect these objects, your Committee do not entertain a doubt; but, though they regard it as an incalculable public blessing, if they could be persuaded that it trespassed upon the conscientious rights of any portion of our citizens, they would begin to doubt the propriety of its continuance: they cannot, however, conceive that it is justly amenable to such a charge, so long as sectarian dogmas and peculiarities are excluded from the schools, and no pupils are either admitted into them, or excluded from them, against the consent of their natural or legal guardians. The system has grown up under the auspices of a voluntary association of individuals usually known as "The Public School Society," formed for the purpose of promoting education, and admitting to membership any citizen of good moral character, who is not a clergyman, upon a contribution of ten dollars to its funds. This society has watched with indefatigable vigilance and untiring assiduity over the rise and progress of the system, and by their unrequited labours it has been nurtured into maturity. In its present aspect, it is a monument of disinterestedness and public spirit, of which our city has reason to be proud.

Your Committee hereby acknowledge their indebtedness to the

members of that society, for the prompt manner in which they responded to every call made upon them, and they cannot but hope that the spirit of candour which they have displayed, and which the petitioners in the same spirit acknowledge, will ultimately remove every barrier, which, through misapprehension, as your Committee believe, has hitherto retarded the entire success of their benevolent and patriotic exertions. It has been objected on the part of the petitioners, that the books used in the public schools, contain passages that are calculated to prejudice the minds of children against the Catholic faith. This objection, your Committee discovered to be not wholly unfounded; but we are happy to have it in our power to add, that the School Society fully agree with us in the opinion that nothing in the books or usages of the schools should be continued that is calculated, in the remotest degree, to wound the feelings or prejudice the minds of children in favour of or against any religious sect whatever; that they have expunged such passages in the books as they have been able to discover in any way objectionable; that they desire to continue, and earnestly solicit the aid and co-operation of the petitioners, in the work of expurgation, until every really objectionable feature shall be entirely obliterated. The extreme difficulty of this undertaking is illustrated by the fact that some of the very same passages quoted by the petitioners as particularly objectionable, and which have been obliterated in the public school books, were found by your Committee entirely unobscured in the books used in one of the Catholic schools. It is a melancholy fact, that in neighbourhoods where Catholic children are numerous, the public schools number but few children whose parents profess the Catholic faith; but after the arduous task of expurgation shall have been completed, and every well grounded objection removed, your Committee fondly hope that the school-houses will be filled with children, and that no parents or guardians, be their religious feelings what they may, will refuse to avail themselves of the benefits of the public schools for the education of their children, being fully persuaded that many years would elapse, before any new system of instruction could be organized, with advantages equal to the one, now equally available to every child in the community. If, with such a system, any portion of the children should be left uneducated, it cannot be justly chargeable to a want of comprehensiveness in the system, but is more fairly attributed to imperfections which human legislation cannot remedy. The general objections to sectarian public schools, do not apply to cases where children are supported by charity, and necessarily confined to a particular locality, and not open to all children. Your Committee think that all such establishments might enjoy the benefits of education, at public expense, without an infringement of the principles contended for; and the rule being made general, their participation in the benefits of the School Fund, would not necessarily constitute a public recognition of their religious sectarian character. No school system can be perfect which does not place the means of education within the reach of every child who is capable of receiving instruction; and such your Committee believe to be the design and capacity of the system now in use in this city.

The Public School buildings are constructed upon a uniform model; the books used are the same in all the schools, and the classes and departments in each, are so similarly constituted and provided,

that the removal of a pupil from one school to another will not interrupt his studies or retard his progress. Though religion constitutes no specific part of the system of instruction, yet the discipline of the schools, and the well arranged and selected essays and maxims which abound in their reading books, are well calculated to impress upon the minds of children, a distinct idea of the value of religion; the importance of the domestic and social duties; the existence of God, the Creator of all things; the immortality of the soul; man's future accountability; present dependence upon a superintending Providence; and other moral sentiments, which do not conflict with sectarian views and peculiarities.

The different classes examined in several schools by your Committee exhibited an astonishing progress in geography, astronomy, arithmetic, reading, writing, &c.; and indicated a capacity in the system for imparting instruction, far beyond our expectations; and, though the order and arrangements of each school would challenge comparison with a camp under a rigid disciplinarian, yet the accustomed buoyancy and cheerfulness of youth and childhood did not appear to be destroyed in any one of them: such were the favourable impressions forced upon our minds by a careful examination of the public schools. It is due to the Trustees, to add, that not one of our visits was anticipated, and no opportunity was afforded to any of the teachers for even a momentary preparation. In the course of our investigations, we also visited three of the schools established by the petitioners, and for the benefit of which a portion of the School Fund is solicited. We found them, as represented by the petitioners, lamentably deficient in accommodations, and supplies of books and teachers: the rooms were all excessively crowded and poorly ventilated; the books much worn as well as deficient in numbers, and the teachers not sufficiently numerous; yet, with all these disadvantages, though not able to compete successfully with the public schools, they exhibited a progress which was truly creditable; and with the same means at their disposal, they would doubtless soon be able, under suitable direction, greatly to improve their condition. The object of the petitioners is to supply these deficiencies from the fund provided by the bounty of the State for the purposes of common school education. But, however strongly our sympathies may be excited in behalf of the poor children assembled in these schools, such is the state of the public mind on this subject, that if one religious sect should obtain a portion of the School Fund, every other one would present a similar claim, and it would be a signal for the total demolition of the system, which has grown up under the guidance of many years of toilsome experience; attaining a greater degree of perfection, than has perhaps, ever before been achieved, and which is probably extending a greater amount of instruction at smaller expense than can possibly be imparted by any other school system that has been devised. This result of such a disposal of the School Funds would most probably be followed by a counteraction in the public mind, which would lead to a revocation of the Act by a succeeding Common Council, and the awakening of a spirit of intolerance, which, in our country, is, of all calamities, the one most to be dreaded. Political intolerance is an unmitigated evil; but the experience of past ages ought to admonish us to guard, with unceasing vigilance, against religious intolerance, as an evil greater in magnitude in proportion as eternal consequences exceed

those of time. So long as government refuses to recognise religious sectarian differences, no danger need be apprehended from this source; but when it begins to legislate with particular reference to any particular denomination of Christians, in any manner which recognises their religious peculiarities, it oversteps a boundary which public opinion has established, violates a principle which breathes in all our Constitutions; and opens a door to that unholy connexion of politics with religion which has so often cursed and desolated Europe. Under these impressions of the impossibility of granting the prayer of the petitioners, without producing the most fatal consequences, and impressed, at the same time, with an anxious desire to remove every obstacle out of the way of the public education of their children, if it could be done without sacrificing any fundamental principle, your Committee invited the School Society and the petitioners to appoint delegates to meet them, with a view to effect a compromise, if possible. The invitation was promptly responded to, and several meetings were held, at which the subject was fully and very courteously discussed, in all its bearings, and though we extremely regret to report, that the conferences did not result as favourably as we had hoped, yet the spirit and tenor of the following propositions, submitted, at our request, by both the School Society and the petitioners, encourage a belief that our labour may not have been entirely in vain.

[Here follow certain propositions, submitted by the Roman Catholics and by the Public School Society.]

Your Committee deem it proper to remark, in vindication of the School Society, that they were only one of the numerous remonstrants against the prayer of the petitioners. Their views were represented in the late discussion before the Board only by their legal advisers, Messrs. Sedgwick and Ketchum. The other gentleman who participated in the discussion represented other bodies which are not in any manner connected with them. Sentiments were uttered by some of them which the School Society do not entertain, and for which they are not justly accountable. This explanation is deemed proper, in consequence of a remark in the above proposition of the petitioners, which appears to be founded on an erroneous impression. The unwillingness of the petitioners to agree to any terms which did not recognise the distinctive character of their schools as Catholic schools, or which would exclude sectarian supervision from them entirely, was the obstacle to a compromise, which could not be overcome. However much we may lament the consequences, we are not disposed to question the right of our Catholic fellow citizens to keep their children separated from intercourse with other children, but we do not believe the Common Council would be justified in FACILITATING such an object; they have an unquestionable right to pursue such a course, if the dictates of conscience demand it of them, and they have a just claim to be sustained by the Common Council in the exercise of that right, but they cannot justly claim public *aid* to carry out such intentions, unless they can show that the public good would be promoted by it, and that such public aid can be extended to them without trespassing upon the conscientious rights of others; but if any religious society, or sect, should be allowed the exclusive right to select the books, appoint or nominate the teachers, or introduce sectarian peculiarities

of any kind into a public school, the exercise of such right, in any one particular, would very clearly constitute such a school a sectarian school, and its support at the public expense would, in the opinion of the Committee, be a trespass upon the conscientious rights of every tax-payer who disapproved of the religion inculcated by the sect to which such school might be attached, because they would be paying taxes for the support of a religion which they disapproved. Your Committee are, therefore, fully of the opinion, that the granting of the prayer of the petitioners, or conforming to the terms of the proposals submitted by the Committee who represented them, would render the school system liable to the charge of violating the rights of conscience, a charge which would be fatal to the system, because it would invalidate its just claim to public patronage.

The proposition of the Committee who represented the Public School Society appears to us to have been conceived in a liberal spirit; your Committee think it goes as far as a due regard to the true objects of the institution would warrant, and seems to open an avenue which we would fain hope may yet lead to a satisfactory arrangement. Both propositions exhibit more liberality, probably, than either party had before given the other credit for, and we hope that the result may prove to be an important step towards the accomplishment of an object which every patriot must desire with intense anxiety. Your Committee respectfully ask to be discharged from the farther consideration of the subject.

WM. CHAMBERLAIN,  
ROBERT JONES,  
JOSIAH RICH.

#### REMARKS.

##### *The Anti-Catholic Books.*

The Committee discover one remarkable fact. We had heard and had stated, that they found *one* book in the *Romish* Schools that had been subjected to a purgatorial process in the Public Schools. But here we are told that,

“Some of the very passages quoted by the petitioners [the Roman Catholics] as particularly objectionable, and which have been obliterated in the *Public School* books, were found by the Committee entirely unobscured in the *books* used in one of the Catholic Schools.”

So, all the clamour they have raised against the books, and which has always been regarded as the only reasonable objection to the present system, turns out to be mere clamour, (*vox præterea nihil*), even in their own estimation. Bad as these Protestant books are, they prefer to use them in their own schools, when the whole field of *Romish literature* invites them to cull its choicest passages for the instruction of their young. Let this be remembered when this tempest is stirred again.

##### *A Revocation of the Act.*

The report asserts most truly, that even if the Common Council should grant the demand, “the result would be followed by a counter-action in the public mind, which would lead to a revocation of the act by a succeeding Common Council.” There is no doubt



at all in that matter. Never was a graver truth uttered by a corporate body. We were not disposed to use such language while the case was pending, lest it should seem to be an appeal to the fears of political men. But we are glad they have put it on record; that henceforth it may be known that the men in the city, or state, or national halls of legislation, who shall vote the public money to the Roman Catholics, will be swept away from the posts they have betrayed, as chaff is driven by the storm. Let this declaration, therefore, adopted by the Board, 15 to 1, that if one Council grants this unrighteous demand, another will recall it, be written in letters of light over the walls of their Chamber, to be read whenever the subjects of a foreign potentate ask for Republicans' birthright.—*N. Y. Ob.*

ART. VII.—*Some Questions relative to the final Perseverance of the Saints.*

(By the late Rev. Thomas Scott, author of the Commentary on the Bible, &c.)

THE doctrine of Final Perseverance has been so repeatedly and amply proved to be true and important, from a vast number of express Scripture testimonies; from the Divine character and perfections; from the nature of the whole scheme of salvation; and from the security of the covenant of grace; that it would be superfluous to add any thing to the evidence that has already been adduced.

Yet, there are many persons that appear to be, and doubtless are, true Christians, who not only hesitate to embrace this truth, but have strong prejudices against it. This, I apprehend, frequently arises from the too common want of accuracy in our method of stating the doctrine; from the gross abuses of which, not only it is supposed capable, but which are actually made of it in buoying up the vain confidence, and ministering to the unhallowed joys of hypocritical professors; and from their not seeing how it can be guarded from such dishonourable perversions. To obviate, therefore, such objections against a part of Divine truth, which is so useful for the peace and establishment of the humble Christian, and to rescue it from those abuses which oppose it to the scorn of Pharisees and Infidels, should be the uniform endeavour of every one who believes it, and finds spiritual advantage from it. I would, therefore, propose, and attempt to answer, a few plain questions relative to this doctrine.

1st. WHO ARE THE PERSONS that shall finally persevere?

It is easy to answer, in general, that all believers, children of God, or saints, shall finally persevere. But this leaves the matter where it was; to remove the difficulty we must enter more particularly into the subject.

No minister of the Gospel, by preaching this doctrine, intends to convey the idea, that the whole company of persons who profess to believe this, or any other doctrine, or all other doctrines of their system, shall finally be saved; or that the privilege of final perseverance is confined to those who make it an article of their creed. The belief of this doctrine may do the pious person important services; the rejection of it may be very prejudicial to him, without either being the cause of perseverance on the one hand, or of obstinacy on the other. Those hearers of the word, in all congregations,

who receive the seed by the way-side, which, being taken away by Satan, does not strike root; those who receive it in stony ground, in an *unhumbled* heart, whose temporary faith and ostentatious profession, sooner or later, will come to nought; and those who receive it among thorns, who are so attached to, and encumbered by *worldly* things, that they bear no fruit; all these, having no grace, can persevere in nothing but open sin, or specious hypocrisy. The Word of God gives us reason to suspect that, even of those professors who stand very high in the estimation of the most experienced and judicious servants of God, some will end no better than Ahithophel, Judas, or Demas; whether they persevere in their unsound profession or apostatize from it. God alone can see the heart, and though he has given us such rules of judgment as suffice to direct us in our duty, yet he never meant to communicate his Divine prerogative of *certainly* knowing others to be true Christians. How then can we certainly know of any man, that he will infallibly so persevere as to be saved? "Let God be true, though every man be a liar." If any professor, however eminent, apostatize, and live and die an apostate, (which, by the way, it is not very easy for another man to be sure of,) let us not bring it as a matter of fact to overturn the truth of God, by saying, "a child of God has fallen away finally;" nor let us rashly suppose an *impenitent* apostate has been saved; rather let us say, a very specious hypocrite has been unmasked.

But though we cannot *certainly* know concerning others, whether they have real grace, because we have no consciousness of what passes in their hearts; yet, as conscious of what passes in our own, we may, in some cases at least, *certainly* know that we have true grace, and, therefore, shall finally persevere. While grace is very small, and the discerning faculty very dim, and sin prevails very much, the minuteness of the object, the imperfection of the organ, and the surrounding obstacles, must make it difficult to decide absolutely; but when the judgment is matured, and grace increased, and corruptions more brought under, I apprehend we may determine in a more confident manner.

This premised, the matter comes to an issue. The true Christian shall finally persevere. He who is sure of his Christian state, may thence certainly infer his perseverance.

Now true Christians perceive a vast importance in eternal things, and judge temporal things comparatively worthless.

True Christians see great hatefulness in sin, and much sin in their past lives, in their present conduct, and in their hearts, which produces deep humiliation, sorrow for sin, and unfeigned repentance, and causes them to set themselves against all sin, especially that sin which has been most customary to them; to watch against it, to pray against it, and to dread it, and to consider sin as the worst thing that can come to them.

True Christians are influenced in their daily walk by a realizing belief, that things are, have been, and will be, as the Word of God declares them.

True Christians especially believe the whole testimony of God concerning Jesus Christ, and, humbly conscious of their need of such a salvation, freeness, and sufficiency, renounce all other hopes to flee to, lay hold of, apply for, and trust in Jesus Christ, and God's grace and mercy through him.

True Christians count every personal endowment, attainment, or performance, and every worldly interest, connexion, and comfort, worthless, in comparison of Christ, and are thus prepared to part with any or all of them, when they come in competition with him, and have actually given up many things for his sake.

True Christians receive him unreservedly in all his offices, and live by faith in him, as their Prophet, Priest, and King, for the pardon of all their sins, and the supply of all their wants.

True Christians have the law of God written in their hearts; inwardly delight in it, though they cannot obey it as they would; they are then most in their element, and happiest, when they are engaged in their religious exercises and holy services. They allow of no known sin, and neglect no known duty, but "by the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, are taught to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world."

Now as far as any man is inwardly conscious that this is his experience, these his desires, this his daily aim, his character and conduct, he may be sure that he possesses what no hypocrite ever yet attained. And he may be sure that the same distinguishing grace, which has wrought this decisive difference, will persevere and perfect its own good work. But, whilst this matter remains doubtful, the other cannot be certain; for how can he be sure of perseverance who is not sure of conversion? Such should be exhorted to "give diligence, to make their calling and election sure;" and be encouraged by the promise, that "they who seek shall find." But let them not prematurely grasp at what neither belongs to them, nor would yet be profitable to them. Nay, if the established Christian grows very slothful, or sinks into allowed sin; by thus weakening his evidence of conversion he loses the *warranted* comfort of this doctrine; which, in this case, would operate as a most dangerous opiate when stimulants alone are requisite. It is the wise appointment of God, that when love declines, fear should rouse the torpid soul; and none should counteract this appointment. Is the backslider alarmed and distressed? It is well. Let him "repent and do his first works," and in due time God will restore his former consolations; but let none encourage themselves in sloth and sin by this doctrine, lest, being deceived, they perish with a "lie in their right hand."

The true believer, then, in the habitual exercise of grace, and practice of his duty, is the only person who can *warrantably* be confident of perseverance. Having so fully resolved the first question, the others will more readily be despatched.

2nd. WHAT NEED HAS THE PERSON ABOVE DESCRIBED OF THIS ENCOURAGEMENT, seeing he may be supposed to be otherwise comforted?

The more a man values spiritual blessings, the greater will be his dread of losing them. The more conscientious, circumspect, and watchful he is, the greater will be his acquaintance with the treachery of his own heart, the fascinations of the world, and the artifice of Satan. The falls of others, whom he has preferred far before himself, will much alarm and distress him. He will not always, even when most diligent, walk in light and comfort; and he will be conscious of much sloth and evil, though he cause no scandal

to the Gospel, nor much bring the reality of his conversion into doubt. On all these accounts, he will be anxious about the future, and distressed about the event of the important warfare; even to the discouraging of his heart, and the weakening of his hands at some time. But this doctrine is sweetly suited to encourage him to commit the keeping of his soul, for the remnant of his days, into the hands of a faithful, covenant God, that without distraction he may attend to his present duty. For the Lord takes pleasure in seeing his servants joyful in their work, though not in sin and sloth. But,

3rd. IN WHAT shall they persevere?

1st. In that state of grace wherein they stand, so as not finally to perish, or come short of glory; for their good shepherd shall keep, and "none shall pluck them out of his hand," by temptation or persecution, living or dying. 2d. In an habitual course of holy obedience, progressively "waxing stronger and stronger," and bringing forth fruit more and more even to the end. The former mainly respects their personal interests; the latter is intimately connected with the glory of God, and the credit of the Gospel in the world, together with the interests of religion and the salvation of souls; the former is important—the latter infinitely more so. Self-love alone may influence a man to desire to be saved from misery, and made eternally happy; but nothing short of Divine grace, producing genuine love of God, attachment to the cause of godliness, and benevolence to the souls of men, can render us anxious about the latter. To suppose a man awakened and converted, and then returning into the world and sin, and after a long interval, perhaps of many years, just brought back again to escape hell; and to suppose this a general and common case, and to accommodate the doctrine to it, is to make a perseverance pleasing to hypocrites, dishonourable to God, scandalous to religion, subversive of holy practice, and unsuitable to true Christians, who all long to persevere to the end *in increasing holiness*, and dread sin as the greatest evil, and cannot bear the thoughts of dishonouring God and being hurtful examples to others, even though they should not be sent to hell for it. A few anomalous cases we may allow of; but the general rule is, a perseverance to holiness, even to the end.

4th. Finally, HOW SHALL THIS PERSEVERANCE BE EFFECTED?

The Lord himself will either, by his continual grace, uphold his people in the uniform holy walk which he requires, daily exercising "repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," and cheerful universal obedience; or, if at any time they are left to step aside, he will withhold comfort from their souls, rebuke them by his word, chastise them with his rod, till he brings them to repentance, and leads them, "with weeping and supplication," back into the forsaken paths of holy obedience. Did it consist with the purpose and counsel of God to leave a true Christian to depart from him, and return into the world and sin, and die impenitent, he not only might, but certainly should perish. Our security is, that God hath promised that he will "put *his fear* into the hearts" of all his true servants, that they shall not thus depart from him.

Thus stated and guarded, this doctrine may be of eminent use to the true Christian, to quicken his diligence, arm him with courage, and invigorate his resolution to press forward; to be "steadfast and immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch

as he knows that his labour is not in vain in the Lord." And if hypocrites will abuse it, they do it at their peril.

THOMAS SCOTT.

MR. EDITOR,

As the Religious Monitor is the only proper organ of the Associate Church in this country, I would respectfully ask leave to make an explanation respecting the proceedings of Synod.

In 1838 I published a series of Miscellaneous Letters, written by a Layman. At the foot of page 78, it is said "against this decision Dr. Ramsey with ten other ministers and two elders protested." From the reading it might appear to apply to a case of appeal just decided, while it was intended to apply to the passage of what is called the new marriage act. This will appear from the minutes of Synod referred to. Perhaps it is correctly understood, as no one has informed me of an error; but, as I perceive the language is susceptible of a wrong meaning, to guard against any possible mistake, I have deemed this explanation necessary.

Now that the subject is before me, permit me to ask how stands the matter respecting this new rule? From 1833 to 1837, inclusive, this subject was before Synod, and then suffered to die. It was surely not the intention of Synod to make this new rule a stepping-stone to no rule at all, and yet such is the effect. Some persevered in opposition to Synodical authority; others yielded; and now, in some parts of the Associate Church, there is an utter disregard of all church rules on the subject of marriage.

I just mention the facts, and leave it for others to say whether things are as they should be.

JAMES MORROW.

### Obituary.

DIED—At Lewistown, Pa., on the 21st of October, Mrs. MARTHA WALTER, in the 83d year of her age. It is not the object of these few remarks needlessly to eulogize the deceased. Her life was, indeed, marked by the development of the most kind, social, and benevolent feelings, and her humble and unobtrusive piety and faithfulness, amid the varied duties of life, has left a sweet memorial in the hearts of surviving friends; yet, it is chiefly on account of a Christian firmness and consistency, rarely to be met with in these degenerate times, that her memory may justly claim a public tribute of respect. It is an example, of which the influence should be widely felt. At an early period of her life she made a profession of religion, in connexion with the Associate Presbyterian church, which profession she continued to adorn throughout her lengthened years, by a consistent walk and conversation, and by a faithful adherence to those principles which she knew to be in accordance with the Divine Word. For more than thirty years before any Associate congregation was organized in Lewistown, she was alone in her profession, enjoying ordinances only occasionally by some passing minister, or by an annual attendance on sealing ordinances in the nearest congregation, thirty-three miles distant. Her patient waiting, in well-doing, was ultimately rewarded. She lived to see and enjoy, for a number of years, the fellowship of a settled congregation. Her memory will long be cherished with fond regret as a mother in Israel, and her name be mentioned with respect, by all who value

Christian integrity. Christian firmness and gentleness characterized her life, resignation and faith beautified her death. A covenant God will never forsake his own. If professors are called, in Divine Providence, to reside in places where they are deprived of ordinances, agreeable to their profession, instead of falling in with prevailing corruptions, let them remain firm, and the Great Head of Zion may yet make them the germ of a future congregation. If clearly in the way of duty in residing in such places, we have reason to believe God will send the Gospel to his own.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—“A Father’s Advice to his Children,” though dated in November last, has only recently come to hand, and will probably be inserted in the present volume. The Answer to the question—“Should a person baptized by one who is destitute of Ministerial Authority be re-baptized?” did not reach us in season for the present number. It will appear in the next. Our correspondent E. is informed that we have not room to enter on the investigation of “Old Testament Servitude” in the present volume; but if spared and permitted, in the providence of God, to go on with another volume, as we hope, a discussion of that question will be admitted into the pages of the Monitor. “Further Remarks on Voluntary Associations” in the next number. The “Catholic Claim” is published as an article of intelligence. The contest appears to be between “Popery” and “No Religion.”

---

SOCIAL CORRUPTION.—“Moral disease of a deadly dangerous nature has overspread the land. Witness the chicanery of the law; the frauds and impositions in every branch of trade, and the aggravation of our commercial iniquity, as connected with the colonial system. Because of swearing, profligacy, drunkenness, and Sabbath-breaking, the land mourneth. Impurity and prostitution have awfully increased, and are still increasing. Infidelity, worldly-mindedness, antinomianism, hypocrisy, fanaticism, and a false liberality, ever ready to sacrifice the authority of revelation at the shrine of human reason, clearly indicate that the power of vital religion has obviously declined, and impiety seems coming in like a flood.—Where is that deep penitent spirit, that holy zeal for Christ, that entire separation from the world, and the dread of its spirit and maxims, lest the heart should not be right with God, which so eminently distinguished our holy men in former times?”—*Thorpe*.

---

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—“The concussions of the nations—the simultaneous shaking of the Ottoman and Papal empires—the propagation of the gospel beyond the limits of the western Roman empire—the state of feeling and excitement in the Jewish nation—the infidel insensibility of the world—and the death-like slumbers of the church—the midnight cry which has recently been raised, and is now ringing in the ears of the infidel world, and the sleeping church—all indicate that the mysterious 1260 years have nearly run out their course.”—*Thorpe*.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

APRIL, 1841.

---

ART. I.—*Family Worship.* (No. II.)

2 Sam. vi. 20: "Then David returned to bless his household."

WE have lately called your attention to the consideration of the duty of family religion, and family worship, from the words of Joshua, when delivering, in his old age, his farewell address to the people of Israel, "*As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.*" In these words you have the resolution of an eminent saint, that not only he himself would serve the Lord, but that his *house*—his wife—his children and his servants should unite with him in this service. I trust that the example of so great and good a man, has not been without its effect upon those heads of families who may have been present. Is it so? Can we cherish the hope that any who may have been living in the neglect of family religion, have returned to their houses with the determination that they should henceforth be dedicated to the worship of the only living and true God? If such has been the case, we pray God that they may continue faithful to this noble resolution, and that the morning and evening sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving may be daily offered upon their household altar. But perhaps it has been otherwise. Perhaps there may be some hearing me, whose families are yet "*without God.*" If such be the case, we pray that the God of families may yet incline your hearts to this duty; and to this end we would affectionately invite you to a farther consideration of the subject. You have heard the voice of reason and of nature calling you to dedicate your households to the service of God. But there is a more powerful voice than that of reason and nature, which we would entreat you this day to hear; this is the voice of God, "spoken at sundry times, and in divers manners, in times past, unto the fathers by the prophets, and in these last days unto us by his Son." We will now appeal to *the law and the testimony* on this subject, and we hope that you will regard their dictates with that meekness and submission which their authority requires.

We shall endeavour to establish three points from Scripture.

I. That heads of families possess an *absolute* power over their families.

II. That family *instruction* is a duty enjoined upon them in the Scriptures.

III. That family *worship* (by which we understand prayer and praise) is a duty enjoined upon families as such.

I. We are to prove that *there is an absolute power residing in the*  
VOL. XVII.—41

*head of the family.* When we say that there is an absolute power residing in the head of the family, let us not be misunderstood. We do not say that the head of a family has power to enforce the performance of that which is *wrong*, and that where such a power is exercised, it is the duty of the family to submit to it. By no means. It is better in *every relation* to obey God than man; and obedience to a parent, or master, must not take the place of obedience to God. But when we say that the head of a family has an absolute power vested in him, we mean that he is to be the *sole* and *supreme governor* of the family. It devolves upon him in virtue of the relation he sustains; he is the *natural* head, and must therefore be the *governing head*. For if we do not vest it in *him*, in whom shall we vest it? Shall we vest it in the children? Common sense shows that it does not belong to them; that their weakness, ignorance and helplessness would disqualify them for the exercise of this power. Shall we vest it in both parents and children? This would be to destroy it; for if we vest it in both parents and children, we can have no such thing as government; there would be a perfect equality in point of authority. If, then, there is to be such a thing as family government, it is evident that this government must be in the hands of the parent, and that it must be absolute and unlimited by any law except the law of God. This principle is plainly recognised in the Scripture. Does not the fifth command imply the existence of such a power? "Honour thy father and thy mother." Here is honour due from a child to the parent. This implies superiority, and consequently superior power to correspond with it. If you refer to Malachi, i. 6, you will find that God compares the honour which is due to *Him*, to that which is due to a *father* from a son, and the fear which is due to *Him*, to that which is due from a servant to his master. "If, then, I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear?" This plainly shows us that there is honour and reverence due from children to parents, and from servants to masters, in virtue of the relation they sustain, and consequently, a power in parents and masters to enforce it; for you cannot but observe, that the inference from this passage is that honour and reverence *belong* to fathers and masters as such; the very relation itself lays a foundation for it. In the fourth commandment, we see an obvious recognition of this power. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant." Here you will observe that this command to refrain from work is addressed to one person, but the operation of the command extends to all that are under this one person. Now, from the fact of this command being addressed to one person, and the operation of the command extending to all, we infer a *power* in this one person to enforce upon all the observance of this command. He, then, who is bound to withhold from working on the Sabbath, is bound by the same command and obligation to see that his son, his daughter, his man servant and maid servant, his cattle, and the stranger that is within his gates, refrain from working. You will observe that after the *thou* follows the *son*, the wife is not mentioned, because the husband and wife are bound as one person; and this power is lodged in each, and is to be exercised by each as circumstances require. Had it not been for this power, how could



Joshua say that his house should serve the Lord? Had it not been for this, why would the Almighty commend Abraham for commanding his children and his household to keep the way of the Lord? You will observe that Abraham is said to *command* his children and household. Does not this imply power and authority? What then are we to infer from the existence of power on the part of the head of a family? Are we not to infer an obligation resting upon him to see that whatever is the duty of the family be performed, and where its performance on the part of the family is impossible or improper, that it be done by him as their representative, and that it is their duty to concur with him in its performance. This is truly a plain and unavoidable inference. Parents, then, are the heads of the family, and are *bound* to act as their representatives.

II. We observe that *family instruction is a duty enjoined in the Scriptures*. The remarks which we have made were designed to show that there is a power vested in parents, and that this power implies in it an obligation to act for the family, as their representative. We shall now endeavour to show that this power should be exercised in *family instruction*. And, in the first place, we remark, that the Scriptures teach us that the husband and wife are to instruct each other, according to their opportunities and abilities. If you refer to 1 Peter, iii. 7, you will find that the husband is required to live with his wife as a man of knowledge. "*Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge.*" What are we to infer from this? Does it not teach us that it is the duty of the husband to promote the spiritual interests of his wife, by constant and faithful instruction, according to his ability? The instruction here referred to is no doubt principally spiritual instruction, for he is to dwell with her according to knowledge, "*as being heirs together of the grace of life.*" Let the husband then bear in mind that he is to make use of that power over his wife which God has given him, for her spiritual edification. Nor is this obligation resting upon the husband merely; it is also binding on the wife to instruct her husband. Is not this implied in that interrogation of the apostle? 1 Cor. vii. 16, "*What knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?*" They must both endeavour, to the utmost of their ability, to promote the edification and salvation of each other, and therefore both must "*reprove, rebuke and exhort one another, with all long-suffering and meekness.*" We say both; for the obligation is mutual. The husband is to dwell with his wife according to knowledge, and the wife is to endeavour to save her husband, but in a way consistent with that subjection which the apostle enjoins in 1 Peter, iii. 1. "*Likewise ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives.*" Let me remind those of you who are united in the marriage relation, that God requires you to serve him in this relation by "*provoking each other to love, and to good works.*" Is your conduct, then, in accordance with your obligations?

In the second place we observe, that *the Scriptures require parents to instruct their children according to their ability and opportunity*. We have a most express command to this effect, in Deut. vi. 5, 6; "*And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with*

*all thy soul, and with all thy night. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart."* But is this all? Does God require nothing more, than that we should love him, and put his words in our heart? Hear what follows in the seventh verse. "*And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."* Here you will observe, that parents are expressly commanded to talk of the Scriptures to their children when they are sitting in the house; and what is this but at regular seasons, when all the family are collected together, such as in the morning after they arise, and in the evening before they retire. Now is there a parent in this house who can doubt, after this command, that it is his duty to instruct his children? But does he need this command to show him his duty? Does not the name *father* imply this obligation? Consider that you are the author of their being; that while God is the father of their spirits, you are the father of their flesh, as the apostle declares in his epistle to the Hebrews; and will this consideration have no weight with you? Have you been instrumental in bringing into existence beings possessed of immortal souls, souls which by union with their bodies have become defiled, and shall you be so regardless of their eternal salvation as not to instruct them according to your ability? O! who can tell the cruelty of such a parent?

In the third place we observe that this *instruction is due from masters to servants*. The master has a charge over the *soul* of his servant as well as the body; this will appear evident to any one who will read the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Here we find that servants are commanded to "*be obedient to their masters, as unto Christ.*" Now, if it be the duty of the servant to obey the master in this way, it is certainly the duty of the master to give the servant that instruction, without which this obedience cannot be rendered; for to whom does it belong to instruct a servant as to the manner in which his work should be performed, if not his master? If they are to perform their work, "*as the servants of Christ, doing the will of the Lord from the heart,*" surely it is the duty of masters to instruct them in the will of God. And, accordingly, we find that masters are enjoined to act towards them with a reference to their Master in heaven. "*And ye, masters, do the same thing to them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in heaven.*" The same duties you will find inculcated in the third and fourth chapters of Colossians, and in the sixth chapter of the first Epistle to Timothy. Thus we find that Abraham was commended by God for commanding, not only his children, but his household, which includes servants. And what was the nature of these commands of Abraham? It is evident they related to the service of the Lord; for it immediately follows, "*and they shall keep the way of the Lord.*" We shall not dwell longer on this point, for it must appear plain to every one, that it is the duty of heads of families to instruct their families. Even if there were no command enjoining it in particular, the general commands in the scriptures, "*to exhort one another daily,*" to "*let the word of Christ dwell in us richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another,*" should be sufficient of themselves to show the duty of family instruction; for if we are to exhort, and teach, and admonish one another daily, then surely husbands are to exhort, teach and admonish their wives

wives their husbands, parents their children, and masters their servants.

III. We observe that *family worship is a duty enjoined in the scriptures*. By family worship, here, we mean the formal acts of prayer and praise; and we wish it to be observed, that where one of these is referred to, the other is included; for they are used promiscuously in the scriptures, according to the *occasion*, and the *motives* by which they are enjoined. But where a *part* of divine worship is enjoined, the injunction that obligates to the performance of a part, obligates to the performance of the whole; for there is no figure of speech more common in the scriptures, than that by which a part is put for a whole.

In the first place, we infer this duty of family worship from some general precepts that are contained in the scriptures. Thus we are commanded to "*pray without ceasing*," to "*pray always*," and to "*pray every where*." Now, if, as we have seen in a former discourse, prayer be suitable to the family relation, do not these general injunctions include this particular duty? Most certainly they do; these injunctions, doubtless, obligate to prayer in every capacity, and, therefore, in the family capacity. They require it on every suitable occasion, and could there be one more so, than when all the members of the same family, who are associated by the dearest ties, are collected together around the same fire-side? Surely he who is anxious to learn and obey his Master's will, will be satisfied with such intimations.

In the second place, *there are particular precepts which seem to refer directly to this duty*. There is one circumstance which we wish you to observe, that in those places in the scriptures where domestic and relative duties are enjoined, there generally follows a reference to prayer. As an instance of this, let me refer you to Colossians iv. 2. Here you will find that immediately after the apostle has instructed husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants, we have the command to "*continue in prayer*." Now what are we to infer from this? Is it not that continual prayer is necessary to the discharge of those domestic duties before referred to? The inference is surely fairly deduced from the close connexion. This same connexion between the directions of the apostle respecting relative duties and prayer, you will find in the sixth chapter of Ephesians, and the third chapter of the first epistle of Peter. We believe, brethren, that our Lord had a special reference to family prayer when he gave to his disciples that form of prayer which is commonly called the Lord's Prayer. This we infer from the fact that in the address to God, the *plural* number is used; whereas, when he enjoins secret prayer upon them, he says, "*Pray to thy Father in heaven*," not your Father. This is sufficient to show that it was designed more especially as a form for *social* prayer, and that it was for family prayer appears probable from the phrase, "*Give us this day our daily bread*;" this petition is especially suited to the relation of a family, the members of whom are depending upon each other, and all upon God for a subsistence; and this probability is increased from the fact of it being designed for a *daily social* prayer, "*Give us this day*;" for if it be designed for a daily social prayer, it must surely be offered up in the family capacity; for it is only in this capacity that daily social prayer is possible.

In the third place, *there are several passages of scripture in which it seems to be taken for granted, that this duty is performed by the servants of God.* In Psalm cxviii. 15, David refers to the tabernacles of the righteous, as places where is "*the voice of rejoicing and salvation.*" It was in this way that their dwellings were to be distinguished from those of the wicked. Had it been necessary to separate the dwellings of the one from the other, he would have made this the criterion, he would have inquired in what families was the voice of rejoicing and salvation? O! how should this passage cause those in whose families this voice is never heard, to tremble! It places them among the families of the *wicked*. If there are any such families present, let me beseech them to dwell upon the awful import of this passage. Again, we find God expressing his delight and complacency in such families as kept up his worship. Thus, in Psalm lxxxvii. 2, it is said, "*The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.*" And why is it that he loves the dwellings of Jacob? It is because his worship is maintained there. The passage itself shows it in the clearest manner, for there is a comparison drawn between the gates of Zion and the dwellings of Jacob, as they are objects of God's love? And why is it that the gates of Zion are the object of his love? Is it not because his public, solemn worship is maintained there? When he declares, then, that he loves "*the gates of Zion more than the dwellings of Jacob,*" does it not follow that in the dwellings of Jacob the worship of God is kept up? Most certainly: deny this, and you take away all ground of comparison between the two. Does your dwelling belong to the dwellings of Jacob, and is it a Bethel in which God delights to dwell? If so, thanksgiving and the voice of melody are heard there.

In the fourth place, *let me direct you to that awful curse which Jeremiah invokes upon prayerless families.* You will find it in Jer. x. 25. "*Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name.*" Now, my brethren, it is true that this is an imprecation; but we must remember that an imprecation, uttered by an inspired person, is the same as a threatening pronounced by the Almighty himself. Observe that families, not persons, but *families*, that call not upon the name of God, are compared to the heathen that know not God, and shall be made with them the objects of his fury. O! how terrible is this curse! If there is a prayerless family hearing me this day, let me beseech them to consider this dread imprecation of the prophet. Parents, if you have no regard for your own souls, yet will you not avert this awful judgment from the souls of your families? Will you have God to place them in this world, and in the world to come, along with the heathen that know him not? O! let the tenderness of a parent, if not the piety of a Christian, forbid it.

In the fifth place, *we infer the duty of family worship from the examples of God's people recorded in the scriptures.* And here I know not which of these to present you first. We may look back as far as Abel, and we will find that the custom of offering sacrifices was in existence; nay, this custom is dated at the time of Adam. Now these sacrifices were, no doubt, offered in a family capacity, for it was in this capacity that mankind first existed in *distinct* societies. These were offered by the father of the family, who officiated in the capacity of a priest. Thus we find, by reading the twelfth chapter of Genesis, that Abraham built an altar to the Lord at those places

to which he removed with his family. The same thing is recorded of Isaac and Jacob in their removals; these were family altars, for it was with their families that they removed, and, consequently, here are examples of family worship. Are you then the spiritual children of Abraham? You will follow the example of your father, by building an altar to the Lord in your family, and, like him, you "will command your children and your household, and they shall keep the way of the Lord," and, consequently, pray to him. I need not refer you to those words of Joshua which we had formerly under consideration, "As for me and my house we will serve the Lord." Would you, like Joshua, follow the Lord wholly? you must enter into the same noble resolution, not only to serve the Lord yourself, but also to maintain his service in your families. The example of Job also is worthy of notice; you will find it recorded in Job i. 5. Here we read that "he offered burnt offerings according to the number of his children," and this, we are told, he did continually; his sacrifices were always accompanied with prayer. Now it is true that the feasting in which his sons had been indulging, called for these additional offerings on this particular occasion, yet we are told that he *continued* this exercise; and, as it was for his children, there is little doubt but that those of them who were at home, would unite with him in this exercise. The example of David, recorded in our text, is worthy of especial notice. The ark of the Lord had been brought from the house of Obed-Edom with great gladness, and David had, with the people, been celebrating, in a solemn manner, its safe arrival at the place he had fixed for it. But no sooner had he finished this public celebration, and solemnly blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Hosts, than we are told that he "*returned to bless his household.*" How striking is this example! What beautiful order is here observed in the worship of God! Though this servant of the Lord was engaged in a public and solemn celebration with the people of Israel, yet he does not forget his household. He returns, like a pious father, to bless his family, by which we can understand nothing else but worshipping God with them in a family capacity. O, that every father who is this day engaged in the public worship of God, would imitate the example of David, and return from the house of God to bless his own household. Queen Esther also affords us an example of family worship; for we are told that she "and her maidens fasted and prayed together." Daniel, also, is an example to this effect,—though there was an interdict passed by King Darius against a petition being asked of any god or man save himself, yet we are told, "When Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God as he did aforetime." This we look upon as an instance of family prayer. Had it been secret closet prayer, it would not have been known to his enemies; for we cannot suppose that Daniel, although he would not have been ashamed to be found in the duty of secret prayer, would have performed it thus publicly, as he seems to have been in the habit of doing. The most probable supposition then appears to us to be, that he went into his house three times a day and prayed to God with his family. This supposition makes his heroism and piety appear more conspicuous,

while it divests his conduct of a seeming ostentation which it would otherwise wear. But let us pass from the Old Testament to the New; and here we have several examples recorded for our imitation; Cornelius will serve us as an example. In Acts x. 2, he is said to be "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house." The word fear in scripture, is used in a general sense for *worship*. Not only did Cornelius worship God himself, but, like Joshua, he worshipped him with all his house; and in the thirtieth verse, we are told, that he was praying in his house; which probably means household, as the word house often does in scripture. But passing by all other examples, let us contemplate our blessed Saviour. He, it is true, had no stated place of residence, yet his own disciples were to him as a family, and we find him calling them by the endearing name of *children*. Now, we often read of him praying with his disciples, and, as they lived with him, these instances set forth our Lord as an example to heads of families to pray with those who are depending upon them for support, guidance and protection.

Such, brethren, are some of the scripture proofs from which we would infer the duty of family worship. And now we request you to consider them *collectively*, and then ask yourselves whether they do not obligate you to the performance of this duty. Remember, we do not rest the *proof* on any *one* passage we have quoted, but on the *whole*; and are they not, we ask you, sufficient to produce conviction upon the minds even of the most doubting and incredulous? What have you to answer to the reasons we have adduced from the light of nature? What have you to answer to the precepts we have read from the sacred scriptures? What have you to answer to the expressions of God's complacency and delight in families that worship him? What have you to answer to the encomiums he pronounces upon such families, and the awful threatenings he denounces against those who call not upon his name? What have you to answer to the many examples of praying families we have set before you? Will not these things convince you? Then, surely, arguments are of no use; reason and scripture are nothing in your estimation. But why do we thus speak? You cannot but know, that family worship is a duty. The proofs we believe are so plain, that he who considers them attentively, cannot but be convinced. What then is your determination? Is it to neglect this duty? to close your ears against the voice of reason, the voice of conscience, and the voice of God? Is it to stifle your present convictions? Is it to defer the performance of it to a future period? Beware of this, dear brethren. There is nothing more dangerous than to strive against conviction. It is thus that we become "*hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.*" We hope better things of you, though we thus speak. We believe that we are addressing *wise men*, and, therefore, we would call upon you to judge of what we have said. Nay, more; we believe that we have been addressing serious men, and, therefore, we call upon you to hear the voice of God in the scriptures. Do not disregard this voice. Remember that "*that servant who knoweth his Master's will and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes.*"

(To be continued.)

**ART. II.—*Should a person baptized by one who is destitute of ministerial authority be re-baptized?***

The above question was referred to the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge for solution; an answer reported by a committee was adopted by the Presbytery, and ordered to be published, which is accordingly offered for the pages of the Religious Monitor.

This is a question of great practical importance, and demands our solemn and careful consideration. The Church of Rome, holding the doctrine that baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation, holds baptism by women to be valid, and require them in cases of supposed necessity to baptize children. The Church of England for a time adopted the same measure, and of course held the baptism valid. These errors in doctrine and abuses of the ordinance of baptism, led the Westminster Divines to give an express testimony against them. This testimony the Presbyterian church adopted; and let us not now slide back into these errors of the great apostacy. Unquestionably men have no more authority than women to administer the ordinance of baptism, unless they possess that authority from Christ.

We answer the above question in the affirmative, namely, that a person baptized by one who is destitute of ministerial authority ought to be re-baptized; and, therefore, we avow the inference that the baptism in question is invalid. Our Confession of Faith, Ch. xxvii. § 4, declares that baptism may not "be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word lawfully ordained." And Confession, chap. xxviii. § 2, stating the essentials of baptism, says that "the party is to be baptized—by a minister of the gospel lawfully called thereunto." The Larger Catechism, question 176, says, that baptism is "to be dispensed by ministers of the gospel, and by none other." It is, therefore, fairly implied in these subordinate standards, that baptism, administered by one not authorized, or not a minister of the gospel lawfully ordained, is not valid. That is, it is not the ordinance of baptism; and, consequently, that the subject of such a baptism should be re-baptized. So much for the doctrine of our subordinate standards.

We shall now endeavour to establish this doctrine by holy scripture. And in order to do this, we shall lay down this premise—that if authority, conferred by Christ on the person administering, be essential to baptism, the want of that authority renders it invalid. To bring this premise to bear on the question before us, we observe—

I. Christ has authorized ministers of the gospel to baptize. For proof of this it may be quite sufficient to refer to Matt. xxviii. 19, 20: "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." On this text consider,—

1. These words, though addressed immediately to the apostles, were equally directed to the ordinary ministers of the gospel as successors to the apostles in the ministry, because the promise is added, "I am with you to the end of the world." Now the apostles' extraordinary office was not to continue till the end of the world, and therefore they could not baptize in that office, nor have Christ's presence with them in the exercise of it till that period; but the ordinary

office of the ministers, which was embraced in their apostleship, was to continue by succession till the end of the world, and, therefore, both the duties and the promise expressed in this text, belong to that ordinary office. Besides, baptism was not peculiar to the extraordinary office of the apostles: for Paul, speaking of his apostleship, 1 Cor. i. 17, says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

2. The authority to baptize is given to those who are authorized to teach and *disciple* the nations to the end of the world; so that to baptize and to preach the gospel belong to the same office. But it may be asked whether this authority to the ministers of the gospel to baptize, is exclusive, so that no other person or persons may administer baptism? To this we reply,—

II. The authority given by Christ to gospel ministers to baptize is exclusive; no others have authority from him. Because—

1. Christ alone had authority to institute this ordinance, as well as all other ordinances, which he has given to his church, and to appoint the administrators of it; and, therefore, none have authority to baptize unless they receive it from him.

2. He has left, in holy scriptures, no appointment of any others to administer baptism, but gospel ministers; and the want of appointment itself is a prohibition, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Isa. i. 12, is the divine challenge against all unauthorized observances.

3. Christ does not give commission to some to do that which is left common to all; and therefore the commission to gospel ministers, to baptize, is not common to all, but is exclusive of all who are not commissioned.

4. Christ gives no secret commissions for the discharge of public offices in the church; because the people must have opportunity of knowing those whom the Holy Spirit has made "overseers" to them. Heb. xiii. 7, 17, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account."

But it has been asserted that, though none but gospel ministers have authority from Christ to baptize, yet when the ordinance is administered, it is valid, though done without authority. We reply, that this opinion is generally based on some very common, popular, and ruinous errors; such as that divine ordinances are only rational and moral means of improvement—that there is no need to inquire whether we have divine authority for what we do or observe in the church—and that we are under no obligations to Christ in his ordinances, nor under any peculiar responsibility to him for our neglect or perversion of them. These infidel principles are a great cause of God's controversy with his church in the present time, are rendering ordinances unprofitable, and provoking Christ to withdraw from us. But to reply to this opinion more particularly, and in reference to the present question, we observe—

III. The nature of baptism shows that it is invalid if administered without authority, which, we have seen, is conferred by Christ on the ministers of the gospel alone. To establish this, consider—

1. Baptism is an authoritative admission of the person baptized into the visible church. It, indeed, supposes the person to be already a



member of Christ's body; yet it is his formal admission to church-membership. Thus in Acts ii. 38, 39, the apostle Peter exhorts the hearers to be baptized because the promise is to them; and when they were baptized it is said, verse 40, they "were added unto them," that is, to the church. To the same purpose we may cite 1 Cor. xii. 13, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," and reason thus, that if by the baptism of the Spirit we are made one body really and spiritually, by the baptism of water we are made one body visibly. Now this authoritative admission includes a judicial act, such as Peter exercised; Acts ii. 41, "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized;" and again, Acts x. 47, 48, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." This judicial act cannot be a valid deed, except as done by those who have authority to rule as well as teach, and whose deeds Christ promises to ratify. Matt. xviii. 18, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Any man may give his opinion that such a person is a member of Christ's body, but without authority from Christ he cannot admit him to church membership. Therefore, by an unauthorized baptism such a person is not admitted, and is not thereby a visible church member.

2. Baptism is an obligatory engagement of the person baptized to Christ, as his Saviour and Lord, Gal. iii. 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." It is true, every one who hears the gospel, is bound to engage himself to Christ, and by the act of believing in Christ he does so; but baptism is an open and formal engagement of the person taken in the name of Christ, or taken in his stead, which requires his authority in the administration.

3. Baptism is an authoritative declaration, made in Christ's name, of the person's privileges in the covenant of grace, and in his name pledging his promise to that person, as Acts ii. 38, 39, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you, and to your children," &c. Now this cannot be done without authority from Christ to dispense such a promise and pledge.

4. Baptism is an authoritative admission to a visible covenant relation to God, as appears from texts above quoted; and authority from Christ must be necessary in order to form this visible relation.

5. Baptism is a seal of the blessings of salvation, as every divinely appointed sign of applying that salvation is, Rom. iv. 11, "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised:" compared with Col. ii. 11, 12: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him." The latter text shows that circumcision and baptism signify the same thing, and therefore the former shows that baptism is "a seal of the righteousness of faith." No one can use the seal of an earthly prince, and give validity to a deed by it, unless authorized by that prince to do so.

Baptism is a seal of the King of kings, and therefore it is not only high presumption and wickedness in any to use it without authority from him, but the deed must be invalid.

6. Baptism is a deed of God himself, performed through the instrumentality of men appointed by him. This is plainly taught in Matt. xxviii. 19: "Baptizing them in the name," &c. To do any thing in the name of another, is to act in his stead, so that he acknowledges the deed as his. But who can thus act in the name of God, and perform a valid deed without his authority? To baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" has, indeed, a farther meaning, but it necessarily includes what is here stated.

7. Baptism of itself, and without the authority of Christ, can confer no benefit whatever, spiritual or sensible, the spiritual blessings are wholly of Christ. Matt. iii. 11, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me—shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And its power to confer external privileges is wholly dependent on the institution and authority of Christ. Col. ii. 20, 23; "Why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances—after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh." Baptism therefore, to be of any use, must be dispensed according to Christ's authority.

8. Baptism is not valid unless it be dispensed in that way to which Christ has promised his acceptance of the deed, his confirmation of it, and his blessing with it; but he has promised all this with baptism as dispensed by ministers of the gospel, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them—and lo, I am with you alway," &c. The authority here given, we have seen is exclusive, and consequently the promise also. It plainly follows, then, that baptism is invalid which has neither the authority of Christ for dispensing it, nor his promise to accept and bless it. Besides, Christ has expressly declared, respecting all who dispense ordinances without his authority, "I sent them not, nor commanded them, therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." Jer. xxiii. 32. And it is a universal truth, respecting the dispensation of divine ordinances, what the apostle says respecting the priesthood: Heb. v. 4, "No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron;" that is, without the call of God, no man takes it acceptably, profitably, nor successfully. Holy Scripture furnishes many examples in proof of this doctrine, but one of which we shall select at present. Uzziah could burn incense as well as the priests, but he had not authority, and therefore he could neither be profited by it, nor accepted in it; and for the mere want of authority while he attempted it, a mark of divine displeasure was set on him. 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 20, "And they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests, the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense. Then Uzziah was wroth, and while he was wroth with the priests, the leprosy even rose up in his forehead, and they thrust him out from thence; yea, himself hasted also to go out, because the Lord had smitten him." "Now all these things hap-

ened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition." 1 Cor. x. 11.

But still, it may be said, it cannot be denied that there are many deeds that are valid, though done in some respects unlawfully, and therefore baptism may be valid though administered without authority. To this we reply, 1. It is in this objection, tacitly admitted, that there are some deeds which would not be valid if done unlawfully. It is then an important question—In what cases is it true that a deed is valid when done unlawfully in some respects? We answer, 2. It is true only in those cases where the unlawfulness consists in things which are not essential to the validity of the deed, such as preaching the gospel with sinful motives, Phil. i. 15, 16, administering just reproof mingled with error and sinful feelings, Num. xx. 10, but we have showed that authority is essential to valid baptism. Or, 3, It is true, when the deed itself is all that is essential to its validity, as the payment of a debt by some sinful but legal method, or the private and murderous execution of a criminal who is by law condemned to death. But baptism has no efficacy of itself, it depends entirely on the positive authority of Christ for its validity.

We might add as an argument for our position, that according to Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, the committing of authority to baptize with the authority to preach the gospel, and exercise discipline, intimates that baptism must be dispensed with the word, and discipline, authoritatively administered; and therefore that baptism by persons destitute of ministerial authority is not valid. The original word in the nineteenth verse translated "*teach*," signifies to *disciple*. The direction is, induce them to be disciples of Christ, and so baptize them, and still, verse 20, "*teach them*," and not only teach them what they are to observe, but teach them *to observe* all things which Christ has commanded, which evidently includes discipline. Thus we trust it is sufficiently manifest that baptism administered by one who is destitute of ministerial authority is not valid, and that the person so baptized, has not the external seal of the covenant, and ought to be re-baptised.

But though, according to the above views, it be admitted that baptism administered by one who is destitute of ministerial authority is invalid, yet it is a question with some, whether a person once authorized, as a gospel minister, to dispense gospel ordinances, but since deposed, has still ministerial authority, or whether that authority is utterly taken away by deposition. It might appear to be trifling to notice this question, were it not that many are perplexed on the subject, and some do hold that the authority is still retained, notwithstanding deposition. This opinion is, no doubt, founded on some misapprehensions of the subject, which we shall endeavour to state and remove.

1. It appears to be a misapprehension of some, that by ordination something is mysteriously given which cannot be taken away by the person that gave it. To refute this, we remark: that it will surely be admitted that ordination to the ministry produces no physical change on the person ordained; and, also, that it does not actually communicate the Holy Spirit; which things, indeed, if communicated, man, by a judicial deed, could not take away.

2. Another misapprehension appears to be, that it is not ordina-

tion, nor Christ by means of ordination, that confers the authority to exercise the ministerial office, but that the authority depends entirely on personal qualifications, such as knowledge, abilities, or grace. This, we believe, is a popular notion, and if true, it would indeed follow, that the ministerial office could not be taken away by deposition. But with Presbyterians, (and with others we are not debating at present,) this sentiment cannot be entertained for a moment. Natural, or acquired abilities, do not authorize the possessor to exercise the ministerial office. "No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Heb. v. 4. Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were not rejected on the ground of the want of natural or acquired abilities, nor was Uzziah punished for attempting to burn incense, because of want of ability; in both cases want of authority was the sole ground. But,

3. Another misapprehension in favour of the opinion we are opposing, is, that the vow into which the gospel minister enters in ordination, being a perpetual engagement from which he can never set himself free, like the Christian's engagement to Christ, in a life of faith and holiness, it can never be annulled, and therefore, his office can never be taken from him. To this, we reply, that it is true his vow is for life, he cannot himself lay aside its obligations, nor can he by his sin rendering himself unworthy of his office, ever acquit himself of his vow, so that he should be innocent in rendering himself unfit for the ministry; but it is illogical to infer from these premises, that his office cannot be taken away, nor his right to exercise it. This argument, if true, would prove, that the professed Christian, engaging as a church member, which is a perpetual engagement, could never be deprived of that relation to the church, yea, more, that as his engagement to observe the ordinance of the Supper is permanent, he can never be deprived of his right to participate in it. What proves too much, proves nothing; that is, it is an unsound argument. There must, therefore, be a distinction between the *obligations* of a vow, and our *rights* to privileges and official stations. A person's engagement to Christ in all the duties of his station is permanent, but yet his right to certain privileges may be taken away for his sin, and he cannot, in duty, use those privileges in those circumstances; and this is the case with the gospel minister deposed for his sin. Some things are given immediately by Christ, as the Holy Spirit, grace, the privilege of faith, and a right to heaven: these men cannot take away: but there are certain things conferred through the instrumentality of men, such as visible church membership, officers, &c., and these may, by man, as an instrument, be taken away. Proof of this may appear more fully in the sequel.

4. But another misapprehension should be noticed. It is maintained by some, that deposition does not signify the entire taking away of the office, but only the suspension of its exercise. We reply, that this opinion must mean, either that the church does not by deposition intend the entire taking away of the office, or if they intend this, they are not warranted to do so from Holy Scripture. As to the first supposition, the Book of Discipline of the Associate Church, declares her meaning on the subject, Part Third, Article Eighth, Section Fourth: "Deposition is a sentence depriving a church officer of the office with which he had been solemnly invested, at his ordination." But the second supposition is the main

subject of inquiry, viz. Do the Holy Scriptures warrant such a deposition as takes the office entirely away? To this, we reply, that the Scriptures do warrant it, as appears—(1.) From Solomon's deposition of Abiathar, 1 Kings, ii. 27. "So Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord." Here was the entire taking away of the office. And this was done according to the will of God; for it is added, that he did this, "That he might fulfil the word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh." The word referred to is found in 1 Sam. ii. 27, 36. It appears, (2) from Hos. iv. 6; "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me." This is an entire deprivation of the office. God might take several ways of performing this, but we see cases of its fulfilment afterwards, first, in the time of Ezra, at the return from the captivity, a certain class of priests, "were, as polluted, put from the priesthood." Ezra, ii. 62. Again, in Ezek. xlv. 10—13, speaking of the times after the captivity, and of priests that had gone into apostacy, as many did in the time of Hosea, God says, verse thirteenth, "They shall not come near unto me, to do the office of a priest unto me, nor to come near to any of my holy things, in the most holy place."

But it may be said, these decisions occurred, and the law was applied in these cases, under divine inspiration, and cannot apply to our times. We reply, "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." The above cases show that it is the will of God that unworthy officers in the church should be utterly deprived of their office, and that such a measure is sometimes necessary in the church. Now the church must be in sad circumstances, if what is necessary to her existence, prosperity, or purity, cannot be attained without the immediate aid of inspiration when such a dispensation has utterly ceased. But even in the latter ages of the church, Christ has furnished her with means of attaining to all that is necessary to her purity or prosperity. And in order to illustrate this, and also for a more particular answer to the question, whether deposition entirely takes away ministerial authority from the person deposed, we observe,—

1. Christ has chosen to conduct his church, and to cherish and bless her, by means of external ordinances, and instead of visibly dispensing them himself, he dispenses them by means of men authorized by him to do so. This we must acknowledge if we own him to be the King of Zion. This method he adopted during the old dispensation, and this he has adopted for the present. So, 1 Cor. iv. 1. "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." And, 2 Cor. iv. 7. "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." And, Matt. xvi. 19. "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Thus, Christ himself dispenses ordinances by commissioned servants.

2. Christ has two, and only two methods of granting a commission or authority to dispense gospel ordinances; viz., A supernatural call or commission, as was given to Aaron, to the prophets, and apostles, and an ordinary call, or a call by ordinary means. And as it is necessary that the church should know who are authorized to dispense these ordinances, Christ has given marks, or rules, by

which we may know them. Now it will be admitted, that extraordinary calls have ceased, and therefore none but the ordinary remain. If then, those ordinary calls do not confer authority to dispense ordinances in Christ's name, his promise has failed in which he promises that he will be with his ministering servants, "to the end of the world;" and that whatsoever they "bind on earth shall be bound in heaven;" and what they "loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This would be a virtual denial of Christ's kingly office over the church, and a blasphemous charge against his truth. But his promise cannot fail, and therefore he does, by ordinary means, commission men to act in his name, and accompanies the commission with his gracious presence.

3. Since Christ promises to ratify what his commissioned servants do in his name, and to give his presence to his church as really and fully when extraordinary calls have ceased, as when they existed, it follows that his authority is as really and fully given by ordinary calls as by those which were extraordinary. In the infancy of the church, God was pleased to employ extraordinary measures in order to give incontestible and even sensible evidence of his presence, authority, and grace in his ordinances, but they were not intended to be the standing order of dispensation, nor even to intimate that ordinances were then more solemn, nor the people under greater accountability; but, on the contrary, that the authority and solemnity and grace then displayed miraculously would be the authority, solemnity, and grace actually attending divine ordinances when they should be dispensed in their ordinary manner. And even in that extraordinary dispensation, God was pleased to introduce the ordinary methods both of appointing officers, and of dispensing the gospel, as in the ordinary introduction of priests into their office, in choosing a sanhedrim in the schools of the prophets, and in the worship in their synagogues. Now let it be observed, that though Aaron had an extraordinary call to the office of the priesthood, yet his successors were generally brought into office by ordinary means; and we know that these successors to Aaron did hold their office *lawfully*; yet the apostle, Heb. v. 4, says, "No man taketh this honour to himself, (that is, lawfully,) but he that was called of God as was Aaron:" the necessary inference from which is, that those priests called by ordinary means were called of God as was Aaron. That is, the ordinary call is as much of God and carries as much divine authority in it as the extraordinary. The inference is, moreover, as strong that ministers of the gospel are as really called of God to the work of the ministry by the ordinary call, as the apostles were by that call which was extraordinary.

4. From what has been said, it follows, that to assume an office in the church now without an ordinary call, is as presumptuous and sinful, and the deed as invalid, as to have assumed it without a call, when extraordinary calls existed. The ordinary call of God is as exclusive, and as much condemns the assumption of authority as the extraordinary call did. This inference is fully maintained by the punishment of Uzziah, who, in attempting to burn incense, interfered with the priests who had only the ordinary call. If it be said, their office was at first an extraordinary appointment, we need only reply, the office of the ministry under the New Testament was at first an extraordinary appointment, also. But the truth of our position will be farther manifest by comparing Numb. xvi. chapter,

containing the account of Korah's rebellion and punishment, with 1 Cor. x. 11, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition." This teaches us that those displays of divine displeasure made of old, for trifling with divine authority, were not intended as the ordinary course of divine dispensation, but as visible displays of that displeasure which would always take place on the violation of any divine order or appointment under the ordinary dispensation, although the full manifestation of it would be reserved till the day of judgment; and that, therefore, we should now walk by faith, and not wait for sensible manifestations as indications of sin or duty. Our position is also maintained by the promise given to the apostles and their successors in the ministry. Matt. xviii. 18, 20, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven—For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them:" and by the solemn warning, Luke x. 16, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." These passages evidently teach, that Christ has by the ordinary call as really and fully appointed church officers to act in his name, as he did of old by extraordinary calls, and therefore that the assumption of authority and office is now as sinful, and presumptuous, and invalid as it was of old. As, then, Christ has promised to be with his authorized servants ministering in his name, and to ratify what they do accordingly, so he will not acknowledge those who are not authorized by him, nor own nor bless their deeds, Jer. xxiii. 32, "I sent them not nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord."

5. We hold that Presbytery is Christ's method of conferring authority to exercise the office of the ministry, since the extraordinary calls have ceased. And as this debate is with professed Presbyterians, we shall not wait to argue this point farther than to notice one text of holy Scripture. 1 Tim. iv. 14, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." What then was this gift which was communicated by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery? It was not knowledge, nor grace, nor additional natural abilities, none of which could the Presbytery convey by laying on their hands, or by ordination; but it was *authority* to preach the Gospel, the authority of a Gospel minister.

6. As, then, the Presbytery is Christ's method of communicating authority to men, to exercise the office of the ministry in his name, it must be his method of taking it away. And this position will be supported by the following particulars: (1.) Christ has showed by examples and by declarations, as we have seen, that it is his will that unworthy men in office in the church, should be deposed or their office be entirely taken away. And as this was necessary when extraordinary calls existed, it must be as necessary now. (2.) Christ has pointed out no other method than Presbytery of performing this necessary service to the church and the cause of God; and extraordinary interpositions we are not to expect. (3.) He has expressly committed to Presbytery both to "*bind and loose*" in his name. Now as ordination is a *binding* under the obligations of the office, *loosing* must be deposition or taking away the office. (4.) Christ has commended this exercise of authority in the Presbytery in his

epistle to the church of Ephesus, Rev. ii. 2, and condemned the neglect of it, in his epistles to the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira, Rev. ii. 14, 15, 20; ii. 2, "Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars." If it was competent to the angel or Presbytery of the church of Ephesus, to try false apostles and to find them liars, so it must have been competent to them and their duty to try false ministers of the Gospel, whether they had assumed the office without the ordinary call, or had rendered themselves unworthy of sustaining it by their error or immorality, and to find them liars; that is, if they find them liars in professing to be ministers of the Gospel, they find they are *not ministers*. And if they find those to be liars or not ministers, who had been in the ministry but had rendered themselves unworthy of it, it must be by taking their office from them. This view is corroborated by Rev. ii. 14, 15, 20. The latter case we select for a remark. "I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants." We need not wait here to prove, that according to the figurative language of the Revelation, Jezebel signifies a professed teacher in the church. Now the duty of the angel or Presbytery of the church of Thyatira was not to suffer this false teacher. They could at that time impose no civil pains or restraints, if even it were the duty of church officers to do it in any circumstances, which it is not. What then should they do, so as not to suffer the false teachers? evidently, in the language of the epistle to Ephesus, to "*find him a liar*," that is not a Gospel minister; and if once a Gospel minister, to find him a liar with deposition. We may add, That if the authority of the Presbytery be insufficient to take away the ministerial office, it was insufficient to confer it; but if it was able to confer the office, it is able to take it away.

He, then, that is deposed by the Presbytery in Christ's name from the office of the ministry, is no more in the possession of that office than if he had never been ordained; he has no authority to dispense gospel ordinances, and, therefore, no authority to baptize; and consequently baptism by such a one, is null and void, and the ordinance should be again administered.

The above views, indeed, are doctrines of faith, and are received and acknowledged only by faith. An unbelieving world, we may expect, will mock them, because they are not evident to carnal reason. Divine authority not supported by miraculous interpositions, is in their view a chimera; and such is the strong tendency of the human mind, even in the church, to unbelief and to refuse, to receive and acknowledge any thing but what is supported by sensible evidence or carnal reason, that when God had manifested his will, even to carnal sense, by miraculous dispensations, they rebelled, and denied the intimations of his will, as in the case of Korah and his company; and how much more may we expect those truths to be denied in an age when such sensible evidence is not to be given! With due allowance for the darkness and the difficulties of true believers on these points, we must hold that the denial of those truths, with the manner of denial manifested by many, is a sad evidence of prevalent infidelity, and an evident proof that the church has needed a purging out of this leaven.



ART. III.—*Extracts from a Correspondence between Bishop Doane of New Jersey, and the Rev. H. A. Boardman of Philadelphia.*

After reading this correspondence the reader will be the better prepared for the following statement of facts:—The Bishop's letter was published in the "Banner of the Cross," and "particularly directed by the Bishop to be sent to Mr. Boardman." And yet, the editor of the Banner refuses to insert Mr. B's. reply, because it did not appear to him "altogether relevant to the subject of controversy;" and because he was "unwilling to fill his columns to the exclusion of better matter, with the notions of partisan writers, adopted without investigation, and maintained with a rancour unworthy the Christianity they profess." Owing to this circumstance, Mr. B's. reply appeared in a pamphlet form. The intelligent reader will probably not be much surprised at the anomalous conduct of the editor of the Banner, when he reflects upon the cringing servility of the *lower orders* of the clergy to their *Prelates*. Rather than leave his Diocesan in the sad dilemma into which he had plunged himself, by *gravely* assuming the air of Father Confessor to a free-born Protestant, and the office of a voluntary champion of "the innocent and absent;" and then in the exercise of his newly assumed functions, demanding of Mr. B., as an act of mere justice, the retraction of FACTS well known to the whole Christian world, on the pain of excommunication from his Right Reverend charities and sympathies, as a person "prompted by malice" or a "feeling of uncharitableness"—I say, rather than leave his venerable Diocesan in such a dilemma, the editor has placed himself in the unenviable position of refusing the privilege of reply, to an individual specifically called by name to answer! The learned Prelate should try again.

It is intended to give extracts from Mr. B's. second and third letters in the next number, showing that his allegation is fully sustained by the Tracts themselves.

---

*Bishop Doane's Letter.*

TO THE REV. H. A. BOARDMAN, "PASTOR OF THE WALNUT STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH," PHILADELPHIA.

Reverend Sir,

Though I cannot claim the pleasure of your personal acquaintance, I feel myself compelled, in justice to the truth, and to the character of brethren and fellow-members of a sister Church assailed by you, to intrude myself on your attention. A little book, bearing your name, "a Lecture," delivered by you on the 27th day of December last, has just come into my hands, not by purchase, but as the gift of one of the publishers. Opening it cursorily, this morning, I am shocked to find, on pages 20 and 21, such language as this:—"These facts are sufficiently startling, but there is another feature in the present religious state of Great Britain, equally ominous, namely, *The Oxford Tract movement*. Romanism could make little headway in that country if the ministry of the established Church were all such men as Bickersteth, and Melville,

and Henry Blunt, and the Noels. But, unhappily, a large and learned body of the clergy (embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery; and are employing both the pulpit and the press with prodigious efficiency, to give them currency among the people. This state of things in England, must operate powerfully upon this country. The increase of Romanism there can hardly fail of giving a fresh impulse to it here. The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and Roman Priests are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church."

Your position in the community forbids the supposition that you can under-estimate the value of reputation, and especially to "the clergy," and "ecclesiastical teachers." The office which you hold, as "Pastor of the Church" in which these words were uttered, is accepted as a sufficient pledge that you would not willingly depreciate, but from the clearest sense of duty, what you must allow to be so valuable: valuable, in the instances alluded to, not to the parties spoken of alone or chiefly, but to the cause of which they are the accredited advocates; the cause of Him whose ministers they are. I set aside, then, as impossible, the thought that these grave charges were prompted by one particle of malice; or that they are uttered, however much they may betray the want of due consideration, in any feeling of uncharitableness. I throw myself on the less offensive, because less culpable supposition, that the words which I have quoted were words not duly weighed; spoken in the fervour of excited zeal, on grounds not thoroughly investigated. And in entire frankness and courtesy, I wish to afford you an opportunity to reconsider them; and should you find them not sustained, as most assuredly they cannot be, to do what your sense of justice will, I trust, instinctively demand of you, and your Christian charity, rejoicing not in iniquity, but rejoicing in the truth, will hasten to perform—acknowledge that you were in error, and make utmost and immediate reparation.

In thus addressing you, I undertake no championship of what you are pleased to call "the Oxford Tract movement," as such; claiming, however, for myself the privilege to use and to approve, without permission and without reproach, (responsible for that alone which I adopt,) the vast amount, that is most timely and most excellent, in those calumniated writings. As little do I identify myself with any school or set of men, on either side of the Atlantic: although the names of those whom you have charged as striving to pervert their age to Popery, while they profess to stand upon the ground which Cranmer held at his life's cost, the ground of primitive antiquity, are such, for talents, learning, piety, integrity, holiness, heavenly-mindedness and charity, as would adorn the purest age the Church has ever known; and are—the Papists know it, though you do not—the boldest and the ablest living champions of the truth, against the force and fraud of fallen, frenzied Rome. I do no more than claim the application of that golden rule of mutual duty, which the Saviour taught us, in demanding, as I would that others should for me, reversal of the sentence, which, without a proper hearing, has been passed upon the innocent and absent. Nay, less, far less than this. I do but act on the indignant prompting of a heathen's sense of justice:

"——— *absentem qui rodit amicum;*

*Qui non defendit, alio culpante;*

——— *hic niger est, hunc tu Romane, caveto."*

Believe me, truly and respectfully, your friend and servant,

G. W. DUANE.

Riverside, February 13, 1841.

*Rev. H. A. Boardman's reply to Bishop Doane.*

LETTER I.

TO THE RIGHT REV. GEORGE W. DOANE, D. D., BISHOP OF THE  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESS OF NEW  
JERSEY.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR:

In the "Banner of the Cross" of the 20th instant, (for a copy of which I am indebted to the courtesy of a friend,) I find a letter, addressed to me under your signature. It appears from this letter that your feelings have been greatly wounded, and even "shocked," by a passage in relation to the Oxford Tracts, which occurs in my recently published "Lecture on Romanism." And you call upon me either to retract or substantiate the sentiments there expressed—sentiments which, you feel assured, must have been uttered "in the fervour of excited zeal, on grounds not thoroughly investigated." You do me the justice to disclaim any apprehension that these "charges" (as you characterize them) were prompted by the least feeling of "malice" or "uncharitableness." I trust I am incapable of calumniating any one—much less could I "assail," with malicious intent, the reputation of men holding (like the gentlemen at Oxford) a high and responsible situation in a sister-branch (*sit venia verbo*) of the church of Christ. And it is a source of unaffected regret to me, that the remarks alluded to should have given pain to my respected correspondent, or any other human being.

The passage in the Lecture which bears upon this subject is as follows:—

"These facts [namely, certain statistical facts quoted from Mr. Bickersteth, on the alarming increase of Popery in Great Britain,] are sufficiently startling; but there is another feature in the present religious state of Great Britain, equally ominous, namely, the *Oxford Tract movement*. Romanism could make little headway in that country, if the ministry of the established church were all such men as Bickersteth, and Melville, and Henry Blunt, and the Noels. But, unhappily, a large and learned body of the clergy (embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery, and are employing both the pulpit and the press, with prodigious efficiency, to give them currency among the people.

"This state of things in England [the state of things disclosed in the above paragraph, and in the quotation from Mr. Bickersteth,] must operate powerfully upon this country. The increase of Romanism there, can hardly fail of giving a fresh impulse to it here. The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and Roman Priests are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant church."

To these paragraphs is appended the following foot-note, which I regret you did not copy into your letter, as it modifies somewhat the impression which the text is adapted to produce.

"True Protestants of all denominations must rejoice at the emphatic condemnation which has been passed upon these publications by the eloquent Bishop of Ohio, and other distinguished clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. This opposition (the lecturer has been happy to learn since the lecture was delivered,)

is likely to keep the circulation of these pernicious writings within very narrow limits."

You avow it as one of the objects of your letter to "afford me an opportunity to reconsider" these strictures, that I may thereupon acknowledge that they are unfounded, and "make utmost and immediate reparation."

I beg leave to assure you, Reverend Sir, that you are mistaken in supposing that the above passage was penned "without due consideration." It was written (and written not in anger but in sorrow,) after mature reflection. Nevertheless, the possibility that I might have wronged the authors of those publications, (a wrong I should be as prompt to atone for, when discovered, as any friend of theirs could be to demand "reparation,") has induced me, on your suggestion, to "reconsider" the whole subject, and reinvestigate the grounds on which the statements were made. I have examined the Oxford publications anew, (as many of them, that is, as are within my reach,) and I am only strengthened in the opinions on which you have animadverted. It is my sober, deliberate judgment, that those publications embody "some of the worst errors of Popery," and that the whole system is more Popish than it is Protestant. And I believe, (claiming for myself the same liberty of opinion that I concede to others,) that Oxfordism, instead of preparing true Christianity for its approaching conflict with "the man of sin," is destined greatly to accelerate the progress of Romanism in England.

Alluding to the writers in question, you observe, near the close of your letter; "they are—the Papists know it, though you do not—the boldest and the ablest living champions of the truth, against the force and fraud of fallen, frenzied Rome." The remarks just made will confirm you (if confirmation were wanting) in the propriety of ascribing to me the ignorance associated with my name in this sentence. I certainly "do *not* know" what you affirm. I do not believe that any set of men can withstand Rome successfully, who have thrown away the weapons with which the Reformers vanquished her—who have spiked their cannon, and abandoned their citadel, and gone forth to meet her with small swords and pistols. Nor do I think that the Papists themselves are as well informed on this point as you suppose them to be. I have serious doubts whether the name of Oxford spreads more terror through the halls of the Vatican, than any other name in Christendom. But of this more presently.

The main question between us respects the alleged Popish character (in some particulars) of the Oxford publications. It is obvious both from the opening and the close of your letter, that you consider the various points adverted to by you, as subordinate to this. And every candid reader of the passage quoted from my lecture, will perceive at once that the whole question hinges here. To this point, therefore, I shall direct my chief attention. After making two preliminary remarks, I will proceed to spread before you some of the grounds on which the statements in the lecture rest.

In the first place, it is important we should define what is to be understood by the phrase, "some of the *worst errors* of Popery." There may be a difference of opinion on this point. Some may hold that the Papal supremacy, the schismatic position of the church of Rome within the dioceses of the church of England, the denial of the cup to the laity, &c. &c., are the worst features of Romanism. But the author of the lecture had his eye upon what *he* deemed to

be errors of a much deeper dye. He believes with the judicious Hooker, that "the grand question that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome, is about the matter of **JUSTIFYING RIGHTEOUSNESS.**" With this may be associated the **NATURE AND MEANS OF REGENERATION**, and the **NATURE AND TRUE DESERT OF SIN.** The doctrines of Rome on these and their affiliated points, together with her rejection of the Bible as the only infallible **RULE OF FAITH**, are, in the judgment of the writer, her "worst errors"—the prolific source of nearly all her abominations.

My second remark is this:—If you were "shocked" at the sentiments expressed in my lecture, I was surprised beyond measure that you should treat the imputation they involve against the character of the Oxford Divinity, as though it were a *novelty*. I cannot think it was so designed; but the legitimate impression conveyed by the whole tone of your letter, is, that I am the first individual who has presumed to ascribe to these Tracts a strong Popish tendency! In a matter of this sort, I neither court responsibility nor shrink from it. But it is right that the readers of this correspondence should know (if they do not know it) that these Tracts have been, and still are, the subject of a wide-spread and vigorous controversy, both in the established church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal church in this country; and that they have been denounced for their Popery in terms of solemn and indignant rebuke, by many of the ablest pastors and *Prelates* in each of these churches.

I propose to show now, that I have the authority of both Protestant Episcopalians and Roman Catholics, for all that I have said respecting the character of the Oxford publications; and having done this, I will then appeal to the Tracts themselves.

I begin by quoting a single sentence from the noble work of Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio, on "Oxford Divinity." "He (the author) is constrained to say, that every further step of insight into what is indeed a thoroughly wrought, highly complex, and deep-laid scheme or system of doctrine, (much as the name of system is rejected by its advocates), has produced but a deeper and deeper conviction on his mind, that whatever the intention or supposition of those who maintain it, it is a systematic abandonment of the vital and distinguishing principles of the Protestant faith, and a systematic adoption of that very root and heart of Romanism, whence has issued the life of all its ramified corruptions and deformities." (P. 14.)

The esteemed Rector of St. Andrew's church, in this city, writing from Oxford, in 1838, says, "From all that I have learned since I have been here, after very free conversations with some holding the new divinity, and others who reject it, I am constrained to think that Messrs. Pusey, Newman, and Keble have started a system which, when brought out in full development, will be found to *contain all the elements of Popery.*" (Clark's "Glimpses of the Old World." Vol. II., p. 207.)

The author just named quotes (Vol. II., p. 58,) the Rev. Josiah Pratt, the biographer of Cecil, as remarking to him, that he "had attentively read the 'Tracts for the Times,' and could come to no other conclusion than that this new theology was nothing more nor less, than the *exploded errors of Popery revived.*"

Mr. Bickersteth, in his introduction to the "Testimony of the Reformers," makes this observation respecting the Oxford writers:—"With much learning and study of the Fathers, with great apparent,

and, doubtless, in some cases real devotion, and a devotedness ascetic and peculiar, they seem to the author, as far as he has seen and known their course, to open another door to that land of darkness and shadow of death, where the 'man of sin reigns.'"

You remark in your letter, that the Oxford writers "profess to stand upon the ground which Cranmer held at his life's cost, the ground of primitive antiquity," &c. Mr. Clark, in his account of them, says, "The Reformation, some of them speak of as a *prodigious evil*; and they *scout Cranmer and Ridley*, and those other English Reformers who shed their blood for the truth, as innovators who are not to be listened to." (Vol. II., p. 49.)

On the 48th page of the same work, there is an extract from a sermon by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, which the author heard. Alluding to the Oxfordists, Mr. Noel said "there were a spirit and a class of men springing up within the bounds of their own communion, that if allowed to prevail, would bring back *some of the worst errors of Popery*—men who were the avowed apologists of the Romish church, and who spake of that corrupt body, as '*our venerable sister*,'—as '*Christ's most holy fold*.' What! (said he) is that '*our venerable sister*' and '*Christ's most holy fold*,' which God has denominated '*Babylon, the habitation of devils—the hold of every foul spirit—a cage of every unclean and hateful bird*;' and in reference to whom God says, '*Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues*?' Is that '*our most venerable sister*,' and '*Christ's most holy fold*,' which God denominates '*Anti-Christ*'—'*the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*?'"

I might quote numerous passages to the same effect, from the (London) Christian Observer—a periodical which, as every intelligent Episcopalian knows, has sustained itself with singular consistency, ability, and devotion to the cause of truth and holiness, for forty years, and which has spoken fearlessly and solemnly on the subject of this new divinity.

But I waive this, and close my first class of testimonies, with the following extract from an article in the Episcopal Recorder of April 25th, 1840, under the signature of "Warburton," (generally understood to be the Rev. Dr. Beasley:)—"They (the Tracts) decidedly maintain the doctrine of the real presence and a real sacrifice in the eucharist, which, if not so monstrous an absurdity, is scarcely less objectionable than transubstantiation; recommend the offering of prayers for the faithful dead, as efficacious in producing an amelioration of their condition; and establish principles which lead to the necessity of a more refined purgatory than that of Rome. In imitation of Popery, they attribute a magical and miraculous influence to external ordinances, especially that of Baptism; transcend all Protestant opinions concerning the authority and prerogatives of the clergy; strike from the code of our church that fundamental tenet of justification by faith, and obscure the hopes and sap the confidence of Christians, by attributing an undue influence to the efficacy of works and external rites and ceremonies, thereby limiting the extent and blurring the truth of that great cardinal doctrine of our religion, that our salvation is the free gift of God through Christ, and the sole purchase of the Saviour's sufferings and death. . . . They would, like the Pharisees of old and the Romanists in the present day, introduce among us a wearisome and barren routine of external observances,

loading men's shoulders with a burden too heavy to be borne. . . . . Finally, so strongly are the sentiments tinctured with Popery, and so close is the approximation to which they would bring us to that corrupt and abominable system, that they would have us, like Romanists, imitating apes and monkeys in our public services, bowing perpetually at the name of Jesus, and upon our approaches to the altar, turning to the east when we kneel in prayer, tracing the sign of the cross upon public or private occasions, and soiling our beautiful, various, and sublime liturgy with more copious extracts from those "precious relics of antiquity," Roman breviaries and missals; and, to complete our filial assimilation to the Romish church, instituting associations of nuns and sisters of charity like the Romanists, an ascetical order of the ministry, an order devoted to celibacy, and given to the austerities of monastic and cenobitic life." "Warburton" then goes on to show, that if "the plan projected by these writers was completely carried into execution," the Protestant Episcopal Church would be very little removed from "the decayed and putrid system of Popery."

Such, Sir, are some of the Protestant Episcopal authorities I rely upon for sustaining the account given in my lecture, of the Oxford Tracts.

I will now show that, however the Oxford gentlemen may consider themselves as the most successful *opposers* of Popery, they are viewed in a very different light by Romanists.

In a Roman Catholic paper now before me, dated January 2d, 1841, I find part of a speech delivered at a recent repeal meeting in Ireland, by the Rev. Mr. Hughes, a Romish priest. I quote from it a single sentence: "I hold (he says) in my possession the works of Dr. Pusey; and were I to be concerned in a discussion on religion, I would not desire to be furnished with better works, replete with Catholic authorities and Catholic arguments, than the writings of Dr. Pusey."

In another part of the same paper, there is this item of intelligence. "On the 3d instant, at Bruges, Belgium, a young (English) gentleman named Biden, solemnly abjured the Protestant religion, and embraced the Catholic faith. *An attentive perusal of the writings of Dr. Pusey, was the immediate cause of his conversion.*" (I learn from another paper that two months after his conversion, "he entered a novitiate of the society of Jesus.")

The following passage from a periodical, published at Rome (two years ago,) will show with what feelings the 'Oxford Tract movement' is regarded at the head-quarters of the Hierarchy:—

"The attention of all good Catholics, and especially of the congregation for the propagation of the faith, cannot be enough excited by the present state of religion in England, in consequence of the new doctrine propagated with so much ability and success, by Messrs. Newman, Pusey, and Keble, with arguments drawn from the holy fathers, of which they have just undertaken a new edition (translation) in English. These gentlemen labour to restore the ancient Catholic liturgy—the breviary, (which many of them, to the knowledge of the writer, recite daily,) fastings, the monastic life, and many other religious practices. Moreover, they teach the insufficiency of the Bible, as a rule of faith—the necessity of tradition and of ecclesiastical authority—the real presence—prayers for the dead—the use of images—the priests' power of absolution—the sacrifice

of the mass—the devotion to the virgin, and many other Catholic doctrines, in such sort as to leave but little difference between their opinions and the true faith, and which difference becomes less and less every day. Faithful! redouble your prayers, that these happy dispositions may be increased!”

Such are some of the Roman Catholic testimonies, to which I feel authorized to appeal in vindicating the obnoxious passage in my lecture from the strictures passed upon it.

Whether I am right or wrong, then, in my estimate of the Oxford publications, I am sustained both by Romanists and Protestant Episcopalians of high repute, in affirming that their authors have “returned to some of the worst errors of Popery.” The question still remains, whether I am also sustained in this allegation by the Tracts themselves. This question I propose, if Providence permit, to consider in another letter. I sincerely regret that I am obliged to trouble you with so prolix an answer; but the terms of your call upon me were such, that I could not deem it either respectful to you or just to the grave subject which has occasioned our correspondence, to respond to your requisition, without entering into some details.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir,

With much respect,

Your friend and servant,

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philad., Feb. 22d, 1841.

---

**ART. III.**—*Statement of the Associate Session of Xenia, to the Congregation under their Inspection, of their Authority from the Church and the Church's Head, for exercising the Discipline of the Church on those who offend by what is usually called, “Occasional Hearing.”*

WE proceed to the statement of our authority from the church, and the church's head, for the exercise of discipline upon the persons who attend upon the ministration of the word in other churches, being churches from which we are warrantably separate. We choose to begin with our authority from the church.

Here we might refer to the answer to the 138th question in the Larger Catechism, where the “hearing of the word” is mentioned as one of those ordinances which the second commandment requires us to observe and keep *pure*; we might refer to the language used in the bond for covenanting, condemning the “latitudinarian schemes prevailing in the United States of North America,” and declaring it as our duty “to mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have received, and *avoid* them.” But we shall content ourselves with particularly adverting to part 3, art. 2, sec. 9, of the Testimony. What we have asserted respecting the admission of persons to church communion, is no wise contrary to our Confession of Faith, which declares that saints by profession are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other services as tend to their mutual edification; because, to enter into communion with the visibly wicked, with the promoters of error, and with the lukewarm, who will not openly and faithfully appear in the cause of Christ; or to



enter into communion with those who are obstinate in apostacy from the truth received, would be no *holy fellowship*, and would tend to our mutual hurt: we would neglect our own duty, and encourage others to neglect theirs."

This part of our Testimony clearly asserts the following things: 1st, Those uniting in the "worship of God" have "fellowship and communion." 2d. The *hearing of the word* is one of those ordinances of the "worship of God" in which this "fellowship and communion" is had: for the Confession, from which this quotation is made in the Testimony, asserts that the *hearing of the word* is one part of the "worship of God," (see chap. 21, sec. 5.) 3d. The "communion" into which we enter, with "the promoters of error, and with the lukewarm, who will not openly and faithfully appear in the cause of Christ, or are obstinate in apostacy from the truth received," when we *hear the word* as dispensed by them, is a communion not "*holy*." 4th. As our profession recognises all other churches as being, in a greater or less degree, "promoters of error," &c., such "entering into communion with them" is not that "*holy fellowship and communion* in the worship of God," which, according to our Confession and Testimony, *we* "are bound to maintain." The objection, "that in hearing the word in other churches we do not enter into *church* communion with them," whether it be time or place, cannot be regarded as solid, when advanced to prove that our *profession* does not condemn the practice in question. Call it *church* communion, *ministerial* communion, the communion of sinners, or any other kind of communion you please, and the position still remains unrefuted, that our profession, though it does not declare which of all these kinds of communion this practice is, nevertheless does assert that it is "communion," and a "communion" not *holy*—not *that holy communion* which we are "bound to maintain."

But again it is objected, that this is finding a condemnation in our subordinate standards, of the practice in question, only *inferentially*,—that in these standards it ought to be found condemned expressly, or with all clearness, before it can be regarded as being a term of communion. Let us see what would be the operation of this objection, if true. If we recollect correctly, intercommunion, in the seals of the covenant, is not *expressly* condemned in the Confession, or Testimony only "inferentially." According, then, to the spirit of the objection, *this* ought not to be regarded as a term of communion in our church, and the practice of it ought to be tolerated in our members until an explicit condemnation of it is inserted in these documents. Should it be responded, we testify against *occasional communion*, we reply, this is only "inferential" proof; and should we be again answered, that though "inferential," it is sufficiently *plain*, we ought to be allowed, in our turn, to reply, that the proof that communion with the erroneous in the hearing of the word is condemned in these documents, though inferential, is nevertheless also sufficiently *plain*: besides, since both our Confession and Testimony hold the language that "we are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God," until the objector proves that hearing the word is not a part of "the worship of God," we will claim to have as good a right to plead this our testifying against "occasional communion" as "plain proof" that joining with

other churches in the *hearing of the word* is condemned in these standards, as he has to plead it as "plain proof that joining with them in the Lord's Supper is therein condemned. But let us for a moment suppose the ground occupied by the objector is good, and let us occupy it against him, as he does against us, and we doubt very much whether his "proof" of a condemnation in our standards of intercommunion in the Lord's Supper will appear so "plain." We "are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, but to enter into communion with the promoters of error, &c., would be no holy fellowship." All this language, we would admit, our Testimony does hold, and more too, that "we testify against what some call *occasional communion*:" but, according to the spirit of this objection, we would object, that there are a great many *kinds* of communion, *church, organical, ministerial, official, Christian*, the communion of sinners, &c., and the Testimony does not say which of these it intends to condemn; we would farther assume that, in our opinion, it condemns only *church* communion with other denominations, and that in partaking of the Lord's Supper in another church, we have communion with the private members only as *Christians*, and with the administrator only in his *official* character—we have only *Christian* and *ministerial*, or *official*, not *church* communion, which is the only kind of communion with other denominations condemned in the Testimony. Thus we see how, with the help of a few *distinctions* about communion—distinctions, too, which are becoming very common with some, and with the help of taking a few things for granted which ought not to be admitted, we might mystify the matter so as to assert, if we felt so disposed, that the proof of a condemnation, in our public profession, of intercommunion in the Lord's Supper is so "obscure" that it will necessarily be denied by some who can neither see nor feel its force. An objection that disproves too much disproves nothing.

The principle which, as we conceive, is thus fully set forth in our Testimony, is again and again asserted most explicitly in the judicial decisions of our church.

In an act against occasional communion, passed in the year 1796, by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania—(now the Associate Synod of North America,) it is declared "That if we attend on the ministrations of such as are involving themselves in the common defection, it is contrary to the profession we have made; *for we thus take part with them as a church, in the service of God*, while by our profession we expressly declare, that we ought to maintain a separate and distinct communion, as a testimony against them."

Again, by the act passed in 1817, by the Associate Synod, adopting the Book of Discipline, it is declared that "as our Declaration and Testimony adopt the assertion of the Confession of Faith, that saints by profession are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God: and farther declares that to enter into communion with the promoters of error, and with the lukewarm who will not openly and faithfully appear in the cause of Christ, or to enter into communion with those who are obstinate in apostacy from the truths received, would be no *holy* fellowship, and would tend to our mutual hurt.—And as in the acknowledgment of sins prefixed to solemn covenant engagement to duty, we confess it is the sin of multitudes in this land that they have verified what was fore-

told by the Holy Spirit, that the time should come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears:—and as in an act against occasional communion, passed in the year 1796, by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, (now the Associate Synod of North America,) we have declared that if we attend on the ministrations of such as are involving themselves in the common defection, it is contrary to the profession we have made; for we thus take part with them, as a church, in the worship of God, while, in our profession, we expressly declare we ought to maintain a separate and distinct communion, as a testimony against them:—And as the synod still adheres to these sentiments, thus judicially declared, they do therefore judge the practice of attending on the administration of such as are known to be erroneous, or opposers of a testimony for truth, to be censurable.”

These judicial decisions need no comment; there is nothing “obscure” about them; no objection *can* be urged against them for want of explicitness, and hence the objection of the advocates for the practice, in them condemned, has been directed against their *authority* or *force as acts*, especially that of the act of 1817.

It is objected that against the act of 1817, an appeal was taken to the General Associate Synod of Scotland, which, having been admitted, suspended the force of the act until the appeal was acted on by the General Synod, and that, as that Synod declined acting on it, the act, before it could have authority, required to be re-enacted by this synod, which never has been done.

In order to meet this objection, let us attend briefly to the history of this *act*, and the protest against it. At the same meeting it was passed, a resolution was passed appointing “a committee to superintend the printing of the overture as enacted.” Why the protesters made no opposition at that time, (for the minutes of the Synod, which are before us, do not show any,) to the appointment of this publishing committee, we cannot tell; however, at the meeting in 1818, the Presbytery of the Carolinas, to which two of the protesters belonged, appeared with a remonstrance against the resolution appointing the publishing committee. In reply to this remonstrance, Synod at that meeting made the following decision. “In regard to the remonstrance from the Presbytery of the Carolinas, the Synod, in order to obviate misapprehensions respecting the matter referred to, *agreed* in declaring that the Book of Discipline enacted at the last meeting, is not to be considered as in full force and operation, *while* the protest and appeal taken by some members *are in dependance before the general Associate Synod*: allowing, however, the same regard to be paid to the matter of it that was paid to it before it was enacted.”

The whole force which this objection claims to have arises from the *admission* of the protest and appeal, and the fact of its never having been acted on by the general Associate Synod. It is important, then, that we correctly understand the nature and effect of an appeal *admitted*, and the explanation or qualification which the *admitted* appeal in this case received the next year. An appeal taken and *admitted* is an agreement between the parties that the cause be translated to the judicature appealed to, and in the mean time, suspend the force or operation of the act appealed from. This was the nature of the appeal and *admission* of it, about the act enacting the Book of

Discipline, and also the effect of it *at the time* the appeal was taken and *admitted*; but see how this admission of the appeal, or *agreement* to translate the cause to the general Associate Synod, and especially how the effect it was to have, was explained, qualified, or amended, the next year, when it was unanimously "agreed" (for the minutes make no mention of either the protesters or any other persons even dissenting,) to declare "that the Book of Discipline enacted at last meeting, is not to be considered as in full force and operation, while the protest and appeal taken by some members *are in dependance* before the general Associate Synod: allowing, however, the same regard to be paid to the matter of it, that was paid to it before it was enacted." We conceive the following things are plainly imbodyed in this unanimous *agreement*, or legitimately deducible from it, and what the general Associate Synod did do *in consequence* of the appeal. 1. That in the event of the general Associate Synod's declining to act in the premises, it should not be necessary for our Synod to re-enact it; the language used is *peculiar*, and it seems that the general Associate Synod's declining to act in the premises was anticipated by our Synod, and that, too, with a good degree of probability, and, therefore, this *agreement* was so expressed as, in that event, to supersede the necessity of re-enaction. This anticipation of the general Associate Synod's declining to act on the appeal, turned out to be not without good ground; for at the same time that that Synod declined this action, they did, in order to prevent being called to decide upon similar cases in future, "declare themselves and the Associate Synod in America to be only sister churches, on a parity in respect of judicial authority, and perfectly independent of each other."

2. The action of the general Associate Synod, not upon, but in consequence of, the appeal, if it had any effect at all upon the act appealed from, was to confirm it; they declined acting on it; they did not remit it to our Synod, but "declared the Synod in America on a parity in respect of judicial authority with them. By this action our Synod was declared the supreme judicature of the church here, the court of the last resort, and that, for this reason, this appeal to that general Synod would not be entertained. Surely this action of that Synod, if it had language at all, declared that the action which the Synod in America had had in the premises was final.

3. That the general Associate Synod having declared our Synod a co-ordinate church court, on a parity with them in respect of judicial authority, and having, therefore, declined to act on the appeal, the appeal in question most certainly was no longer *in dependance before the general Associate Synod*, and consequently, according to the unanimous agreement of our Synod in 1818, which we have already stated, the act of 1817 appealed from is to be considered as having been in "full force ever since the general Associate Synod declined to act on that appeal.

4. That, even though the act of 1817 be regarded as having no authority, yet inasmuch as the *agreement* in 1818 provided that the matter of the act of 1817 appealed from, should have the same authority in the church that it had before 1817, the authority, not only of the Testimony, but of the act of 1796, stands wholly unaffected by the admitted appeal of 1817, and in full force—an act against which not even a dissent has ever been entered, and which declares "That if we attend on the ministrations of such as are involving themselves

in the common defection, it is contrary to the profession we have made, for we thus take part with them, as a church, in the service of God, while by our profession we expressly declare that we ought to maintain a separate and distinct communion, as a testimony against them."

Again, it is objected that that part of the Book of Discipline which makes occasional hearing censurable, was not adopted in accordance with Presbyterian principles—the Presbyteries had not been over-tured upon this particular subject. The truth of the implied assertion in this objection, that the draft of the Book of Discipline upon all occasions of its being sent down to the Presbyteries, contained nothing on the subject of occasional hearing, we would not positively deny, and still we cannot as yet admit it, having received individual verbal information to the contrary. We, nevertheless, readily admit, that when Synod met in 1817, the draft did not contain any thing on this subject. However, the draft of the Book of Discipline having been sent down to Presbyteries, the Presbytery of Chartiers proposed the addition of what the Book of Discipline now contains on this subject, which addition Synod did, in a committee of the whole, adopt. It is presumed that many other amendments, besides this, were then made; we *know* some were. It surely cannot be the intention of the objectors to assert, that so long as Presbyteries continued to propose amendments, the Synod was bound to overture the Presbyteries on these proposed amendments; for according to this principle, alternate proposing of amendments and consequent overturing of Presbyteries *might* have been continued for almost any length of time, and the Synod for the same length of time kept back from final action. If, then, we understand the "Presbyterian principle," which the objection asserts was violated by the act of 1817, adopting the Book of Discipline, it is this, that before a Synod judicially decides upon a matter either of truth or duty, Presbyteries must be overtured, in order that Synod may receive their expressions of opinion, and that the Synod, having received these presbyterial expressions of opinion, is bound to judicially decide in accordance with them. Such a principle, however, we cannot admit to be "Presbyterian." According to this principle, a Synod would not be allowed, in deciding upon a matter of truth or duty, to decide according to light obtained while the subject is under discussion, but according to determinations already made by Presbyteries: indeed there could be no discussion at all about the matter, unless perchance it might arise about the simple arithmetical question of addition, and perhaps subtraction; for a Synod would be nothing but a *calculator* of numbers, a teller of the votes of the members of presbyteries. But the principle is absurd: office-bearers in the house of God travel hundreds of miles; make great sacrifices of time, labour, and money; meet and solemnly constitute as an ecclesiastical court; approach the throne of grace and solemnly beseech the God of all grace for light and direction; and for what? This pretended "Presbyterian principle" says all this is done and ought to be done in order to the settlement of the simple arithmetical question of addition, and perhaps subtraction.

But if the fact, (if it be one,) that the Presbyteries were never overtured on that part of the Book of Discipline which respects occasional hearing, proves that this part of that book has not been enacted in accordance with "Presbyterian principles," then we declare

that neither the Confession of Faith, nor the Catechisms, nor the Directory for Public Worship, nor the Form of Church Government, were enacted in accordance with "Presbyterian principles" by the Assembly at Westminster; for though the Assembly in 1639 made an act referring some matters to inferior judicatories, yet in the years 1647 and 1648 they made no such reference with regard to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms then established, nor did they make any such reference in 1645 with regard to the Directory for Public Worship and the Form of Church Government then enacted.

Farther, it is objected that the acts against occasional hearing passed in 1796 and 1817 are only judicial decisions, and no judicial decision can be enforced as a term of communion until it is imbodyed in our Testimony. This objection is a sweeping one, and it is indeed new, at least to us; but we think the principle it contains is clearly condemned by both our Testimony and the word of God. This objection, it will be perceived, makes no exception—none in favour even of those judicial decisions which might be unanimously regarded as being in accordance with the word, nor even those imperiously required by the word. Is such a principle as this in accordance with the declared principles of our profession? The very reverse is most clearly contained in those principles. In Part III., Art. viii. § 5, of the Declaration and Testimony, the Associate Church declares and testifies as follows, namely, "The office bearers of the Church of Christ may, and ought to meet together, not merely to consult and give advice in matters of difficulty, but to judge and determine controversies which may arise about the doctrine and order of the Church. The word of God is their rule: they ought to judge and determine every thing according to it: if they do not, their decisions are not to be received. But their *determinations*, if agreeable to the Scripture, and warranted by it, *ought to be submitted to by the Church.*" If, then, it is a principle of our profession, that the "Church," or the members of the Church are in duty bound to "submit to" those "determinations" of church courts "about the doctrine and order of the church" which are "agreeable to Scripture and warranted by it," does it not necessarily follow, that it is likewise a principle of our profession, that church courts have authority to enforce such "submission" by the exercise of discipline? If this question is answered in the affirmative, as it must be, does it not necessarily follow also, that it is a principle of our holy profession that decisions or determinations of church courts, if agreeable to the Scripture and warranted by it, are in themselves, and apart from any other circumstance, terms of our communion? Thus, we see, we have associated ourselves together as a church, upon this as *one of our terms of fellowship*—that all *judicial decisions*, or "determinations agreeable to the Scripture," are to be received and submitted to; and there is no mention whatever made in this, or any other article of our association, about the insertion of such determination in our Testimony, before this submission shall be due, or can be enforced. The only questions to be asked are—is such a matter a "judicial determination? and is it agreeable to, or warranted by the word of God? According to our declared principles, then, not only is our Testimony a term of communion, but all judicial determinations agreeable to Scripture and warranted by it, about the doctrine and order of the church, are also terms of communion. We would only refer, farther, to the language of the Confession of Faith, c. 31, § 3, "It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine contro-

versies of faith and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his church, to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration and authoritatively to determine the same; which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the word of God, *are to be received with reverence and submission*, not only for their agreement with the word, but also, for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his word." The same course of reasoning applies to this as to the article just quoted from the Testimony.

But the principle contained in this objection is also, we have said, clearly condemned by the word of God. We shall not here stay to prove that synods and councils have authority or power to determine controversies about faith and practice believing it will be, and must be admitted by all who have declared their adherence to our Testimony—nay, by all who adhere to the Confession of Faith. The only question, then, that remains to be considered is, what is necessary to give their judicial decisions authority in the church, as terms of communion? Is it necessary that they be embodied in the subordinate standards of the church? or only that sufficient means be afforded to the church of becoming acquainted with them *as* judicial decisions? That the last is all that is necessary, is plain from the fact, that the judicial decision of the controversy, from Antioch, by the Synod at Jerusalem, was simply sent to the church at Antioch in the form of a minute or letter, and *submission* to this decision upon *mere information of it as* a judicial decision, was *required* and actually rendered. Acts xv., 15—31 verses, inclusive.

(To be continued.)

#### ART. IV.—*Voluntary Associations.*

MR. EDITOR,

MY intention was to take no farther part in the discussion of the mooted question, of the lawfulness of voluntary associations. But some invidious remarks being made by a writer on the negative side of the question, over the signature of C., in the last No. of the Monitor, induced me to ask your indulgence, for the insertion of another communication, in which I will endeavour to be as brief as possible.

This C., from his own telling, is an intrepid warrior; but if we are permitted to give an advice, we would say, "let not him that putteth on his armour boast, as he that putteth it off." Even a redoubtable champion has been "killed off" by a boy, and even did not get a brave soldier's death by warlike weapons, but was proceeded against, as if he had been a dog with a sling and a stone; and even old women have waxed valiant in fight, and in their rude way, have cut off mighty champions; the nail of a tent and a workman's hammer have done great execution. Or if the enemy would advance too close in order to scale the walls, a piece of a mill-stone thrown over the wall by a woman might be as fatal as the discharge of a cannon, and a far more inglorious death for a veteran.

It certainly was a great dereliction in duty in C. to stand by and see a "parcel of old women and boys" dealing out devastation and destruction, and not to aid in averting such a direful catastrophe. Though it might have been inglorious to enter the field against such

antagonists, yet he should not have preferred his own personal honour to the honour of the church and state, which are God's institutions; which, he says, are suffering so severely from the doctrines exhibited by the advocates of voluntary associations. Did not the editor give warm solicitations for writers to appear on the negative of the question? Why did not C. then appear? Was it not evident that these ruthless creatures were dealing out death and destruction? Did not C. know that means, apparently as trifling as a cake of barley bread, tumbling into a host, discomfited it? Why did he not raise the banner that he complains was stricken, and unfold it to the breeze; and might not the enemies of voluntary associations have confidently expected to see "victory perching on his banner?"

We are wholly unacquainted with C., and know not who he is. But our smiting is not intended to break his head, were we potent enough to inflict a wound, nor could his remarks, as it respects us personally, have elicited any reply. But, through us, a thrust is made at the cause we advocate. We believe that voluntary associations are links in the chain of means which God is making use of to bring about his purposes, and they have been blessed for that purpose. If any think otherwise, it is certainly their duty, in a manly, Christian spirit, to show their opinion, supported by argument.

We will now make a few remarks on C.'s sentiments respecting voluntary associations. His sentiments, if we correctly understand him on this subject, are, that the church and state are the only institutions that are sanctioned by God, and are amply furnished for their duties; all other institutions must necessarily be sinful, because devised by man, and to organize any other institution is competing with God's institutions, and their organization implies, that God's institutions are not adequate for the purposes for which they were designed. We believe that God in his word has given ample directions for the performance of all duties devolving on the human family, either by precept or example, or legitimate inference; and all devices which would not bear this scrutiny are sinful, in and of themselves. The means of performing a great many duties have been left to human prudence, which must not be inconsistent, in any case, with Christian principles. It is only to the church that God has given an exact pattern, and has said, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount."

On C.'s position our institutions of education, and many others which might be named, are sinful, because not immediately instituted by God. It has been demonstrated over and over again, in the discussion of this subject, that voluntary associations did not propose to do any thing which is exclusively the province of church or state. We will confine our remarks to the abolition society, which is neither a rival or competitor of either church or state. It may be said to be antipodes to them both on this subject in the United States. Civil government has created and perpetuates slavery; the church, as a body, to say the best of her, connives at it, and, in numerous instances, openly defends it. The anti-slavery society rebukes this evil, and pledges itself to use its moral influence to have it eradicated from our nation. Now is the church and this association competitors? If church and state would put forth all their energies to root out this evil, and fail through impotency, and voluntary associations



profess to do what church and state were inadequate to do, there would be some pretext for saying that it was professing to be more potent than God's institutions, and that it was offering itself "as a prop." The advocates of voluntary associations never doubted but that civil government itself is potent enough to do away slavery, as it created, and can destroy. Nor do they doubt but that there is moral power enough in the church of herself to do it away; she is equipped with all the implements of war, and is terrible as an army with banners to her enemies, provided they are the enemies of her Master. But she has made a truce with this enemy of God and man; slavery finds refuge under her wings, consequently she is not terrible to slavery, but is its ally and friend. No, she does not appear in the field at all as an antagonist to slavery. She has never displayed her banners to declare for *this truth*, "we are to love our neighbours as ourselves." No, the church is the bulwark of slavery, with a few honourable exceptions. She hides slave-holders in the secret of her pavilion. Let the church open her batteries on slavery, and the roar of her heavy artillery will be so great that we shall not hear the discharge of the small arms of voluntary associations; they would be discharged from the field of action, as a supernumary corps. Let her arise and shine, and the glory of the Lord will so rise upon her, that she will be clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners. As when the sun rises, the bright luminary of the day, from its transcendent refulgence obscures the stars from our sight, so would the church obscure the shining of voluntary associations, or any other, if she would arise and shine with the splendour which her Master has conferred upon her. She "is a city set on a hill, and cannot be hid." Let the church judicially and ministerially rebuke slavery, and let prayer, without ceasing, be made by the church for its overthrow; her prayer is as incense, and the lifting up of her hands as the evening sacrifice. Let her ministers put the gospel trumpet to their mouths, and cry aloud, and spare not, against this abomination. Although the sound of this trumpet may appear to the men of the world as the sound of rams' horns, yet, nevertheless, the adamant walls of slavery will fall down flat before them. She "is mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds." But does the church as a body thus act? No, she has proved recreant to her trust. Now what is to be done in this emergency, when church and state have proved recreant in duty? Is there no other lawful means by which these suffering individuals (the slaves) are to have their wrongs redressed? It is no where promised that church and state will infallibly do their duty; they have both erred and proved unfaithful to their trust. Is there no provision made for such an emergency, which can in some measure supply their delinquency? Are they the only channels through which every act of Christian philanthropy must flow? There was provision made under the Old Testament dispensation for voluntary vows.

We beg leave again, to turn the attention of the reader to that beautiful and instructive parable of the good Samaritan, which is exactly in point. We think it may be legitimately inferred, that church and state were remiss in their duty at the period when the individual fell amongst the thieves. Civil government had not been

vigilant, or the robbers would not have been permitted to infest the country, and commit their depredations; the priest and Levite, the constituted officers of the church and her representatives, beheld this individual, but passed by on the other side. The Samaritan, though not such an orthodox worshipper, gave the necessary assistance, which the others denied. "Go thou, and do likewise," is the command of our Lord. Let this be your warrant for the performance of this duty. O! but, says the opposer of voluntary associations, this is only individual action. But if the number robbed and wounded have been so great, that one individual could not perform the duty himself, are they to be left weltering in their blood, and perish? Are their wounds to remain unbound and unmollified with ointment? Are they not to be removed to the inn for necessary accommodation? Why is it good to be alone in this act of Christian benevolence and philanthropy, when it is not so in other situations? Why are two better than one in other situations, and not in this? "A three-fold cord is not easily broken." And "as iron sharpeneth iron, so does the countenance of a man his friend." If church and state will not do their Master's work, *he will employ Samaritans*. If priests and Levites did not give due praise to the Saviour, he can make the "boys" in the temple "shout Hosannahs," (and girls too, no doubt.) Yea, verily, he can make even "the stones to cry out." There are duties to be performed which do not exclusively belong to either church or state. The good Samaritan's labour of love was pre-eminently of this character; he was not even a member of the Jewish church or state. Can any one suppose for a moment that the priest and Levite would have sinned against God in assisting him to the inn with the invalid? and yet he was not orthodox in his creed, as it respects religion; "salvation was of the Jews." By this act of philanthropy there was, indeed, a heavy censure passed on the priest and Levite, or, if you please, on *the ministry and deaconship of our day*. But was it the fault of the Samaritan that this censure was passed? By no means. The priest and Levite had first the opportunity of performing this labour of love, and rejected it; so we say of the church. There are some duties which are exclusively the duty of church and state, which must not be infracted. As it respects the church, it is exclusively her prerogative to ordain ministers to preach the gospel, to administer the ordinances, and exercise the disciplinary duties of the church. But every man and woman has a right, in their civil capacity, without the authority of church or state, "to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and to bring them that are cast out into their houses." "To relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow, open their mouths for the dumb," to rebuke their neighbour and not suffer sin upon him, yea, though the individual speaking might be a heathen man, as the heathen mariner said to Jonah, a prophet of the Lord, "What meanest thou, O, sleeper; arise and call on thy God." "And remember those that are in bonds as bound with them," and the duties inculcated in this parable which we have already considered. Now here are duties enjoined, which cover the whole field of anti-slavery action, without license from church or state, and it is every man and woman's duty to perform them, let their character be what it may, if individuals are in such calamitous situations as we

have described, and we, in the providence of God, are enabled in any way to administer relief; now, as it is every one's duty to perform these acts of charity, let his character be what it may in other respects, what is the reason we cannot act in unison? It is our duty to "provoke all to good works." This is the doctrine of the Confession of Faith, p. 224, direction 7, for the right understanding of the ten commandments.

The argument, that we associate with the wicked and profane, and the heterodox, would come with equal force with our associating with them in civil government. Now it is clear to us that we have given scripture authority, from clear and legitimate inference, for voluntary associations, excepting the mere formality of organization; and the mode of performance being left to our own selection, embraces this also, as it is not inconsistent with Christian principles—"all things are to be done decently and in order;" we are really surprised that the mere innocent formality of appointing officers, for the sake of good order and to expedite business, should even be thought of as sinful, which seems to us to be over righteous. There are never a number of men collected together to discuss any question, agricultural, or mechanical, or literary, or moral, or religious, or what not, but what there are officers appointed, for the time being, for the sake of order and regularity of procedure. If it is lawful to organize for one hour, when not immediately appointed by God, it is also lawful for years, if the case require it. Are the opposers of voluntary associations more zealous and ardent to do their duty in a church capacity, against the evil of slavery and other immoralities, than are the friends of voluntary associations? If so, we bid them God speed.

E.

#### ART. V.—*Respecting Holiness.*

IN the number for November, 1840, p. 267, the following passage occurs: "The believer's holiness is the connecting link which binds him to the throne of God—secures the ministry of holy angels—the protecting power of the Almighty, and *makes* him an heir of glory."

Our meaning in these expressions has been misapprehended; whether through any real defect in the expressions, or a want of attention to the context, is not material; perhaps, in part, from both these causes. It has been supposed that the language gives countenance to those "who are in the habit of ascribing pardon and acceptance with God to inherent righteousness, and not righteousness imputed." It is scarcely necessary to say that we abhor such a sentiment. Had the word *actually* been inserted, it would, probably, have prevented the misconception. Thus, "the believer's holiness is the connecting link which [*actually*] binds," &c. Standing by itself, the passage requires the addition of the word *actually*; taken in its connexion, it is believed the reader cannot fail to perceive that the actual union is necessarily implied; for the following reasons:

The *nature* and *necessity* of holiness only are spoken of in the ar-  
VOL. XVII.—44

ticle from which the expressions are taken, to the exclusion of other branches of the subject; it is described as a work of the Spirit of God, and, consequently, our remarks were not designed to embrace directly the *effect* or *evidence* of holiness which is the believer's good works. We spake not of the believer's own holiness in any other way than as it is a free gift; consequently, we referred to the sanctifying work of the Spirit in the believer. In this respect, holiness binds us to God, because it makes us like him. This is the ultimate design of the whole gospel, as it terminates on the believer; which is required Matt. v. 48, and expressed Eph. i. 4, and in many other places, while a holy life is to be regarded only as the effect and outward evidence of this work upon the soul. "First make the tree good, and then shall the fruit also be good." For this work we are as much indebted to the righteousness of Christ as for justification. "Who of God is made unto us SANCTIFICATION." May there not be too much of a legal view of holiness in the objection to our language when taken in its proper connexion, or, at least, to the thing intended to be conveyed?

Holiness, considered as the purchase of Christ and the work of the Spirit, in which sense it was spoken of, actually binds us to God, because it is God's own work by which he draws believers to himself, and makes them like himself; "draw me, and we will run after thee;" and the fact that God is at work in this manner in the souls of believers, is used as an argument persuading them to a holy life. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." A holy life is, then, simply the right use and improvement of a free gift.

It will be seen, we make an important distinction between holiness as it is in the heart, and as it is in the life; the distinction of cause and effect. It is the former that binds us to God; the latter is both the effect and evidence of that binding. This distinction is made by Fisher: "The matter of sanctification is the fulness of Christ communicated, or grace imparted from him." John i. 16. "But the righteousness of sanctification [a holy life] is not meritorious, being only the righteousness of a sinful creature." Cat. Quest. 11, 13, *under the head Sanctification*.

The phrase—"Secures the ministry of the angels" is scarcely defensible. *The believer's holiness renders the ministry of angels consistent with their holy nature, and secures its actual exercise*, would be less liable to misapprehension, and, therefore, preferable. But, in order to make the truth respecting these interesting doctrines as clear as we are capable of doing, it might be stated thus: The covenant of grace secures all the blessings here spoken of; justification confers a legal title to them; while holiness secures their actual possession or enjoyment by believers. Thus, the holy angels could

show no special favour to persons who are unholy, as God shows no special favour to the elect until effectually called, when this holy principle is implanted, although he regards them as *legally* entitled to the imputed righteousness of Christ; yet that righteousness not having been actually imputed, and the holiness of which we speak not being actually communicated, they are regarded as "children of wrath." And the communication of holiness is as necessary as the imputation of righteousness, ("which," says Fisher, "as to time, go hand and hand together,") in order to render the *actual* ministry of the angels consistent; otherwise it would be said to them, "Shouldst thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord?" The conclusion, then, is that we are as much indebted to the meritorious righteousness of Christ for inherent holiness, as for imputed righteousness. The one makes a change of relation, or a *legal* change; the other a change of nature, or an *actual* change; the one is by imputation, the other by implantation; the one gives a title to God, the other actual possession. The one is in Christ; the other in the believer; by the one we are restored to the favour of God, by the other adorned with the *image* of God. And both are procured for us by the death of Christ. If the image of God does not bind to him, what can? If it were proper to make any distinction between these two things in respect to value, (but it is not proper, because they are inseparably connected,) then the holiness would take the precedence, in as much as the actual possession or enjoyment of an inheritance is more valuable in itself than the legal title.

Does not this view give countenance to those who are in the habit of ascribing our acceptance with God to inherent righteousness? By no means, if justification be rightly apprehended, as taught by the Reformers. "Justification," says Fisher, "is not to *make* him righteous; but to declare him to be so, upon a law ground and trial of a judge; and if justification does not *make* the believer righteous, it cannot *make* him an heir of glory; but confers upon him only a *legal title* to glory, and secures his being made an heir. Hence our joint heirship with Christ is spoken of in connexion with adoption, which is the work of the Spirit, rather than in connexion with justification." Rom. viii. 17. "*If children, then heirs.*" Gal. iv. 7. "*If a son, then an heir.*" Heirship, then, certainly includes the sanctifying work of the Spirit; and the angels "are ministering spirits to them who shall be *heirs* of salvation." Heb. i. 14. Holiness, then, secures the *actual* ministry of the angels, though imputed righteousness removes the *legal* obstacles out of the way of their exercising this ministry.

The two leading errors of those who are in the habit of ascribing justification to inherent righteousness, consist in the denial of imputed righteousness for justification, and in ascribing justification to those good works which proceed from inherent righteousness. Thus,

say the Papists, "the works done by an unregenerate man cannot, indeed, justify him, but the works done by a regenerate man may justify." Here we have a total rejection of imputed righteousness, and justification by works. But we maintain the justification "of the ungodly" through imputed righteousness, before any good works are actually performed, and simultaneous with the implantation of that grace from which good works proceed. Watson, in his *Body of Divinity*, seems to go even beyond this. He says, "First, the soul is refined by holiness before God puts the royal stamp of justification upon it." But Fisher is more accurate when he says, "as to time, they go hand in hand together." Therefore, although inherent holiness is not the cause of our justification, it is an inseparable concomitant, and perhaps we may add, the very thing designed to be accomplished by justification; at least we may say that justification is the removal of all legal obstacles out of the way of the implantation of inherent holiness, which is the very thing God requires, and for the attainment of which, in subordination to his own glory, the whole plan of salvation has been developed. If the implantation of holiness be one of the things designed, in connexion with justification, and justification be a preparatory act in the order of nature, for its bestowment, then holiness is the *real* bond of connexion between God and the believer, while imputed righteousness is only the *legal* bond. This doctrine is also implied in such passages as the following:—"Be ye holy." Why? "Because I am holy." "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Why? Because the dissimilarity between a holy God, and an unholy man, is so great, that it is impossible for the latter to see him. But, being made a partaker of the Divine moral nature, by the implantation of inherent holiness, he shall see God.

It has been said, and truly said, that love is the bond of union; but the mutual love that subsists between God and the believer has this similarity of moral nature for its basis, the Spirit on the part of Christ, and faith on our part for its medium. We intend, of course, the love of complacency or delight, and not that everlasting love of good will, in the exercise of which God gave his Son to be our Saviour. Hence, the highest aspirations of the saints are breathed out in language like this:—"I shall be like him,"—"I shall see him as he is,"—"I shall be satisfied, when I awake with thy likeness." It is inferred,

1. That justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ is the connecting link which legally binds us to God, while inherent holiness is the *actual* bond of union.

2. That we should guard against resting upon imputed righteousness, or any other blessing secured in the covenant of grace, in such a way as to undervalue inherent holiness, or relax our efforts after perfect conformity to the image of Christ.

3. That we should avoid legal views of holiness, as though it consisted in our good works; seeing that good works are the effect and evidence of holiness, and not holiness itself, and that we are indebted to Christ, our Head of influence, for all that is good in us.

4. That they who are not *actually* united to God, by a work of the Spirit, are not justified, and consequently are destitute of imputed righteousness. If Christ be not *in* us the hope of glory, the well spring of spiritual joy, he is not *upon* us as a robe of righteousness, and a shield to answer the demands of justice, or ward off the shafts of our enemies.

5. That a Christian is one who is daily approximating towards God in moral likeness. Tested by this standard, who can abide the trial? "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me."

---

#### ART. VI.—*Theological Students.*

It will be recollected, that we published certain resolutions of the Theological Students, in the number for January, page 374, which see. Of the 11th resolution, we expressed our disapprobation at the time, and have now to add, that the trustees have never passed "any resolution, denying the use of the Hall for public meetings on the subject of slavery." It is not supposed that the students are chargeable with wilful misrepresentation; but the statement is incorrect, and, consequently, their serious charge against the trustees is without foundation. We have farther to add, that, on a closer inspection, we regard the 10th resolution scarcely less objectionable than the 11th. By what authority do students first assume that any of our brethren have set themselves against the action of the church on slavery, and then denounce them as "guilty of protecting a system which is sending millions of souls to perdition?" But we forbear at present to express several thoughts which have suggested themselves, confidently believing that the students will themselves voluntarily correct what was with them, probably, nothing more than an inadvertency. It cannot for a moment be anticipated that the church at large will suffer the 10th and 11th resolutions to stand without an expression of her disapprobation.

It is proper to add, that these two resolutions would not have appeared in the Monitor, had they not been forwarded for publication, in the "Christian Witness," and "Xenia Free Press."

---

#### ART. VII.—*Slavery in Great Britain.*

*Factory Hours in Great Britain.*—According to the report of the British Parliament on "Mills and Factories," it was testified by the evidence of two persons, that "the usual hours of work are, about Nottingham, twenty hours a day." It was farther declared by J.

Bury, "that children are up all hours of the night, when the lace machines are at work. They are generally at work twenty hours a day. The children, from nine to fifteen years of age, are obliged to be in the mills during the whole night and the day too. They very seldom get out until ten or eleven o'clock, and when the lace-mills are at work twenty-four hours a day, the children must be, during the whole of that twenty-four hours, either on the premises, or where they can be called out of bed whenever they are wanted!" Where are these children during the time they are detained in the mill? *When detained at night, and not employed, I am told they are lying about on the floor.* Is it customary to close at eight on Saturday evening in lace-mills? I think it is.—How then do they compensate for the loss of those four hours' work in those mills? *By working all night on Friday:* those are the mills in which they pay so much for their power.—Must not there be a considerable wear and tear upon the physical constitution of children who are kept in this state? I think it is self-evident. What opportunity have those children of education? None whatever.—Are not young people of both sexes congregated together at all hours of the night? Certainly.—*Are the children often called to begin their work at twelve o'clock at night?* Yes.—What effect have you observed this to produce upon the health of those young children? Decidedly injurious; their very countenances speak it."—*London Quarterly.*

Does slavery in the United States exhibit any thing more revolting to the moral sense, or more shocking to the common principles of humanity? The heart shudders involuntarily at the contemplation of such developments as these, and the soul secretly pants to be away from a world where avarice thus gluts itself with impunity, by devouring the souls and bodies of helpless infancy. Bad as slavery is among us, and much as it is to be detested, it has nothing surpassing this in enormity. And yet, Great Britain claims all the humanity, religion and liberty of Christendom. What will Messrs. Birney and Norton say to this? Will they be ready to attend another London convention, and unite with a people, who sacrifice the defenceless, soul and body, to the mammon of unrighteousness, in stigmatizing their own countrymen? American domestic slavery is a monster, but British slavery, both foreign and domestic, is quite a harmless thing! That London convention must have been any thing but a pleasant place for Americans, if indeed there were any such in it. We have sometimes questioned whether they had any thing American about them, except the name. The men who will unite with others in a public condemnation even of that which is wrong in the members of their own families, can never command the approbation of a generous mind.

We envy not those who will be ready to charge us with the sin of aiming a blow at the anti-slavery cause by these remarks. If we really desire the removal of slavery, we must treat those of our countrymen who are involved in the evil in a different manner. Show them that, while you contend with them, you still regard



them as brethren; and that you will resent the interference of any foreign officious intermeddler, and defend them from the attacks of strangers to the family, especially such as are involved in similar, if not more enormous, moral evils. Show them that you are interested in their welfare. That you feel deeply on the subject of slavery, on account of the family connexion. Their interests and yours being in a measure identical on account of this connexion. If you convince them that *their* interest requires the abolition of slavery, the object is accomplished peaceably and honourably. In this way, if at all, it must and will be accomplished. Let it be distinctly understood that the existence and responsibility of slavery depends exclusively on their action, and it will not probably survive the present century.

#### ART. VIII.—*State of the Church in Scotland.*

The agitating question of intrusion in the Church of Scotland appears to be approaching to a crisis. Mr. John Edwards, who had been assistant to the minister of the parish of *Marnoch*, was, in 1837, presented by the patrons to the said parish. The population of the parish was twenty-eight hundred, and there were three hundred heads of families on the roll of communicants, and yet, with the exception of three heritors who were not communicants, the whole of these were opposed to Mr. Edwards, who was objected to as an unacceptable and unprofitable preacher. Two hundred and sixty-one of these heads of families protested before Presbytery against the induction of Mr. Edwards. The Presbytery of Strathbogie rejected the presentee. Seven of the ministers of the said Presbytery, in the course of the proceedings, who were in the minority, were finally suspended from the ministry by the General Assembly of the Church. At this point, the civil court, to which complaint was made, interfered, and by a most extraordinary encroachment upon the liberties of the Church, reinvested these seven suspended ministers with the functions of the ministerial office, and directed them forthwith to proceed to the ordination and installation of Mr. Edwards, as pastor of the parish of *Marnoch*. Against this act of the Court of Session, the elders, heads of families, and parishioners of the parish of *Marnoch* have protested, as being without a single parallel in the history of the country, and memorialized the Marquis of Normanby, her majesty's chief secretary of state for the home department. In the close of this memorial, they say:

"That your memorialists are devotedly attached to the Church of Scotland; and for the sake of themselves and of their children after them, they are deeply interested in the maintenance of a faithful and efficient ministry in the parish of *Marnoch*;—that according to the fundamental laws and Constitution of this country, it was never understood that any *civil* court was entitled to dictate to a parish and congregation, the circumstance in which they are bound to receive any man as their pastor, or to require and compel a Presbytery to ordain a man to the office of the holy ministry;—the Church has never so understood the constitution;—the Court of Session itself up to the present day has always understood and *decided* that it had no such power, and although *three* of the Judges of that Court have, notwithstanding, now proceeded directly and in every various form to assume and exercise such a power, the memorialists hope and believe it will yet appear that they have acted in direct violation of the most sacred and fundamental laws of the country. For if the spiritual interests of the parishes of Scotland in the most vital of all particulars, namely, the settlement of their ministers, are not to be determined by spiritual considerations and the laws of the constituted spiritual courts, but according to the rules, and maxims, and compulsors of a *civil* Court, the Church of Scotland is no longer the Church that can either desire or obtain the affections and support of the people of Scotland."

Agreeably to the order of the court, one of the suspended ministers, Mr. Walker, proceeded to serve the edict, and with his law agents got possession of the house, but found few persons to greet him:

"At last a few began to drop in, until they numbered between twenty and thirty. These consisted of three heads of families, some young people, some recently come into the parish, a Voluntary, who acted as precentor, the law agents, the coachman who brought up Mr. Walker and his friends, and ten or twelve Intrusionists from other parishes. The congregation remained outside. They refused to enter, to

countenance religious services conducted by a suspended clergyman, under the orders of a civil Court.

"When thus excluded from the church in which their fathers and they had worshipped, with the greatest propriety of deportment and solemnity of feeling, they collected in a body round their minister, Mr. Henry, by the house-side of an adjoining farm, where (after the services of the church had commenced) he preached to them amidst the snow, frost, and wintry blast.

"The scene was altogether the most solemn and affecting ever witnessed—many an eye stood filled, and many a cheek was bedewed with tears. It was peculiarly touching to behold the solemn and devout appearance of a congregation driven from "their own home," and under the canopy of heaven engaged in the worship, and listening to the word of the living God. Many a hoary head was uncovered during the time of prayer and praise, with its gray hairs waving in the wintry breeze. The whole congregation, as with one heart and one voice, joined in singing the praises of that God who is not confined to temples made with hands, but whose temple all creation is. The notes of praise, as they swelled from the voices of the multitude, when they sung in the 20th Psalm—

In thy salvation we will joy,  
In our God's name we will  
Display our banners, &c.,

and, comingling as they did with the notes of nature's voice in the howl of the wintry blast, were truly touching. It is almost impossible to give a correct idea of the number present; but, comparing the collection, though imperfectly made, as the people were retiring, with the ordinary collection, and considering the number usually attending the church, it was considered that there must have been 1100 or 1200 present. The whole assemblage retired in a most orderly manner—a few, perhaps, out of mere curiosity, went at the end of this service, into the church, so that the number in the church, as they were counted on retiring, was thirty-five!!"

The Presbytery of Edinburgh have had a meeting in consequence of these high handed proceedings, and adopted the following resolutions:—

"1. That the Court of Session have recently pronounced a decision, whereby they have ordered the Presbytery of Strathbogie and certain individuals specified, to receive and admit Mr. Edwards to be minister of the parish of Marnoch; the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court having previously rejected Mr. Edwards, and decided that he shall not be admitted minister of Marnoch, and having suspended from all ministerial functions those persons to whom the order of the Court of Sessions was specially directed.

"2. That the Presbytery contemplate this decision of the Court of Session with the deepest regret and alarm, as involving the exercise of jurisdiction by a civil court in an ecclesiastical matter, and as being thus inconsistent with the word of God, the standards of the Church, and an encroachment upon the acts and liberties secured to the Church and people of Scotland by the Revolution settlement, the act of security, and the treaty of union.

"3. That the Presbytery being deeply impressed with the importance of this subject, of its bearing upon the welfare of the community and the peace and prosperity of the Church, resolve to transmit these resolutions to her Majesty's Government."

In the Parliamentary proceedings, we observe that this matter has already been noticed, but with little prospect of relief. The following is the notice to which we refer:

"The Earl of Haddington, seeing the Noble Viscount in his place, wished to put to him a question on a subject of infinite importance to the inhabitants of the northern parts of this kingdom. He alluded to the collision which had unfortunately taken place between the Church of Scotland and the civil courts in that country. In adverting to this matter, he entertained no wish to offer a single word that could lead to discussion. He did not consider it necessary for him to enter at all into the question. He wished simply to ask the Noble Viscount whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take the subject into consideration, and to propose any measure for allaying the feuds and animosities which so unhappily prevailed, with reference to this question. For himself, he was satisfied with the law as it stood at present; but he thought that efficient and effective support should be given to those who obeyed the law. He wished to know whether Her Majesty's Government meant to introduce any measure on the subject, or whether they were disposed to leave the law as it was at present.

"Viscount Melbourne agreed with the Noble Earl, that the subject was one of very great importance. Her Majesty's Ministers had seriously considered it, and having so considered it, they were not prepared, and did not deem it expedient, to propose any measure on the subject of the non-intrusion question.

"The Earl of Haddington said, he understood, then, that Her Majesty's Government were disposed to leave the law as it was. If so, he hoped they would see that the law was effectually administered for the protection of persons who acted in obedience to it.

"Viscount Melbourne said, it would be left to the Courts to administer the law as it at present stood.

"The Earl of Haddington was gratified with the answer which he had received. But still his own opinion was, that the matter would not be satisfactorily settled without the intervention of Parliament."

### ART. IX.—*The Oberlin Lynching Case.*

AN apology is due to our readers for again occupying our columns with this subject. But a desire to do justice to all parties, and to leave none with any reason to complain, will be sufficient excuse.

An extra of the Oberlin Evangelist has been issued, dated Feb. 24, 1841, just *seven months* after the outrage occurred, giving the first official statement of an affair which has justly been regarded by all sensible persons as a most remarkable transaction connected with a religious institution. On the 25th July, 1840, a young man belonging to the Oberlin Institute was seized in the night by his teachers and companions, gagged, blindfolded, and carried into the forest, and twenty-five lashes inflicted on his bare back, and then left to his uncertain fate, being forbidden to enter the town. The fact that a case of violence had there occurred was published among the secular news at the time, but as an investigation that should bring the whole matter to light was promised, no comments were made. Time passed on, and the Huron Presbytery learning that one of their licentiates, the editor of the Oberlin Evangelist, was one of those concerned, inquired into the matter, and having promptly recalled his license, published the statements that he had made before them. This brought the subject to the public eye, and of course has roused the feelings of the religious community, and covered the institution with odium. Many who before were disposed to think favourably of Oberlin became satisfied that this outrage is the undoubted fruit of fanaticism, and others said that it was no more than they had long expected. The profound silence which the Oberlin Evangelist had observed on the subject, increased the conviction that the *facts* were already before the public. At length that silence has been broken, and we have, in an extra of eight pages, *the official statement*, headed "Lynching at Oberlin," and embraced in ten several particulars, which we will mention in order.

1. "*Introduction.*" This gives the following:

"If it be asked why the statement was not made immediately after the event occurred, it is replied that it was the almost universal impression, that the interests of Christ's cause did not require that it should have a newspaper notoriety. The public press was so nearly silent, that both friends and foes who knew any thing of the case, advised that we say nothing about it publicly. The certificate of the Faculty, appended, shows that we offered to give the facts, at the time, to the public—that we did voluntarily state them to all persons and tribunals to whom we were amenable—that from the first we have had no disposition to conceal any part of the transaction—and that we have made the same statements, and expressed the same feelings, invariably, from that time to this."

A most singular reason truly, why good men who had palpably broken the laws of their country, should wait seven months after repenting, before making a public confession!

2. "*Prof. Cowles' statement.*" Substantially that which we published some weeks since. He says: "Where I ought to have resisted every thing like a proposal to inflict punishment, I gave a hasty and passing assent." What words he used he does not recollect. His confession is ample, and such as a sincerely humble man would make; which is much more than can be said of the next:

3. "*Mr. Taylor's statement.*" He states that the young man "proposed to meet one of the ladies at a specified time and place." A reply was sent to him assenting to his proposals; but "it was found impossible to carry out his plan so as to detect him that evening, and nothing was done about it. Immediately the author of the vile letters wrote again, asking for a meeting, but leaving the time to be set by the person. *The reply to this assented again to his plan, and appointed Saturday evening*, because it could not take place sooner nor be delayed longer. These two letters were the only ones addressed to him."

This pandering to the unhallowed appetites of the seducer, this encouragement day after day of his licentious designs, this direct proposal to meet him to entrap him, and inflict upon him an assault against the laws of God and man, all this Mr. Taylor defends, and even goes so far as to say "it is undeniably the very principle upon which God acts in the providential government of the world." It is so difficult to believe this assertion, that we will give his own words in their connexion.

"The objections that have been made to the means used to detect the writer of the infamous letters, assume the principle that all deception is wrong. But certainly this principle is not sound. Designedly to withhold the truth from any one upon a point where he has right to be informed is certainly wicked. But to withhold the truth from one who is seeking it for evil purposes, is so far from being wrong that it is no doubt a duty. It is undeniably the very principle upon which God acts in the providential government of the world. Numerous instances of this are recorded in scripture; and thousands of illustrations of it occur in the affairs of communities and nations."

For this principle Prof. Morgan argues, and we have yet to learn that any individual connected with the institution differs from him. [Perhaps we ought to except an agent of Oberlin who called on us some time ago, and after full conversation, expressed his entire concurrence in our view of the fatal error which was committed at this point in the tragedy.]

Mr. Taylor details the seizure of the victim, denies that he was crushed down when arrested, admits that he was gagged, blindfolded, that a season of prayer was held over him, his back stripped, and twenty-five lashes laid on with severity. The violence he thinks was wrong, and expresses his sorrow for it; the rest he justifies after seven months' reflection. He even asserts that the victim "knew that we would gladly have suffered all the punishment that we gave him in his stead, and that we had no disposition to injure him." A more deliberate insult to the common sense of mankind we never had the unhappiness to read.

4. "*Prof. Hudson's statement.*" He says:

"My connexion with this deplorable affair was such that my responsibility is perhaps greater than that of any other individual. I

advocated the punishment and even recommended a more severe castigation than that which was inflicted. I advocated the blindfolding of the men, and the concealment of the persons of those engaged in his detection. It was myself who consulted Professor Cowles, and, as I supposed at the time, secured his approbation of the course that was being pursued, and of the flagellation which I thought it best to have inflicted.—His statement will show that I misapprehended the force of his meaning. Had it not been for this mistake the flagellation would not have taken place.”

Farther on, he states that

“As I deemed it possible that he might be tempted to reveal the names of the persons concerned if he should know them, I recommended alike the concealment of their persons and the blindfolding of his eyes.”

But they verily believed the whole time that they were doing right! Not a doubt occurred to them as to the correctness of what they were doing: and yet they blindfolded the young man for fear he should know who were doing him good, and let others know it afterwards! No special pleading will explain away this evidence of conscious guilt. They knew they were doing what would have been wrong among savages; much more among Christians. Professor Hudson acknowledges his error with deep self-abasement, and concludes by saying:

“And if a life of *grief* could do aught to atone for the wrong, that atonement should, by the grace of God, with *all gladness* be made.”

5. “*Confessions of*” the young man. This is a letter written to the Faculty by the young man, twelve days after he was “lynched,” confessing his wickedness in writing the licentious letters; and offering to forgive his brutal assailants. It breathes as good a spirit under the circumstances, as any thing we have seen from that quarter.

6. “*Action of the Citizens.*” They held a public meeting *six days* after, and expressed their decided condemnation of the transaction.

7. “*Action of the Faculty.*” All we are told under this head is in the following paragraph:

“The Faculty had the case of the students before them, and after examining into, and understanding the facts of the case, and the feelings of the men, passed resolutions, which were read in public by the President, in whose hands they probably now are. He is absent, and they cannot be found. The following is written by the member who drafted them, as the substance of the resolutions. They would be given in their place, could they be found:

“The Faculty, after examination into the affair, passed resolutions condemnatory of the violence inflicted on the young man. But in consequence of the confessions and manifest sorrow of those engaged in it, they did not deem it necessary to proceed to their expulsion.”

It is usual to make record of Faculty proceedings, so that at least dates could have been given, but such a record seems not to have been made. This was a very peculiar case.

8. “*Certificate of the Faculty.*” Seven members of the Faculty give a certificate that they think, under all the circumstances, H. C. Taylor should *continue at his post* as editor of the Evangelist.

9. “*Prof. Morgan’s communication.*” This is the article we declined publishing on the ground that it was intended “to palliate

the conduct of the "lynchers, and that it defended sentiments which we regarded as decidedly opposed to good morals. We thought so then, and think so still.

10. "*Mistakes and Misrepresentations.*" After a careful review of this article we cannot discover that a single statement has been made by us that does any injustice to Oberlin. Mr. Taylor says that "the leading facts were not brought to light by Presbytery;" that the young man "was not suspected" before he was detected; and that he was not "adjudged" guilty, but confessed voluntarily; that he (Mr. T.) did not offer as an apology "that the moral purity of Oberlin" required such a procedure, though he did say, "If the civil law would lay the weight of a feather upon him, I would stand between him and all harm." It was said that the young man was a member of the Oberlin *Theological Seminary*, whereas he was only a member of the *preparatory* department, and was not a professor of religion.

Any other errors or omissions have had their correction above, and we are led to the following conclusions:

1. That the transaction, as it has been detailed, did actually occur.  
 2. That several members of the Faculty of the Institution were concerned in it. We have the names of five teachers who, we are assured, did participate, though this official statement makes not the most distant allusion to more than *two*; while it is deliberately said that this statement "*is the truth*, and the *whole truth*."

3. It is taught at Oberlin that it is right to tell a falsehood to draw a victim into the hands of a band of ruffians. Or to make it the most plausible, it is right to practise deception when the deceiver thinks that a certain desirable end is to be answered. So, if the reputation of Oberlin depends on deceiving the public, who shall tell us whether these good men do not think it a case in which deception is justifiable. They are to be judges, and with the code of morals laid down and vindicated by themselves, no one can ever tell whether to believe them or not. And this, too, is Christian perfection!

4. The "violence" is condemned by all parties.

5. The young man who was "lynched" was expelled from the Seminary; his "lynchers" are still cherished as members of the Faculty and the Institution, and at the head of this religious paper.

6. The whole transaction is the natural fruit of a spirit of fanaticism that makes *wrong right* in the estimation of deluded men.

7. God has permitted this melancholy event to take place, that the eyes of the community might be opened, and the tree be known by its fruits.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—E. will perceive that some of his strictures on the performance of C. have been omitted, as the remarks of C. were not intended for the public, but inserted by mistake. This explanation is due to the parties. Some additional remarks of C. will appear as soon as we can find room.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

MAY, 1841.

---

ART. I.—*Family Worship.* (No. III.)

“The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked, but he blesseth the habitation of the just.”—Proverbs iii. 33.

THE path of duty is the path of safety. This is the case whether we can see the consequences that result from walking in it or not. Nay; it may appear to us to be a dangerous path—a path beset with the severest trials and afflictions, but it is still the path of *safety*; if not in reference to our temporal, most assuredly in reference to our eternal interests. The first question therefore should always be, what is duty? If we have discovered this, and act accordingly, we are safe; safe from every thing that would really injure us. This, we say, should be the *first* question; for there are many things the consequences of which we are not capable of judging, and therefore they are not to be our rule in the regulation of our conduct. But while this is the case, while it becomes us first of all to ascertain what is duty, and while our first and greatest motive to action should be the authority of God,—yet it is not only proper, but highly profitable, to contemplate the advantages that may result from the performance of duty. Thus, wisdom’s ways are presented to us in the scriptures, as “*ways of pleasantness, and all her paths as peace.*” The great God to whose service we are called, not only commands us, but presents inducements calculated to encourage and animate us in the performance of his commands. It surely, then, becomes us to consider these inducements, that they may exert their appropriate influence. Does the duty of family religion and family worship, to which your attention was directed on the last two sabbaths, possess advantages worthy our consideration? It does, my brethren; and I hope that you will not consider your time unprofitably spent, while we advert to a few of these advantages. We shall here take it for granted that you are convinced that family worship is a duty—we shall endeavour to persuade you that it is not only your duty, but your privilege. In this view our text presents the subject to us. Here we are told, that “*the curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked, but he blesseth the habitation of the just.*” Observe the force of the expression, “The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked.” It does not visit the house occasionally; it does not linger around, or hover over the house, but it is in the house. It dwells there as its

constant abode. It matters not should this house be the palace of a king,—the curse of the Lord is there,—there to consume, waste, and destroy. “But he blesseth the habitation of the just.” Not he *will* bless, but he *blesseth*. As long as the object of the blessing lasts, so long will the blessing itself continue. It matters not, should this habitation be the meanest cottage, (for this the word signifies; as it is rendered sometimes in the scriptures, a *sheepcote*) his blessing is there, there to impart love, joy and peace. We shall first present to your consideration some of the advantages of family religion and worship, and, in the second place, answer some objections that are urged against the performance of this duty. In our remarks, we shall not aim at what may be new, but what may be profitable.

1. We are to *consider the advantages of family worship*. And here we observe in general, that it is an advantage to the head of a family, to the members of the family, and to society at large.

1st. We observe, that *it is a great advantage to the head of a family; and this both in a temporal and spiritual point of view*. Now, it is true that temporal advantages should not be the prevailing motive to the practice of holiness; but while this is the case, it is no less true that temporal advantages often result from the practice of holiness. Not that the righteous are always the most wealthy, and the most honourable. No; scripture and reason both prove the contrary; but there is this difference between what the righteous man has, and what the wicked man has: the blessing of the Lord is upon the one, while his curse is upon the other; and therefore the “*little that a righteous man hath, is better than the riches of many wicked.*” It is better, because it brings with it more true enjoyment. If he have not the prosperity of the wicked, he has not the sorrows which beset their path. His mind knows nothing of the anxious cares that harass their minds. But while there is a greater amount of what is called worldly prosperity among the wicked, we must recollect that there is also a greater amount of extreme poverty. Although the righteous are not generally among the most prosperous, they are not commonly among the most adverse. They have that for which Agur prayed,—“*neither poverty nor riches.*” This state is, no doubt, even in a temporal point of view, the most conducive to happiness. To what shall we ascribe this circumstance? It is doubtless to be ascribed to the overruling providence of God: but shall we say that worldly blessings have no *natural* causes? No; we believe that there is a connexion established between the means and the end; that while “*the hand of the diligent maketh rich,*”—“*drowsiness clotheth a man with rage.*” Now is there nothing in family worship that has a tendency to make a family industrious? Will he who is in the habit of calling his family together, to supplicate the Divine blessing, be as likely to meet with disobedience from his children, or servants, as he who never prays with his family? Will not the very exercise have a tendency to excite within their minds feelings of reverence, and respect, for their parents, and master, and consequently secure from them that obedience without which success in a temporal point of view need not be expected? Will not the praying parent and the praying master, be apt to impress his children, or servants, with the idea that he has a deep interest in their welfare? and will not such an expression of kindness and benevolence be likely to prevent them from doing any thing that would be to the injury of their parent or mas-



ter? and will it not be likely, if it do not change their hearts, at least to exert upon them a moral influence, by which they will be restrained from many of those vices and follies that are productive of idleness, extravagance, and dissipation? The truth of this is so apparent, that we need not insist upon it. "*Godliness has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.*" But this leads us to observe in the

2nd Place,—*That family worship is of great advantage in a spiritual point of view.* It affords those who engage in it an opportunity of holding communion with God. Now that soul which does not enjoy fellowship with a three-one God, cannot be in a growing state; but he who has not regular seasons for holding converse with God, does not enjoy communion with him. Ah! how apt are we to become immersed in the cares of the world, and to forget the interests of our immortal souls. We suffer the slightest circumstance oftentimes to divert us from the contemplation of that adorable Being who is the author and preserver of our lives. But will he who is in the practice of calling his family together be as likely to feel the same degree of reluctance to spiritual meditation? No; he will not. The very exercise itself would have a tendency to excite within him a disposition to meditate upon God, and his wonderful works. Besides, the near relation he sustains to his family, cannot but have a tendency to impress his mind with solemn and devotional feelings—he feels a serious responsibility resting upon him—he looks upon himself as the representative of his family—he sees the interests of their souls committed to his care—and can such a trust fail to solemnize his mind for the worship of God? Will it not be likely to exert a more powerful influence than even secret prayer?

There is another respect in which daily family worship would be attended with incalculable advantage. It would have a tendency, a most powerful tendency, to prevent the head of the family from setting an evil example before his children and servants. He who unites with his family in supplication at a throne of grace that they may be kept from all sin, is surely less likely to indulge in sin than he otherwise would be. Can we suppose that the man who had prayed that his children might be kept from the sin of intemperance would be as likely to be found in the grog-shop, or the bar-room, as if he had not prayed that himself and family might be preserved from it. Surely not: we do not say that such a thing is impossible, for, alas! we have known it; but we say that it is not probable. There is no man who would not see the inconsistency of such conduct, and there is no man who would not feel his cheek burning with shame, on account of such conduct in the presence of his family. We might make the same remarks in reference to other sins—the circumstance of having prayed to be kept from them, would certainly operate as a restraint from those sins. But can we suppose that family worship would be without its influence upon the other members of the family? Surely not: would it not be a means of *spiritual instruction*? and is not this an object worthy of serious consideration? In this way they are brought to read the scriptures or hear them read, when otherwise, most probably, they would rarely be perused. And can we calculate the spiritual advantage which accrues to their souls in this way? Nor is this advantage confined to the inferior members

of the family; it extends to all. How rarely is it that the scriptures are read in those families where the worship of God is not observed. Indeed the Bible is a strange book to such families. But, besides the spiritual instruction which is derived from the reading of the scriptures, is not family worship calculated in its nature, to impress upon the mind a sense of the Divine presence? The very circumstance of all the members of the same family worshipping the great God, cannot but impress the minds even of the young with a sense of the presence of that same great Being who is the object of worship. And can we suppose that the members of such a family would treat one another harshly and unkindly?—No. This practice certainly would incline their hearts to each other, and unite them in the bond of love;—and when they hear their friends, and the poor and distressed, remembered at a throne of grace, it cannot fail to excite their affection and sympathies, and bring into exercise the soft and kindly feelings of the human heart. But we shall not dwell longer on this point; the effect of family worship in purifying and improving the heart must be evident to every one.

3. *We observe, that family worship is of great advantage to society.* The family relation is the *foundation* of all other relations—it is the very fountain of all societies. Cast the salt in this fountain, and it will send forth streams to make glad both the church and the state. The remarks which we have made as to its effect upon the members of the family, in imparting to them spiritual instruction—in impressing their minds with a sense of the Divine presence, and in calling into exercise the benevolent feelings of the soul, apply equally to its effect upon the *church*:—for is not the church composed of families? and can we suppose that those who have been brought from a state of ignorance, and profligacy, are as likely to become ornaments in the church, as those who have been well instructed in the principles of our holy religion? Can we suppose that they will be as orderly and regular in their attendance upon Divine ordinances, as those who have been accustomed from their earliest infancy to the worship of God? But not only has family worship a tendency to purify, but also to *enlarge* the church. Who are they that are most likely to connect themselves with the church—the children of worshipping families, or the children of those families where the worship of God has never been established? Besides, when the children of praying families become heads of families, they will be much more inclined to set up the family altar, than they would be had it not been erected in their father's house. We read in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, of Abraham building family altars to the Lord—and afterwards we read the same thing of Isaac, and Jacob:—we hope this consideration will have weight with you who are heads of families. Can you expect your children after you to set up the family altar, if you neglect to do it? surely not: Think then of the influence which your example is exerting—an influence that may affect the religious character of unborn generations; for, as you cannot expect your children to worship God, in that relation when they have not seen their father worshipping him; so neither can they expect their children, and so on, from generation to generation. Parents, this is a serious consideration with you; and we beseech you not to disregard it. Think, that your neglect, perhaps from some trifling excuse, may be the source of injury to the

spiritual interests of those who are the hope of the church. But is its influence confined to the church? By no means. As it makes better parents, and better children, better husbands, and better wives, better masters, and better servants, better brothers, and better sisters, so it makes better *citizens*. As whatever improves individuals, improves families, so whatever improves families, improves the state. If, then, you love the church of God—If you desire to see a true revival of religion in our day, do not neglect the worship of God in your family. If you love your country—if you desire to see the Lord's day sanctified in this nation—if you would have those sins by which man is degraded to the level of the brutes abandoned, and if you would have the judgments of God averted from our guilty nation, do not, we entreat you, neglect to purify your families. How often has the true religion and worship of God been preserved in families, when driven from the sanctuary in the days of persecution. Should these days return, what a blessed thing it will be if every Christian family has an altar erected to the true God—an altar which shall be preserved safe from the fires of persecution. The present time has been characterized as a season of remarkable excitement, especially in this city. Hundreds have been impressed with a serious concern for their souls—and hundreds have been added to the churches. Have these impressions been solid and lasting? Have these professions been accompanied with a change of heart? Far be it from me to say that such has not been the case. But there is a test by which it would be well to "*try the spirits*" of this day. Is there as much excitement in the *family*, as in the church? if not, we may suspect these spirits, for Joshua declared that he "and his *house* should serve the Lord."

We shall now briefly consider some of the excuses that are sometimes urged for the neglect of this duty. And,

1. We sometimes hear it said *that persons who have been esteemed for their piety, have not observed it*. This objection should make the cheeks of those who give occasion to it, to burn with shame. But let us look at the objection. Is there any force in it? certainly not:—for it goes on the supposition that we are to take the conduct of our fellow men for our rule; but this is a most fundamental error. The apostle Paul enjoined it upon those who were looking to him for an example, "to be followers of him as he was of Christ." If this inspired apostle would have them to follow Christ, and him only as he followed Christ,—where is the man whom we may follow implicitly?—such a man cannot be found. The best of men have had their imperfections to lament, and therefore, the best are but imperfect examples. We have shown you from the light of nature, and the law of God, that family worship is a duty. Now remember that it is by these you will be tried, and not by the example of this or that man, however pious he may have been. "*To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*" We have answered this objection on the supposition that the person referred to is really a pious person; we, however, suspect the piety of such persons, whatever may be their professions.

2. You tell us *that you have not the ability for this exercise*. This objection seems to be dictated by a spirit of modesty, though it seems strange that this is almost the only thing for which we hear

persons complaining that they have no ability. We believe that in most instances in which this complaint is made, the true reason for its neglect is that there is no heart for it. But this is not the case, we are persuaded, with all. There are many who no doubt feel that they have not the ability—such persons have our sympathies, and our prayers. But we have one question to propose to such persons. Have you ever made the trial—we say, have you ever made the trial? If not, how can you say that you have not the ability? You know not but that you may find yourself more capable of performing this duty, than you at present imagine. You have no ground for this objection then, and it will not serve you in the great day, until you make the trial. But perhaps you have made the trial—and what was the result? Could you find no expression to your desires? Were you entirely silent in the presence of God? If not, why complain that you have not the ability? Does not the Spirit of God “make intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered?” and if you have but poured out your soul to God in groans, your prayer may have been accepted at a throne of grace,—and therefore you should be encouraged. But perhaps you had no desires to express to God; your heart was cold and lifeless. If such were the case, you were indeed in an unfit state to pray,—but why was it thus? Did you reflect, before you fell upon your knees, upon your own wants, and the wants of your family? Did you reflect upon the promises of God to you and your family—and could you not lay these wants before a throne of grace, and plead these promises? O! yes; you are ready to reply, but then I am so slow of speech that I really am ashamed. Ah! here, I fear, is the true secret. And what is the cause of this shame? Is it that God will despise your prayer because you are thus slow of speech? No; you know that he *looks upon the heart*. It is, then, the presence of your fellow men that shames you. Now let me tell you that this shame has its origin in pride, and therefore you have reason to be ashamed of it. You are ashamed, not because you cannot pray—but because you cannot pray like *others*; and is this sufficient to hold you and your family back from a throne of grace? O! no; your own conscience tells you it is not. Do not suffer it then to keep you back. Endeavour to get your heart fixed for this duty, and address your God as though there were not a being in the universe listening to your prayers, but himself. But perhaps the fears of some may be so great, as to incapacitate them wholly for this exercise. To such persons we would say, make use of the Lord’s prayer. You will thereby show that it is your desire to be found in the path of duty, and this prayer is suited to every family. But while we exhort you to the use of this prayer, it is not with the design that you should always confine yourself to this form. By no means; you will find an abundance from the scriptures, especially the Psalms, to add to it. These you should commit to memory for this purpose, and along with them you will be enabled to add requests in your own words. Meditate upon the perfections of God—your sins—the love of Christ, and your own wants, and these meditations will excite your desires; and if your desires are once excited, you will find words or groans in which to express them: and remember, dear brethren, that it is required of us not according to that we have not, but “*according to that which we have.*” The

servant who improved his five talents, received his reward, as well he who improved his ten.

3. You tell us that *you make use of other means for the edification of your family, besides family prayer*—perhaps you read to them, and exhort them. Now all this is well—but here the question again recurs. Is family prayer a duty? Has the God of families authorized it, and enjoined it upon you? If so, there is no place for this objection. He who has authorized and enjoined it, knew of these other ways which you mention, and had they been sufficient, we would not have his authority and injunction for family prayer—some of you will perhaps excuse yourselves not only from family prayer, but family instruction, because your children are taught in the Sabbath-school. But let me tell you, parents, that this is a duty which you owe to your children *as their parents*, and it is a duty which no one can perform for you; for no one stands to your children in the same relation in which you do: you have a power delegated to you by the God of families, and this power you are solemnly bound to exercise: you cannot divest yourselves of your obligations to your children, by committing them to the care of others. Therefore do not satisfy yourselves on this ground. If Sabbath schools were to come in the place of family instruction, it would be an argument against them. But we hope that such is not the case. Nay, so weak is this objection, that we are disposed to believe that some who use it are not conscientious—that they would not instruct their children, and pray with them, if there were no Sabbath school to which to send them.

4. You tell us that *there are domestic difficulties in the way*. Perhaps your servants will not submit to it. This objection supposes that you have made the trial, and discovered this to be the case—for if you have not made the trial, you know not that this difficulty is in the way. Perhaps it is otherwise—it may be that your servants are at this moment wishing in their hearts that you would erect an altar in your family. But we shall suppose that there is ground for the objection. Then we say that it is your sin that you have such servants, and it will be your sin if you continue them in your family—they will corrupt your family, and should therefore, whatever may be the inconvenience, be driven from it. In this we have David for an example; he tells us in Psalms, ci. 6: "*Mine eyes shall be upon the faithful of the land, that they may dwell with me: he that walketh in a perfect way, he shall serve me. He that worketh deceit shall not dwell within my house.*" But perhaps your children will not submit to it. Here let me ask you, may not this refusal on the part of your children be owing to your past neglect of this duty, and the proper exercise of parental authority? But let it be remembered, that their opposition cannot deprive you of your authority, and your obligations to exercise it: and though they may not engage in it themselves, yet it is your duty to maintain it in your family, and to endeavour by advice, warning, and reproof, to bring them to a compliance with your wishes in this respect. But perhaps it is your wife that opposes you in the exercise of this duty. This is truly a painful trial—but it becomes you to bear in mind that you have an authority over your wife; God has given you this authority, and you are bound to exercise it. We say you are *bound* to exercise it where its exercise is called for, and if ever called for,

surely it is when the spiritual interests of your family are at stake. But while you are, according to the ordinance of God, to rule over your wife, let your authority be exercised in reference to this point as well as all others, as it becomes an affectionate husband, and not a malicious tyrant. Show that you desire the spiritual and eternal interests of your wife. But perhaps the wife is desirous of worshipping God in the family, and the husband is averse to it. This circumstance, it must be confessed, is extremely painful. Her situation is one that calls for much prayer, and watchfulness,—but what is to be done? To such we would say,—you have no authority to exercise over your husband—but you may do much by way of persuasion, and exhortation; and this much you are bound to do. But should he refuse—you are to bear in mind that you possess an authority over your family, if not over your husband. In proof of this, we need only refer to 1 Tim. v. 14. There you will observe they are commanded to “*guide the house.*” The word\* translated *guide the house*, is the same as that from which our English word *despot* comes; which shows us that it includes in it the idea of *unlimited authority*. Now this authority belongs to the wife as mother, and mistress; and it is her duty to exercise it. When the husband is dead, or when he is absent, her authority is supreme, and therefore the obligation rests upon her with the same force as upon her husband. And when the opposition of the husband or the peculiar circumstances of the family, prevent it from being performed publicly, it is undoubtedly her duty to retire with her younger children, and her maidens, as Queen Esther did, and to supplicate the blessing of God upon her children and household. When females, as is sometimes the case, are living together, there can be no question as to the obligation resting upon them to perform this duty. In short, we must bear in mind that feelings of delicacy should never so far influence us as to induce us to neglect a commanded duty. We have sometimes known persons who were in the habit of performing this duty, to omit it when visited by their friends. This is certainly wrong: we never should be ashamed to be found in the path of duty. It was not thus with Joshua: he, though a great man, and an honourable man, would serve God with his house, though he should be left alone.

5th. You tell us *that you have not time for the performance of family duties*. This, brethren, is an excuse that we have often heard; but the more we reflect upon it, the more are we convinced that it is not sufficient: and the more are we confirmed in our fears, that, instead of there being no time for it, there is no HEART for it: Now why have you not time? Is it because you are so much engaged in your worldly pursuits? Now we wish you to think, for one moment,—For what are you living here? Is it merely that you may eat, and drink, and sleep? O! no. Do you not know that you are immortal beings? Do you not know that those beings that compose the families of which you are the heads, are possessed of souls that shall know no end? Think of this solemn truth, and then ask yourselves, as in the sight of God, whether this excuse will stand in the great day—whether it will then be sufficient to answer, that you could not take a few minutes in the morning and evening out of the twenty-four hours to pray with your families? We know your own

\* οὐνοκράτωρ.

conscience tells you that it will not stand the scrutiny of that Judge who tries the hearts. There is much that we could say on this point—we could remind you that there is often more time spent in the family without profit to your souls, or bodies, than would be required for this exercise; we could show you from the word of God, that no business is lawful that takes the place of our spiritual duties; that it would be better for us to beg our bread from door to door than to obtain a fortune with the curse of God upon it—we could show you that if he is “worse than an infidel” who provides not for the bodies of his own, then he is ten thousand times worse, who provides not for their souls. But why need we dwell on this point? We feel that there is something wanted which we cannot give—not time, but a love for spiritual exercises; and though we cannot persuade you by arguments, it shall be our prayer to that God, in whose hands are the hearts of all, to incline your hearts to this duty. When he says by the power of his grace, “Seek ye my face,” your hearts will then reply, “Thy face, Lord, will we seek.” But we have a word to say to those who worship God only once in the day. Brethren, this ought not so to be. The word of God tells you that it is “good to show forth the loving-kindness of the Lord in the morning, and his faithfulness every night.” But you, by your conduct, declare that it is not good. You rise from your bed in the morning, after having been protected by the Keeper of Israel from the dangers of the night, without ever calling your family together to praise him for his goodness. This is the time, too, in which you are in the best frame for devotional exercises, and in which your family is in the best frame; but you devote this time to the world, or sleep, and dedicate to God that time which you can no longer spend in the accumulation of wealth. Is this giving to God the first fruits of the day? Is this dedicating to him “the top and choicest of the heap?” surely not. If there are any before me who are in the habit of neglecting the worship of God in the morning, let me beseech them to do so no more. Begin now: make the experiment; if you refuse, remember that your decision is for eternity; and it will be brought up on that day, when we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and when the things of this world, on account of which we excuse ourselves from duty, will appear less in value than the dust that floats in the sunbeams. Think, too, how sad will be the reflection, when some disaster befalls your family through the day, that you had not commended them to the care and protection of the God of families.

But we must conclude the subject to which your attention has been for some time called. We trust, brethren, that you will review in your own minds, the different points which we have presented to you, and give them a candid and prayerful consideration. Weigh them as for eternity. Look upon this exercise to which we have been exhorting you, not merely as your duty, but your, great privilege. Remember, parents, that the eternal interests of your children are at stake: you love these children; manifest this love by instructing them, praying with them, and for them. And let me exhort those of you who are in the practice of this duty, to endeavour to be more spiritual and lively in its performance. Formality in any duty, and especially in family worship, has a most injurious effect: it is very apt to excite a disgust for it, especially in the minds of children. Let your exercises also be short, so that they may not become burdensome: do not put it off in the evening until part of

the family have retired, and the rest are wholly disqualified from attending to it. And now, my young friends, let me exhort you to bear in mind, that as there is an obligation resting upon your parents to instruct and pray with you, so there is an obligation resting upon you to receive their instruction, and unite with them in their prayers, "Hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother: for they shall be an ornament of grace unto thy head, and chains about thy neck." "My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not."

## ART. II.—*Societyism Investigated.*

Mr. Editor: Since you have published my communications, I stand pledged to attempt to defend the negative of this question. I would remark concerning my second letter, that at the time I wrote it, I had not the smallest idea that it would ever come before the public; but since you have opened the way for the discussion of this question, it is my intention in a series of communications, to attempt fairly, and honestly, to investigate the character of Voluntary Associations. They are offered to us as a means of reformation.

Now a true scriptural reformation is very desirable; but an untrue and unscriptural one is not. Because those who are the subjects of an untrue, and unscriptural reformation, are not bettered thereby; but made worse: that is, such a reformation as reforms the life, but not the heart. Such a reformation is a counterfeit, it mocks God, deceives men, and ruins the subject of it. Then there can be no benevolence in striving to promote such a reformation. Then it is not right to desire, or to strive to promote, any other, than a true or scriptural reformation. It is not right to aim at any lower mark than the "mark for the prize, of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Then, in investigating the character of Voluntary Associations, it will be proper first to show what a true, scriptural and spiritual reformation is, and then find out what is the aim of Voluntary Associations, and what are the means they propose for the attainment of their end. And then a simple comparison will decide the controversy. If their end and means for obtaining it, are counterfeit, so are they. I have long been of the opinion that the only way to ascertain whether they are lawful or unlawful, is first, to ascertain their true character; and then we will be prepared to judge whether they will be beneficial or pernicious to society. This is the way we treat individuals, and we ought to treat Associations the same way; for it is as true that Associations have a character, as it is that individuals have. And it is as true, that Associations of bad character will be injurious to society, as it is that men of bad character will. It is not at all safe to patronise and encourage every man that proposes to do that which is good in itself, without regard to his character, his authority, his qualifications, or his integrity. His proposing a good end, is by no means satisfactory evidence that his character is good, his authority unquestionable, his qualifications sufficient, and his integrity that which may be relied upon. I then, see no good reason why we should not use the same precaution with regard to patronising and encouraging associations of men. We ought not only to know the end they propose to accomplish, but the character of the association itself. And that we may know



this, we ought to inquire—1st, after their origin, 2d, their authority for associating, and 3d, after their plan of operation, for accomplishing the end proposed. Then if their origin be good, their authority high and unquestionable, and their plan of operation such as has in it an intrinsic fitness to accomplish a great and good end, I see not how we can withhold our patronage; but, on the other hand, if their origin be low and unworthy, their authority very questionable, and their plan of operation such as has in it no fitness to accomplish the end proposed, I see not how we can co-operate with them; though the end proposed be good. And especially will there be a strong barrier in the way of our co-operating with these associations, if they interfere with the duties and prerogatives of associations known to be lawful, and of unquestionable authority, viz: church and state.

Now I am fully aware that there will be some difficulty in learning the true character of Voluntary Associations. Because they have never yet told us whether their character is purely religious, or political, or whether it is formed by an *amalgamation* of religion and politics. Had they never taken any part either in religion or politics, then there would be real difficulty in ascertaining their character. But we know that they have meddled much, both in politics and religion, and thus they have removed much of the difficulty. Now, if the advocates of Voluntary Associations can prove that they have unquestionable authority and ample qualifications for both religious and political matters, they will then have fully established the affirmative of this question. But if it can be shown that they have neither the authority nor the qualifications to manage them, when truly and spiritually reformed, then it will follow, as a matter of course, that they cannot truly and scripturally reform them, and manage them both, and then the affirmative must fall. I know that the church is a divided body, but, still it is a living, spiritual body. But now what is the character of the body, that is proposed to heal this sick body? is it a sound body? nay, it is a *dead body*. Because they receive into it those who give every degree of evidence of being “dead in trespasses and sins, of walking after the course of this world, after the prince of the power of the air,” of being “led captive by Satan at his will,” this is a deadly principle of those societies “the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps.” Then we can make no better of it than this, that it is a *dead body*, that is proposed to cure a *sick body*, with “*the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps*.” I know that there are already many wild grapes in the vineyard of the Lord, but how do these volunteers expect to mend the matter? is it by planting in it, “the vine of Sodom, whose grapes are grapes of gall, and her clusters bitter?” I think they have been rightly denominated Voluntary Associations; because so soon as either church or state gets into trouble, they volunteer their services to alleviate their distresses. Seeing, then, that their services are volunteered both to church and state, a person would be led to believe that they bear the same relation to both, if indeed, they bear any relation to either. But I am strongly inclined to believe that the church and state value too highly their true relationship, to be allied to this heterogeneous progeny. The church and state are twin sisters, having God for their common father, and thus, are homogeneous. And God has forbidden them to

form any alliance or treaty with heterogeneous bodies. But they are closely allied to each other, so as to be a mutual assistance to each other, by acting exclusively in their own appropriate spheres. God has assigned to each its own appropriate duties and prerogatives, and has forbidden either to interfere with the duties and prerogatives of the other. And now, if it is unlawful for one divine institution to interfere with the duties and prerogatives of the other, certainly it cannot be lawful for a human institution to interfere with the duties and prerogatives of one that is divine. If he has forbidden the church to interfere with the state, or the state to interfere with the church, then it follows as a matter of course that he has forbidden this heterogeneous progeny to interfere with either. Then Voluntary Associations can no more be lawful, than it is lawful for the church to do the business of the state, or the state that of the church; for if they do not interfere with the duties of church or state, they will have no duties to perform whatever. As members of church and state, we are already solemnly bound to believe all things whatsoever God has revealed, and to do all things whatsoever he has commanded; and this covenant bond is the right kind of a bond; nothing can be stronger, wider, longer, deeper, or higher. Then for us to bind ourselves, by the weak, narrow and contracted authority of human institutions, after binding ourselves by God's high, holy, and solemn covenant, is striving to weaken, slacken, and narrow, this high and holy bond, both for ourselves and others. If we were to admit that believers are not slackening their solemn covenant obligations, when they sign the temperance pledge, (which we cannot do) still it could not be denied, but what they are slackening, weakening, narrowing and shortening it for unbelievers. Then if it is sinful for believers to slacken, &c. this solemn covenant bond for themselves, it cannot be sinless for them to do it for others. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." The golden rule is as applicable, and as necessary in this case as in any other, and there can be no case in which the neglect of it will do us or our neighbour a more serious injury.

I will offer only two reasons why Voluntary Associations should not interfere with church and state, the twin sisters both being divine institutions. 1. Because God, who is all-wise, just and merciful, has required of them only so many duties as he has promised them both grace and strength to do. He has not oppressed either the church or state with duties, but, on the contrary, he has given them such constitutions, that the discharge of all their respective duties is indispensable for the promotion, not only of their own beauty, health and peace, but also for the promotion of the health, beauty, growth and peace of their children, (members of church and state.) But as soon as societies interfere, and hinder them from the discharge of their duties, (as we shall show hereafter that they do,) the mothers become ugly, unhealthy, and weakly, their children dwarfs, rickety, unruly and unnatural; and the consequence is, that they commence rending in pieces the mothers that bore them.

But if these sisters commit whoredoms with these *volunteers*, as is too much the case at the present day, their children will be *monsters*. Hence, we see the church and state at the present day filled with ecclesiastical and political monsters.

Your Friend, C.

ART. III.—*Rev. H. A. Boardman's Reply to Bishop Doane.*

LETTER II.

TO THE RIGHT REV. GEORGE W. DOANE, D. D., BISHOP OF THE  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESS OF NEW  
JERSEY.

The advocates of the tracts have often complained that they were condemned by individuals who had merely examined isolated extracts. I admit that this is not the fairest way to form an opinion of any work: I am fully convinced that it is not, of these publications. Whatever may have been the experience of others, I can say for myself, that I had no conception of the mischief they were calculated to do, until I *examined them in detail*. The quotations from them I had read, had left a deep impression upon my mind of their dangerous tendency; but this impression became tenfold stronger, when I came to explore the system as a whole. The good and the evil must be seen in their juxta-position and mutual dependence, before the evil can be adequately appreciated.

The foregoing observations imply that there is something peculiar in the *way* in which Romanism is taught in these writings. Whoever expects to find it openly and systematically inculcated in them, will be disappointed. Nothing can be more ingenious or subtle than the principle on which the controversy with Popery is managed. Some points of it, as, for example, the supremacy of the Pontiff, the schismatical position of the Romish church in its relation to the "Anglo-Catholic church," transubstantiation, &c., they attack manfully: one broadside follows another, until the reader really begins to fancy they *are* the boldest of all the "champions" who have entered the lists against that antichristian hierarchy. But on other points, you will frequently find the case between Rome and Protestant Christendom, stated in a way much more favourable to the Papist than the Protestant: it is not so much asserted as insinuated, that Rome has the best of it. Precisely as you will sometimes hear a judge, in summing up a case, though professing to present both sides to the jury, give the whole weight of his opinion in favour of one of the parties, yet in so covert a way that the adverse party cannot charge him with having decided it. In other passages, you feel sure you are approaching, step by step, an explicit avowal of some rank Popish tenet. But just as you fancy you have reached the point, and hasten to the next sentence to seize on the development, the writer turns off to indulge in some vague generalities or to caution you against premature judging in a case where so venerable a father as this one or that one has spoken doubtfully. Again, you are confident, after reading a sentence, that there is Popery in it; but when you return to lay hold of it, it eludes your grasp. "They are (to use the language of the London 'Christian Observer,') so scholastically constructed, that when the obvious bearing of a passage or tract is shown to be open to objection, there is some little qualifying word in a corner, which an ordinary reader would never discover, to ward off the full weight of an honest reply to the passage in its true spirit." It may be that these "traps for critics," have not been noticed by my Right Rev. correspondent: but many persons have an idea that the tracts abound with them.

One of the first characteristics of the Oxford writings which will strike an unsophisticated Protestant as indicating a strong Popish tendency, is *the extraordinary language in which the Romish and Protestant Churches are respectively spoken of*,—the former being usually mentioned with marked deference and kindness, the latter with arrogance and severity. Indeed, these gentlemen repudiate the names, "*Protestant*," and "*Protestant Episcopalian*," as descriptive of the Church of England; and *unchurch* all other Protestant denominations with as little ceremony as was ever used by "*Holy Mother*" herself. Let me cite a few passages:—

"The English Church, as such, is *not Protestant*, only politically, that is, externally, or so far as it has been made an establishment, and subjected to national and foreign influences. It claims to be merely *Reformed*, not Protestant, and it repudiates any fellowship (!) with the mixed multitude which crowd together, whether at home or abroad, under a mere political banner." (Tract 71, p. 27, N. Y. Ed.)

"Of all combinations, that of Protestant Episcopal is the least pleasant. . . . It may seem harsh thus to speak of 'Episcopacy' and 'Episcopalian,' yet we hope it will not shock any one, if we say that we wish the words, as denoting an opinion and its maintenance, never had been invented. They have done great mischief to their own cause. We are 'of the church,' not 'of the Episcopal church;' our bishops are not merely an order in her organization, but the principle of her continuance, and to call ourselves Episcopalian, is to imply that we differ from the mass of dissenters mainly in church government and form, in a matter of doctrine merely, not of fact, whereas the difference is, that we are *here* and they *there*: we in the church, and they out of it."\*

Dr. Pusey, in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, says, (speaking ironically,) "It is *Popery* and disaffection to our church to doubt whether the Pope is the Antichrist, though Antichrist himself be not yet revealed, nor may we yet know when or among whom he will appear." And the British Critic, in the No. for last October, lays it

\* British Critic, Vol. 26, pp. 340, 341: Article on "the American Church." I make no apology for quoting from this periodical in this connexion, as it is now an acknowledged organ of the Oxford Divines, and is, therefore, equally legitimate proof with the Tracts themselves, in illustrating what is denominated in the obnoxious paragraph in my Lecture, "the Oxford Tract movement." I find also in the "Banner of the Cross," of the 6th Feb. (one week before the publication of your letter,) a glowing tribute to the character of the "Critic," which, with your permission, I will append to this note as a further warrant for the free use I may make of the work in this correspondence. It is as follows:—

*For the Banner of the Cross.*

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

It has been among my warmest wishes, that a publisher might be found who would give to the clergy and laity of our churches, and to all lovers of high intellect, embued with primitive piety and consecrated at the altar of the Holy One, an American edition of this ablest of all the British periodicals, at a price accessible to all. I rejoice to say that better even than that is to be done. Wiley and Putnam, of New York, will import the British Critic, (two annual volumes of 600 pages each, in quarterly numbers,) if one hundred persons order it. It is an opportunity most auspicious to the best interests of theology and literature, and I venture, in my zealous desire for its success, to call the attention of my brethren to it under my own name. I speak advisedly, for I have been a subscriber to it from the commencement of the present series, and the whole set, now twenty-eight volumes, are on the shelves of my library, and among its choicest contents. It should be in the hands of every clergyman, and should circulate in every parish.

Faithfully, your friend,

G. W. DOANE.

Riverside, 30th Jan. 1841.

down as "a most true and most important position," that "the prophecies concerning Antichrist are yet unfulfilled and that the predicted enemy of the church is yet to come." This is precisely the Romish doctrine. Whether the reviewers would go another step, and with Leo X. forbid any clergyman to "explain futurity or *the times of Antichrist*, under pain of excommunication," does not appear. One of the chief reasons which predispose these gentlemen to adopt the theory of Antichrist just stated, must be regarded as very curious by *Protestant* Episcopalians. They urge that their own church is so closely associated with the church of Rome, that the charge of Antichrist against the latter necessarily involves the former also. If this be true, the English Reformers were strangely reckless of the reputation and safety of the church they died for; for Latimer in prison, and Ridley in his farewell letter, and Cranmer (whom you so justly commend,) *at the stake*, declared "the Pope to be Antichrist;" and with them agreed Bradford, and Hooper, Frith, and Tyndale, and others of that noble company of martyrs—men of whom the world was not worthy, and whose names are not so much the property of your church as the common heritage of Christendom. Should the martyrs *happen* to be right and the Oxford theologians wrong, do they run no hazard who would link the destinies of the church of England with those of Papal Rome?

I remain, Right Reverend Sir,

With much respect,

Your friend and servant,

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philad., Feb. 22d, 1841.

### LETTER III.

TO THE RIGHT REV. GEO. W. DOANE, D. D., BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF THE DIOCESS IN NEW JERSEY.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR:

An able writer belonging to your own church, has very happily described the Oxford system as "*a Religion of Sacraments*." This designation denotes at once its affiliation to Popery, and furnishes a clue by which the uninitiated may thread its mysteries.

"The church (we are told by the Tractists,) is the store-house and direct channel of grace—an ordinance which conveys secret strength and life to every one who shares in it, unless there be some actual moral impediment in his own mind." (Introduction to Pusey on Baptism, p. 4.) On the next page the following passage occurs:—

"Rationalistic, or (as they may more properly be called) carnal notions concerning the sacraments, and on the other hand, a superstitious apprehension of resting in them, and a slowness to believe the possibility of God's having literally blessed ordinances with invisible power, have, alas! infected a large mass of men in our communion. Hence, we have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations or [*what is called*] communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which, the church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul

what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example, *would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and apparently insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, must be, under all circumstances, and in every conceivable case, a superstition? And yet neither practice is without the sanction of primitive usage.* And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that Baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated, in the case of individuals,) to consider faith and not the sacraments as the proper instrument of justification and other gospel gifts; instead of holding that the grace of Christ comes to us altogether from without, (as from him, so through externals of his ordaining,) faith being but the *sine qua non*, the necessary condition, for duly receiving it."

I have quoted in my first letter the sentiment of the judicious Hooker that "the grand question that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome, is about the matter of JUSTIFYING RIGHTEOUSNESS," and have specified the Romish doctrine on this point, as "one of the worst errors of Popery." It would be superfluous for me to remind my Right Reverend correspondent, that it has always been a vital question between Protestants and Romanists, whether men are justified by the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ received and rested upon by faith, or by being made inwardly and subjectively righteous. The Protestant doctrine is, that justification and regeneration are inseparably associated, that is, that all who are justified, are at the same time renewed and sanctified; but they deny that this personal holiness, which is communicated by the Holy Spirit in regeneration, constitutes any part of that righteousness on the ground of which, the sinner is pardoned and accepted of God. As our Saviour was "made sin" by having the sins of men legally imputed or reckoned to him (not transfused into him,) as their surety, so they are "made the righteousness of God," by having the Redeemer's righteousness (his perfect 'obedience unto death,') legally imputed to them—they receiving it by faith as the only ground of their hope. But I need not dwell on the distinction so explicitly recognised in the creeds and articles of all the reformed churches, between justification and sanctification.

The Church of Rome confounds these gifts, and makes our sanctification or personal righteousness, the ground of our justification:—"The instrumental cause of our justification (says the Council of Trent, is the *sacrament of baptism*, which is the sacrament of faith, without which no one can ever obtain justification:—the sole formal cause is the righteousness of God; not that by which he himself is righteous, *but that by which he makes us righteous*; with which being endued by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only accounted righteous, but are properly called righteous, and are so, receiving righteousness in ourselves," &c. This inward righteousness of course admits of increase, that is, justification is *progressive*,—as we read in the same decree: those who are the subjects of it, "by the observance of the commands of God, &c., "gain an increase of that righteousness which was received by the grace of Christ, and are *the more* justified."

On this doctrine Hooker remarks, "The church of Rome, in teaching justification by inherent grace, *doth pervert the truth of Christ*; and by the hands of the apostles we have received otherwise than such teacheth."

If I am asked to prove that the doctrine of the Tracts on this vital point is substantially that of Rome, I should be disposed to refer my interrogatory to the truly apostolic work of Bishop McIlvaine on "Oxford Divinity"—that work which the Editor of the Churchman, in his paper of last week, characterized (in the same breath in which he confesses he has never read it,) with so much classic grace and with such profound deference towards an eminent prelate of his own church as "the Romance of Gambier."

In this book the proofs are spread out in detail. But as you may not have it in your library, I will quote a few of the passages cited in it from the Oxford writings.

Speaking of the distinction just adverted to, between justification and renewal, Mr. Newman says, "This distinction is not scriptural." "In truth, scripture speaks of but one gift, which it sometimes calls renewal, sometimes justification, according as it views it, passing to and fro, from one to the other, so rapidly, so abruptly, as to force upon us irresistibly the inference that they are *really one*."

Again; he says, "Justification and sanctification are substantially *the same thing*;—parts of one gift; properties, qualities, or aspects of one." In another place he maintains "their *identity* in *matter of fact*, however we may vary our terms, or classify our ideas."

Again; "*Cleanness of heart and spirit, obedience* by word and deed, this alone can constitute our justification." "The gift of righteousness (for justification,) is not an imputation, but an inward work. "If He (God) counts righteous, it is by *making* righteous; if he justifies, it is by *renewing*."

This indwelling righteousness, it seems, has even a *satisfying* and justifying quality in it, since he calls it, "The propitiation for our sins in God's sight."

Again; "Justification consists in God's *inward presence*." "It is the act of God imparting His divine presence to the soul, *through baptism*, and so making us the temples of the Holy Ghost."

What will plain readers of the Bible say to the following passage? "Christ's cross does not justify by being gazed at *in faith*, but by being actually set up within us, and that not by our act, but by God's invisible grace. Men sit and gaze and speak of the great atonement, and think this is appropriating it. Men say that faith is an apprehending and applying: FAITH CANNOT REALLY APPLY IT; man cannot make the Saviour of the world his own; the cross must be brought home to us not in word, but in power, and this is the work of the Spirit."

The above extracts are from Mr. Newman's work on Justification. That they involve the idea of a *progressive* justification, must be apparent to every one; but we are not left to gather this inferentially. Dr. Pusey, in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, says, "We are by baptism brought into a state of salvation or justification (for the words are thus far equivalent,) . . . a *state admitting of degrees according to the degree of sanctification*."

"Faith, as *gaining its virtue from baptism*, is one thing before that

sacred ordinance; another after." "Justifying faith before baptism is not necessarily *even a moral virtue*, but when illuminated by love and ennobled by the Spirit," (in baptism) "it is a name for all graces together." Before baptism, "it is without availing power, *without life* in the sight of God, as regards our justification,"—that is, "as regards the indwelling of the Spirit," which is justification according to this system. Until it is *baptized*, it is "full of terror and disquiet, *vague*, and dull-minded, feeble, sickly, wayward, fitful, *inoperative*," nothing "till Christ *regenerate* it" in baptism. "When it (faith) comes *for baptism*, . . . . it comes to the fount of life to be *made alive*, as the dry bones, in the Prophet's vision, were brought together in preparation for the breath of God to quicken them."

"We are saved," says Dr. Pusey, "by faith *bringing* us to baptism, and by *baptism* God saves us"—"faith being but the *sine qua non*, the necessary condition on our parts for duly receiving the grace of Christ"—and "the sacraments, not faith, being the proper instrument of our justification."

Again; "Faith," says Mr. Newman, "does not precede justification; but justification precedes it, and makes it justifying. Baptism is the primary instrument, and creates faith to be what it is, and otherwise, is not, giving it power and rank, and constituting it as its own successor. Each has its own office; baptism at the time, faith ever after—the sacraments, the instrumental, faith the sustaining cause."

But it is time to notice a kindred topic, which will in turn illustrate the one we have been considering, viz: the views of the Tractists respecting *sin committed after baptism*. It must "shock" ordinary readers of the Bible to hear that it is a matter of great doubt, in the judgment of these writers, whether any provision has been made in the glorious plan of redemption, for the remission of post-baptismal sins, and if any, where and what it is! According to their scheme, sin after baptism ("mortal sin") destroys the virtue of the sacrament, and removes or cancels justification. Faith having now become *dead* again by sin, must be regenerated anew before it can become a second time the condition of justification. How then can the erring individual, in the case supposed, recover his justification? His faith cannot act, being "unregenerate." His baptism (by which his faith was originally "*created*") cannot be repeated. The Church of Rome has provided for this exigency by the sacrament of *Penance*, whereby "sins committed after baptism, are forgiven." But Oxford has not even this poor, unscriptural expedient, to relieve the conscience of a trembling, heavy-laden sinner: much less does she say to him, as an apostle said to such a one, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Far from this is her frigid and cheerless doctrine. "The Church (says Dr. Pusey) has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him (the post-baptismal sinner) altogether free from his past sins. *There are but two periods of absolute cleansing*, baptism and the day of judgment."—Look, too, at the following: is it not humbling to think that such a passage could have been penned by a clergyman of the Church of England,—an expounder to dying, guilty men, of that blessed volume in which God has said, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they



be red like crimson, they shall be as wool?" Dr. P., commenting on one of the articles, says, "But who *truly* repent? When a man who has been guilty of sin after baptism may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to *what degree* he should all his life continue his repentance for it; wherein his penitence should consist; whether *continued repentance would efface the traces of sin in himself*; whether he might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by repentance, but their extinction depend upon the continued greatness of his repentance; whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment; these and the like are questions upon which the article does not speak."—This is indeed "Protestantism rejected and Popery spoiled!" Let him come back to Protestantism, or rather, I should say, to the Gospel with its "unsearchable riches" of grace; or else let him go forward to Popery, and extricate himself from the meshes of the net in which he has entangled himself, by laying hold of her dogmas of penance and purgatory. Either course would grant him relief—either would be more consistent than to remain where he is—either would save him from the stern rebuke of your Homily of Repentance (as aptly quoted by Bishop M'Ilvaine,) which says; "We do not without a just cause, *detest and abhor the damnable opinion* of them which do most wickedly go about to persuade the simple and ignorant people, that if we chance, after we be once come to God and grafted into his Son, to fall into some horrible sin, repentance shall be unprofitable to us; there is no more hope of reconciliation, or to be received again into the favour and mercy of God."

The Christain Observer quotes another passage, which exceeds in presumption any thing I remember to have met with in the writings of even nominal Protestants:—"The fountain (of the Redeemer's blood) has indeed been 'opened for sin and uncleanness,' but *it were to abuse the power of the keys intrusted to us, (!) again* (that is, after a first offence,) *to pretend to admit them thus;—now there remains only the baptism of tears.*" "May God forgive men," adds the Observer, "who thus awfully presume to limit the virtue of the Redeemer's atonement; who substitute the penance of tears for the blood of Christ; and who interpose between man and his God, to admit, or shut out from the kingdom of heaven, as they see fit, just as the Popish priests did, to their own pontifical dignity and great gain, (though of this we accuse not the Oxford brethren,) till Luther spoiled Tetzels trade."

If the Oxford writers are shy of confessing a purgatory, no such diffidence can be imputed to them in reference to the practice of OFFERING PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD. They cite various testimonies from the early fathers in support of this practice, and the British Critic, I perceive, commends it as "*truly apostolical.*" (I wish the Reviewers had pointed out the passage in the writings or lives of the apostles, which authorizes it.) I quote a single passage from several I had marked in Tract 77.

"I would venture to ask . . . whether (as Luther did) you have not prayed for the perfecting and increased blessedness of a departed friend or relation, even though you have subsequently checked your-

self? whether you did not find a comfort from that prayer? and whether this dictate of human nature, warranted as it is by the early Church, and distinct from the Romish error, *may* not, after all, be implanted by the God of nature—may not be the voice of God within us?” (p. 412.)

Another indication of the Popish tendency of this system, is to be seen in the experiment its authors are trying, of instituting **NEW SAINTS’ DAYS**. My Right Rev. correspondent does not require to be informed that they have (in imitation of the Papists) set apart a day to the religious commemoration of Bishop Ken, and even constructed and published a *Matin Service for Bishop Ken’s Day*, “formed apparently (says the Bishop of Exeter) on the model of an office in the Breviary to a Romish saint. Would it be safe for the Church itself (the Bishop proceeds)—and is it becoming in private individuals—to pronounce thus confidently on the characters of deceased Christians—in other words, to assume the gift of ‘discerning spirits?’ To what must such a practice be expected to lead? The history of the Church of Rome has told us, and the fathers of our Reformation, in compiling the Liturgy, have marked their sense of the danger, by rejecting every portion of the Breviary which bears on such a practice, even while they adopted all that was really sound and edifying in it. Yet these writers scruple not to recommend this very practice thus deliberately rejected by those wise and holy men, and, strange to say, recommend it as ‘only completing what our Reformers have begun.’”

The Bishop of Exeter further censures the Tractists for the gentle terms in which they treat of “some of the worst corruptions of Popery:”—“for instance, **INVOCATION OF SAINTS** and the **WORSHIP OF IMAGES**.” I do not charge them with advocating these practices, but they are far from dealing with them in the ordinary style of Protestants. And one of them, the late Mr. Froude, already mentioned, whose ‘Remains’ were edited at Oxford, says, “I think people are injudicious to talk against Roman Catholics for worshipping of saints, and honouring the Virgin and Images, &c. These things *may, perhaps*, be idolatrous, I cannot make up my mind about it.”

In Tract 71, p. 7, the writers recommend that “we should *put into the back ground the controversy about the Holy Eucharist*, which is almost certain to lead to profane and rationalistic thoughts in the minds of many, and cannot well be discussed in words at all, without the sacrifice of “godly fear;”—“as if (subjoins the Bishop already quoted so freely) that tenet (transubstantiation) were not the abundant source of enormous practical evils, which the faithful advocate of truth is bound to expose.”—One is ready to suspect that there must be some other motive than the one here assigned, for wishing to arrest the controversy about transubstantiation. I offer no conjecture as to what it is; but there is a sentence or two in Knox and Jebb’s Correspondence (a work which contains not merely the ‘germs’ of this system, but, in some particulars, a fuller development of it than we have *yet* been favoured with in the Tracts,) which I beg leave to quote on this point. “Deep measures (says Mr. Knox,) have been taken for making our *re-union* (the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church,) practicable, in the fulness of time; but little less deep measures have also been taken, for keeping it off until that time should be ‘fully come.’ Such a measure

I take to be the decree of the Council of Lateran in the year (I think) 1215, under Innocent III. Until then the actual tenet of transubstantiation had not been enjoined, and the believer in the real presence was equally catholic, whether he did, or did not, suppose a change in the substance of the elements . . . . *I am ready to think this will prove our last remaining barrier to coalescence.*" (Letter 94.)

This brings me to the doctrine of the **REAL PRESENCE**. The Tractists deny transubstantiation, but they hold that the real body and blood of Christ are present in the eucharist. This is implied when they tell us that the ministry in the line of "apostolical succession," have been intrusted with "the awful and mysterious gift of *making the bread and wine, Christ's body and blood;*" and affirm that their Church is "THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS (the British) REALM, WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO HIS PEOPLE." (Tract 4, p. 26.) But in Tract 27, (from Bishop Cosin) the language is explicit, as the following extracts will show. "We hold by a firm belief that it is the body of Christ; of the manner how it *becomes* so, there is not a word in the Gospel. . . . . We believe a *real presence* no less than you (the Romanists) do." "If it seems impossible that the *flesh* of Christ should *descend*, and become our food, *through so great a distance*, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions . . . . and so make our faith to receive and believe, what our reason cannot comprehend. . . . . In this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly *receive the substance of Christ's body and blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly.*" He admits that "there is a *conversion of the bread into the body of Christ,*" and says, that "the *true body* of Christ is not only shadowed and figured, but also given indeed and by worthy communicants duly received."

The only remaining feature of these Tracts I propose to notice, is, their doctrine concerning **THE RULE OF FAITH**. On this fundamental question, they side with the Church of Rome in maintaining the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith, and the binding obligation of "Catholic traditions." That they differ from Rome as to what these traditions are, is a matter of very subordinate moment. With her they hold, that the Bible cannot be understood without the aid of the church—nay, that "the church has ever been the *primary source* of faith." An inquirer "must go *first* to the *Church,*" then, if he chooses, to the Bible. The Bible is, in the judgment of these writers, a very obscure book. Who would suppose that any one, except a Roman Catholic, could speak of the Holy Scriptures in terms like these? "If Scripture contains any religious system at all, it must contain it covertly, and teach it obscurely, because it is altogether most immethodical and irregular in its structure." (Tract 85.\*) Again; "I own it seems to me, judging antecedently, very improbable, indeed, that it (the Bible) should contain the whole of the revealed word of God. . . We do not look into Scripture for a complete history of the secular matters which it mentions; why should we look for a complete account of religious truth? . . . Both the history of its composition and its internal structure, are against its being a com-

\* I have not this Tract at hand, and quote through another writer.

plete depository of the Divine will, unless the early church says it is. Now, the early church does not tell us this. It does not seem to have considered that a complete code of *morals* (!) or of Church government, or of rites, or of discipline, is in Scripture." (This is, indeed, "rancid Popery," as Dr. Beasley calls it.) Again, of the doctrines of the faith, this writer says, (in the same Tract,) "the wonder is that they are all there, or can be gained indirectly from Scripture: humanly judging, they would not be there but for God's interposition; and, therefore, *since they are there by a sort of accident*, it is not strange they should be latent there, and only indirectly producible thence. God effects his greatest ends by apparent accidents." Is not this intolerable from a professed believer in the Scriptures? from a minister of the Gospel? from a signer of those articles which say, not that the Bible is to be received and believed because it may be proved by the creeds, but that the *creeds* are to be "received and believed," because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture?" (See your 8th Art.)

The Book which God mercifully gave us, to be "a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path," having proved so inadequate, another guide must be substituted in its stead. Accordingly, we are informed, see *British Critic*, vol. 24th, p. 254,) that "the *CHURCH* (is, in matter of fact, *our great divinely appointed guide* into saving truth, under divine grace, whatever may be the abstract power or sufficiency of the Bible." Mr. Keble, also, (according to the *Christian Observer*,) maintained, in his visitation sermon, that "church tradition is parallel to Scripture, not driven from it;" that "it fixes the interpretation of disputed texts by authority of the Holy Spirit;" and that "we are as much bound to defer to tradition as to the written word of God, which he has been pleased to give us over and above." Is this Protestant (or, if you will, Reformed) Christianity? Or is it Popery?

It is not surprising that the advocates of these principles, should be engaged in a systematic effort both in England and this country, to discredit *Chillingworth*. These gentlemen see that his great work, "The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to salvation," is, in some of its leading principles, as much in the way of their success, as it has been in that of Rome. And they have joined Rome in her effort to overthrow it. It has withstood *her* assaults for two hundred years: the sequel will show whether her new allies will be able (even by the *mining* process they are resorting to,) to prostrate this noble bulwark of Protestantism. That they come to the enterprise with a zest, is evident, as well from their ungenerous attacks upon the reputation of Chillingworth, as from the thrusts they make on all occasions at his favourite maxim, "The Bible, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants." See examples in Mr. Keble's sermon, and in the *British Critic passim*. This latter work, indeed, gives us a morceau from one of Mr. Froude's letters, (a man whose frankness every one must respect, however we may revolt at his errors,) in which he repudiates the Scriptures as a guide even in fundamentals. "Your trumpety principle (he observes) about 'Scripture being the sole rule of faith in *fundamentals*,' (I nauseate the word,) is but a mutilated edition of the Protestant principle of 'the Bible, and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants,' without the breadth and axiomatic character

of the original.' "Bible religion," is an offence to these gentlemen. They "cannot away with it." It is too simple in its doctrines, its order, its worship. Hence we hear one who was as much the god-father as Knox was the father of the system, exclaiming, "*It is my wish and prayer that I may be saved from the simplicity of Bible religion!*"\* What a prayer for a Christian Bishop!

These writers, it is true, do not adopt the Romish doctrine of the rule of faith in all particulars: but the points on which they are at issue, are quite secondary, in importance, to those in which they agree. The following principles, for example, are (as I understand them) common to the two systems:

1. The Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and practice.
2. Catholic tradition is of equal authority with the written word.
3. The Church is "the primary source of faith."
4. The Church is the only authorized expounder of the Scriptures.

5. Controversies of faith are to be ultimately determined by an appeal, not to the Scriptures, but to Catholic tradition.

I submit whether these principles do not embody the essence of the Popish dogma on this great question?

It is not my object to argue the points involved in this question, but I cannot refrain from adding two or three sentences from an admirable address on the rule of faith, delivered in 1827, by one of the high dignitaries of the established church, the Archbishop of Dublin.

"If Scripture be the word of God, intended for our direction; and if, as such, it contains all things necessary to our salvation; and contains them likewise with sufficient plainness, [positions he had established in the context,]—it is manifestly a full and sufficient rule for the faith and practice of Christians; and *there can be none other*, by which we should be governed, but this alone." After stating the Romish doctrine of tradition, he resumes: "Thus, an unwritten tradition is made necessary to supply the defects and to illustrate the obscurities of the written word of God. And, consequently, that church, which professes to be the keeper and dispenser of this tradition, becomes the only interpreter of the Christian revelation—it holds in its hands all the secrets of the Divine counsels—its rules constitute the true measure of our faith and practice, and its authority forms the immediate and true ground of Christian obligation. . . . . What is this but putting the decrees of men in place of the oracles of God, dispossessing our Lord and Saviour of the supremacy over his church, displacing that church from the foundation which has been laid, and attempting to erect it upon one removed to the greatest conceivable distance from the foundation of Jesus Christ?"

These remarks, I am aware, apply in their full extent only to the Papal doctrine; but they apply substantially to the Oxford school, as having adopted the main principle of that doctrine. With this principle Rome set out, but she could not maintain herself without adding other corruptions to it. Is there any reason to believe it will fare better with Oxford?

\* Bishop Jebb in his 126th Letter to Knox

The other part of my statement, which you call upon me to substantiate, is in the following words:—"The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and Roman priests are publicly felicitating their people, on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church."

Whatever may be the character of these publications, whether Protestant or Popish, or neither, it will not be denied that active measures have been taken to disseminate them. I am aware that it is customary to commend these "calumniated writings," with some reservation. The right of any individual to do this, is indisputable. But it is not easy to see how one can recommend a series of works to the public, if he believes they contain any *serious* error. There may be many sound and excellent sentiments in the Koran, in the "Fratres Poloni," in the works of Belsham or Channing,—but what pious and judicious man would advise the indiscriminate purchase and study of these books? Nay, what conscientious religious teacher would promote the circulation of a work which he believed to be pervaded with any one important error? It involves a serious imputation upon the characters of the clergymen who lend their influence to scatter the Oxford writings through the church, to admit the supposition for a moment, that they can regard the errors they may contain, in any other light than as *very trivial blemishes*.—But let me cite a few testimonies, to illustrate the estimate in which the Oxford Divinity is held in this country. This is, I am sure, quite a work of supererogation; and instead of going into it in detail, I shall quote a few statements and facts from the "*Churchman*," (to come no nearer home,) and then respectfully refer my correspondent for further information, to the columns of that paper, *passim*, for the last eighteen months.

A correspondent of the Churchman thus repudiates, like his brethren at Oxford, the name "Protestant Episcopalian:"—"In the argument which I offered in your last, I must confess my chagrin at the use of the word *Episcopalians*. How can we blame those who are ignorant of Catholic principles for confounding us with the numerous sects of the age, while we sanction and encourage the delusion by taking to ourselves the inadequate designation of *Protestant Episcopalianism*?"

"For one, I am willing to serve under the banner of the church, but not under the flag of a sect; I claim my right to be known as a Catholic, and I complain of the wrong which is done me by a name which does not represent my character, feelings or principles, and which obliges me to belie my profession, and appear to the world in a false character."

What a mortal antipathy this school have to the word "Protestant!" It seems, with them, to taint every thing it touches.

A late No. of the same paper has the following effusion from the pen of Dodwell, a writer quoted with much favour in the Oxford Tracts. Whether the editor joins with this arrogant writer, in the summary disposition he makes of all non-Episcopalians, I do not know. Happily for us, our eternal destiny is not suspended upon the dictum of a poor fellow-mortal so much a stranger to the true spirit of Christianity, as to give utterance to sentiments like these:—

"None but the bishops can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will follow that whosoever is disunited from the visible

communion of the church on earth, and particularly from that visible communion of the bishops, must consequently be disunited from the whole visible Catholic Church on earth; and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and, what is yet more, from *Christ and God himself*. It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the damned, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. The SAME is their condition also, who are *disunited* from Christ by being disunited from *his visible representative*."

A correspondent, in the same No., gives us Dodwell's doctrine over again:—

"*None but the bishops can unite us to the Father*, in the way of Christ's appointment, and these bishops must be such as receive their mission from the first commissioned apostles: wherever such bishops are found dispensing the faith and sacraments of Christ, *there is a true church: unsound it may be*, like the Church of Rome, but still a *true or real church*, as a sick or diseased man, though unsound, is still a real or true man."

The Churchman, it is manifest, then, is quite up to the Oxford standard, on the subject of church power and the apostolical succession. —It is equally explicit respecting the real presence; and even subscribes to the doctrine that "the elements are *converted* into the very body and very blood of the Redeemer." In Nov. 1839, several queries were propounded to the editor, by "Warburton," in relation to the sentiments taught in the Oxford Tracts. In answer to the first question, he says, "We reply without hesitation that the Tracts teach not only the virtual, but the real and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament. In saying this, however, we wish to say as distinctly, that they totally discard the dogma of transubstantiation, as propounded by the Council of Trent: nor, so far as we have seen, do they give the least countenance to any refined modification of that doctrine. And whereas "Warburton" supposes that if they deny transubstantiation, as commonly understood, they yet teach the change of the elements into what he calls a *tertium quid*, we desire to add our belief that he does them great injustice in imputing to them any such folly or irreverence. On the contrary, they, in some places, *teach distinctly the conversion of the elements into the very body and very blood of the Redeemer*." He subsequently adds, "To the doctrine of the real presence, as stated in our answer to Warburton's first query, *we cordially accede*."

How far the editor coincides with the Oxfordists on the fundamental doctrines of justification, regeneration, the nature and desert of sin, and their affiliated points, together with the opus operatum efficacy of Baptism, may be gathered from his laudatory notice of Dr. Pusey's Treatise on Baptism, (forming Vol. II. of the Tracts,) in which these subjects are discussed. We have, in his notice, an example of the "reserve" so frequently exhibited on this side the Atlantic, in endorsing the new Divinity; but the feeble note of dissent which meets us in the third sentence, seems (and with reason,) ashamed to utter its tiny voice in the midst of the swelling acclamations which go up on either side of it.

"BAPTISMAL PRIVILEGES.—It is refreshing to turn from the cheerless and shrivelling theology of the day, to the expanded and ennobling views of our holy calling which Dr. Pusey has opened to

us, in his admirable treatise on Baptism. We have read enough of this treatise to be satisfied that it is replete with pure, primitive, and truly scriptural doctrine. The points on which its correctness may, on solid grounds, be reasonably questioned, are as nothing compared with the broad, Catholic and scriptural principles which it develops with surprising fulness, and advocates with a chastened zeal. We consider it the most extraordinary theological work of the age; and as it is divested of technicalities, and adapted to laymen as well as professional readers, we trust that it will find its way into every family in the Church. If the author seem to his readers to attach too great importance to what they perhaps are accustomed to regard as merely a significant ceremony, let them see whether he have not scriptural authority for his views; and if they still falter, let them think whether any too great things can be said of blessings conveyed to us by the sacrament, which the Redeemer has appointed as the seal and symbol of the redemption of mankind."

—(Churchman of May 9th, 1840.)

I subjoin a single sentence, from the same source, on the rule of faith:—"It will be well for the reader of Chillingworth to bear in mind the unquestioned fact, that *the Church, and not the Scriptures, is the primary source of the faith*; and that the writings of the New Testament were produced as emergencies required, and serve the purpose rather of a safeguard against error than of a first initiation into the faith of Christ." He elsewhere insists on the authority of tradition, in harmony with the Tract writers.

But I need not dwell on particulars. We have testimony, which covers the whole ground, in a very few words. The great question about the Oxford publications, is, whether they are imbued with Popery. We are assured by this paper, that they are not only free from Popery, but even from any "*tendency*" to it. The Editor (in commenting on Dr. Pusey's letter to the Bishop of Oxford) puts his imprimatur upon them thus:—"The members of our own Church who have been inclined to accede generally to the views set forth in the Tracts, but have feared that there might be some foundation for the violent and sweeping charges which have been brought against their authors, may now consider their fears as effectually at rest. *Every suspicion even of a tendency to Romanism, in the Oxford Divines, is removed.*"

The explicitness of this language leaves nothing further to be desired in the way of proof. In the judgment of one of your leading journals, the passages cited in this letter (I refer to these as a sample merely,) from the Oxford writings, on the power of the priesthood,\*

\* One of the powers claimed for the priesthood at Oxford, in as extravagant a degree as at Rome, has not been adverted to in this letter—I mean the power of *absolution*. A single illustration of it is all I can introduce here: and this imports (if I understand it) that in the opinion of these writers, it is at least doubtful whether a penitent sinner can obtain forgiveness through the blood of Christ, without absolution from a priest.—On p. 128 of his treatise on Baptism, Dr. Pusey quotes a brief narrative from the late excellent Mr. Williams of the South Sea Islands Mission, the purport of which is this. Mr. W. was called to see a sick woman, (a member of the church, as I interpret his language,) who was in great distress of mind, on account of infanticides of which she had been guilty when a heathen. "I directed her (he observes) to the "faithful saying, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." This imparted a little comfort; and after visiting her frequently, and directing her thoughts to that blood which cleanseth from all sin, I succeeded, by



the efficacy of the sacraments, baptism, justification and renewal, the office of saving faith, the distinction of mortal and venial sins, the possibility of forgiveness for post baptismal sins, the subordinate position of the doctrine of the atonement and the preaching of the Gospel, in the means of grace, the real presence, prayers for the dead, the institution of new saints' days, the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith, the authority of tradition, together with the marked antipathy of the Tractists to the various protestant denominations, their sneers at the Reformation, and their habitual tone of deference and affection towards the church of Rome—the language of the Tracts on all these points, contains nothing to justify the bare “**SUSPICION** of even a **TENDENCY** to Romanism!”

It certainly will not *now* be an open question among American Protestants, whether the “**heaven**” of this divinity “is beginning to work in our cities.” How widely it will diffuse itself, is known only to Him who knoweth all things. Its fruits, however, will doubtless develop themselves with the system. Indeed, some have appeared already. May I respectfully commend a single fact to your attention? I know of an instance in which a family of the highest respectability *have been converted to Popery, chiefly by the reading of the Oxford publications.* Can a system which leads to such results, be free from “any tendency to Romanism?” Can a good tree bring forth such corrupt fruit?

---

**ART. IV.**—*Statement of the Associate Session of Xenia, to the Congregation under their Inspection, of their Authority from the Church and the Church's Head, for exercising the Discipline of the Church on those who offend by what is usually called, “Occasional Hearing.”*

Thus we have seen that the practice of attending upon the ministration of the word in other churches, being churches from which we are warrantably separate, is condemned in our Testimony, and again and again in judicial decisions of the church. The only question then remaining to be considered is, whether this practice is condemned by the word of God?

This question, of course, *especially* claims consideration. It is not, however, our intention to make it a *principal* part of *our* discussion. This is rendered unnecessary by the illustrations of the impropriety of the practice from abler pens. As containing conclusive proof of the sinfulness of *hearing* in other churches, being churches from which we are warrantably separate, we would refer you to, and affectionately entreat you prayerfully to examine the following, viz. “The Sin and

the blessing of God, in tranquillizing her troubled spirit: and she died about eight days after my first interview, animated with the hope, that her sins, though many, *would* all be forgiven her. And what but the Gospel could have brought such consolation?”—On this statement, Dr. Pusey remarks, “Consolation is not the main object of the Gospel, yet the Gospel would have brought much more consolation, had this teacher known it all, and could have told her of the “one Baptism for the remission of sins,” that she “had been washed, had been cleansed;” and so could he have declared authoritatively, without altering our Lord's own words, “*Thy sins are forgiven.*”—Here not only is baptism made a ground of confidence that our sins are forgiven, but the clergy are assumed to have the prerogative of authoritatively (for the word “*are*” is made emphatic by Dr. Pusey,) pronouncing the remission of sins. Does Rome go beyond this?

Danger of countenancing the Administrations of erroneous Teachers, pointed out: a Sermon by John Anderson, D. D.," to be found in Rev. J. P. Miller's "Biographical Sketches and Sermons," at page 367. "A Vindication of the Principles of Seceders upon the Head of Occasional Communion, by Rev. Robert Culbertson of Leith." "Act of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania in 1796," to be found in the above "Sketches and Sermons," p. 490. "The Question stated, and Objections answered, by a member of the Presbytery of Pennsylvania," found in the same book at p. 496. "Strictures on Occasional Hearing, by James Douglass." Also some excellent papers in opposition to this practice, which have lately appeared in the Religious Monitor. Allow us to add some few remarks, not insisted on, at least so fully, in the documents referred to.

1. We contend that the practice in question is unwarrantable and sinful, because the person practising it enters into communion with the church in which he *hears*. We believe it is now admitted, on all hands, that in hearing "the word," there is communion, but it is contended by the advocates of the practice, that it is only the "communion of sinners," and not "church communion." In attempting to prove that the communion in question is church communion, we are happy to have it in our power to introduce a quotation, in point, from a sermon preached at the opening of Synod, in 1828, on the duty of steadfastness in profession, by the former pastor of this congregation, who is deservedly dear to you. In stating some of the *acts* by which a profession is made, Dr. Beveridge mentions the *hearing of the word*, as one of them; and says "the assertion is according to the common sense of men. This teaches them that those who attend on ordinances are hypocrites, if they be not Christians indeed; and not only does common sense teach that hearing of the word is a general profession of being worshippers, but it teaches that there is a particular approbation of the doctrines which we hear. To go to such a church, or to hear such a minister, and to be a believer in the doctrines held by that church, or that minister, are expressions synonymous in common language. Nor does it alter the case, that our attendance is not regular. We ought to make no profession, and allow ourselves in no act of worship for one day, in which we might not continue every day. Sin is not contracted by continuance in what is right, nor prevented by not persisting in what is wrong." "Men are known by their company in religious, as well as in other associations, nor can we be voluntarily present where strange incense is offered without partaking in the sin." Hence, in volume 5th, the Religious Monitor sets forth the following discriminating and conclusive arguments: "It is a great mistake to think that church fellowship is only in sealing ordinances. That is, indeed, the highest degree of it. But there is certainly a religious fellowship in all religious duties, wherever persons associate together; and that fellowship must take its name from that of the association. When private persons so meet, it is private fellowship. And if there be no articles agreed on as the ground of that fellowship, every one is left at liberty to hold and express his own sentiments. They may differ in opinion, and yet the one party not be chargeable with countenancing the errors of the other. But when they meet as a church, or part of a church, it is church-fellowship; and the principles of that church are the previously settled ground of it. And let

them be as erroneous as they may, the conduct of all who do so meet with them is a professed agreement to the same. I am aware that very many will say they have no such views or intention. It may be so, yet that is the true interpretation of their conduct; and surely there is nothing plainer than that a man's conduct, his profession, and his heart's belief, ought all to be in unison: where that is not the case, there is room for the charge of duplicity. To join in external acts with a professing body, whose very existence is a declaration to the world that they hold such (erroneous) principles, and whose every meeting is a renewal of that declaration, and whose whole aim and labour are to promote these principles, and then to say we do not believe their principles nor enter into their views, but desire the advancement of those that are opposite, is to act a part so inconsistent, that if any man would equal it in secular things, he would be considered unworthy of trust or confidence. Multitudes, indeed, on going into places of worship, intend only to be spectators, without taking any particular interest: but that they cannot be; every man must be either for the truth or against it. "He that is not with me, is against me," said Christ.

We have, in the commencement of this "statement," endeavoured to prove that our separation from the other branches of the church is warrantable, and if we have been successful in this attempt, or even if the position itself be true, those other churches are justly regarded as having caused divisions—as being truly the separatists, they have retired to yonder places, associated themselves together, set up their standards—unfurled their banners, displaying their distinguishing principles, and it is for the maintenance of these (erroneous) distinguishing principles that, not only the sealing but teaching ordinances are dispensed there. They are justly regarded, then, as practically holding this language: "We have embraced certain principles which we could not hold in ecclesiastical connexion with you; on these as *our distinguishing* principles, we have *here* constituted as a church; for the maintenance of *these* principles it is that we have so constituted—for the maintenance of *these* principles it is that we *here* dispense and receive the seals of the covenant—for the maintenance of *these* principles it is that we *here* exercise and submit to the discipline of the house—for the maintenance of *these* principles, it is that we *here* preach and hear the word." Is it not, then, perfectly plain that, under such circumstances of the practical declaration of the design with which the word is *preached* and *heard there*, the person who goes from us to them, for a day, and joins with them in the use of one of their *means* of accomplishing their *design*, practically declares, for the time, his concurrence in the *design* itself; and surely if he practically declares that he wishes, for the time, to promote their *design*, the maintenance of their distinguishing principles, he must also, in the same manner, declare that their belief is his belief—their profession his profession,—if this is not *church* communion, we cannot very well see what is. On this point, we solicit attention to the following passages of Scripture, 2 John, 10th and 11th verses: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." It is thought by many, that it never occurred to any person to give any scripture pas-

sage such an interpretation as would condemn attendance on the ministrations of erroneous teachers until it occurred to Seceders. Hear, then, what the judicious Dr. Guyse, in his Paraphrase, says on this passage: "If there be any one that comes to you with pretences of preaching the gospel, and doth not bring the forementioned ("pure") doctrine of Christ in his ministration, but advances principles subversive of it; give him no hospitable entertainment, more than the common laws of humanity require, as though he were welcome to your house; no, nor so much as admit him into your doors to vent his errors in your family, and endanger the corrupting of them from the simplicity that is in Christ: nor have any such familiar conversation as looks like wishing that God would prosper him in his pernicious designs. For whosoever shows him any countenance and speaks him fair, like one that wishes him success in the abominable principles and practices which he would propagate, is accessory to, and by just construction, a partner with him in his wicked works, and contracts the guilt of helping him forward therein, and encouraging others to fall in with him."

It must be admitted, that when we attend upon the ministration of the word by an erroneous teacher, we bid *him* "God speed;" for surely if we are chargeable with doing so by listening to his erroneous instructions, even when he comes to us as this passage asserts; we must be much more chargeable with bidding him "God speed," countenancing, encouraging him—wishing that God would prosper him in his distinguishing (erroneous) designs, when, instead of waiting till he comes to us, we are at the pains to go to him, and with the express purpose of hearing those instructions, which, according to the profession (erroneous in, at least, some things,) he has made, he is pledged to give. But we apprehend, we "bid" more than him "God speed." We countenance, encourage, declare we wish God would prosper, in the distinguishing design of their constitution, that *body* whose organ he is. The erroneous teacher comes forth with his banner unfurled, displaying the principles he is pledged to preach; he practically declares, "I stand here as a minister of a particular church, constituted upon particular distinguishing principles, a church which, but for the maintenance of these distinguishing principles, would never have existed as a separate body. I stand here as one chosen and ordained by this particular church, and also pledged to her, to defend and propagate her principles. I stand here as her servant, her organ, her mouth, through me it is that the *church* speaks, in hearing me you hear the church whose mouth I am." We then ask the question, can we by attendance on his ministrations, bid him "God speed;" as the servant, organ, mouth, of a particular church, without bidding "God speed" to that church whose servant organ, mouth, he is? Certainly not. This, then, is the premise in the passage. What is the conclusion necessarily deducible from it? We are not left to draw it ourselves, it is drawn for us by him who is unerring. "He that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds;" he that biddeth such a particular church "God speed," is accessory to, and by just construction, a partner with her in her principles and practices, including even those that are erroneous or "evil." Surely this looks like church communion.

1 Cor. x. 18: "Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of

the altar?" The priests and Levites who waited at the altar, and ministered about holy things there, ate among themselves the part of the sacrifices not consumed by fire: this passage asserts that in thus "partaking of the sacrifices they were partakers of the altar," that is, this simple act implied a profession of the Jewish religion, of the entire system of worship there practised. From this the Apostle argues, in the following verses, that those who eat of sacrifices offered to idols, do practically profess themselves to be idolaters and approvers of the entire system of idolatry professed in the particular place. Surely, then, the person who joins with an idolatrous worshipping assembly in one act of idolatrous worship, is chargeable with a participation with them in their entire system; it must be plain that the person who joins with a corrupt worshipping assembly, in any one act of divine worship, is chargeable with a participation with that body in their entire system.

The practice in question, then, is inconsistent with our separation from other churches. This separation, we have seen, is warrantable; but the practice in question, as it implies church communion, is, for the time, an abandonment of this separation—a return to the communion of those churches from which we have warrantably separated: it is, therefore, a violation of that injunction, "Let them return unto thee, but return not thou unto them."

*Hearing* in other churches, being churches from which we are warrantably separate, is inconsistent also with testimony bearing; implying communion with those churches in which we *hear*, it involves an approbation of those principles professed by those churches against which we have *testified* as *errors*; and also our approbation of all the opposition made by those churches to principles for which we have *testified* as truths.

This practice is inconsistent, likewise, with express scripture injunction. Rom. xvi. 17: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." Our separation from other churches being warrantable, it is *they* that have *caused* the division, and this injunction directs us to *avoid* them; but this direction we do not follow, when we *hear*, and thereby hold communion with them. 2 Thess. iii. 5, 6, 14: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye received of us. If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." If we are to withdraw from every disorderly-walking brother, of course, we are to withdraw from all disorderly-walking churches; if we are to note that *man* that obeys not the word, and have no company with him, of course we are to act in the same manner toward those *churches* which obey not the word. Our separation from other churches being warrantable, they are disorderly-walking churches, and our withdrawal from them is to be continued while they continue so,—they are churches which obey not the word, and we are to have no company with them; but by the practice in question we give them the right hand of fellowship, walk with them, and have with them all that kind of "company" implied in church communion.

2. The practice in question tends to the violation of the unity of the church. The unity of the church is a matter of the utmost

importance: only consider that God commands it,\* that he most affectionately and earnestly urges it,† that Christ died to promote it,‡ that he is now within the veil praying for it,§ that he bestows his Spirit to promote it,|| consider how base is the source from whence schism springs, even lusts;¶ how unity beautifies the church,\*\* how absolutely essential it is to her peace,†† how absolutely essential it is to true cordial fellowship among her members,‡‡ and then say whether the unity of the church is not of the utmost importance, whether they who violate it are not fearfully guilty in the sight of God, whether we are not under the strongest obligations to endeavour preserving it, and to avoid every thing which violates or has a tendency to violate it. Such is the tendency of the practice we are opposing. Instead of offering any reasoning of our own in confirmation of this position, we will make a brief quotation from "Strictures on Occasional Hearing, by James Douglas," a work perhaps not in the hands of most of you. "At the present moment, this character (the unity) of the Christian church seems to be in a great measure forgotten in all protestant countries. On the most frivolous accounts, and often in a rash manner, and with a vindictive spirit, a separate ministry is called in, a new place of worship is built, a different communion table is spread, and a new plan of church order and government is formed. At the present moment there seems to be no end of multiplying religious sects, and mournful are the consequences which flow from this custom. The lukewarm and the ignorant are indignant at the endless quarrels that prevail among those that make high pretensions to zeal; and they think themselves justified in that settled contempt they show for sacred things. The influence of a gospel ministry is decreasing every day. And a third evil flowing from it, is itching ears: a love of novelty, a spurning at any thing like restraint by Christian discipline, and a disposition to evil speaking rapidly increases."

Now one thing that prevents unity in the church, and that encourages divisions in her, and all the ill fruits which follow it, is the practice of countenancing every new scheme of religion that is set on foot. If a restless individual bring forward this with apparent piety and a fervent zeal, however wrong this scheme may be, the multitude for a time flock to his ministrations without taking time to examine them by the scripture, and the cry is raised, "Lo, here is Christ, and lo, he is there!" The countenance he gets from the fickle multitude strengthens his hands. He brings forth this as a proof that he has the presence of God with him; and if he had any doubts at the outset about the goodness of his scheme, every new proselyte he makes tends to dispel his doubts, and confirm him in the belief that he is right. Now, the course of church fellowship which we follow, has a great tendency to counteract the plans of restless and enthusiastic men, who rise up from time to time and divide the Church. If all would act as we do, though it would not hinder division from appearing, yet it would cause it to have little bad effect; *it would waste away for want of encouragement.*

3. The practice we are opposing, violates the unity of the ministe-

\* Eph. iv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. † 1 Cor. i. 10. Phil. ii. 1, 2. ‡ Eph. ii. 15, 16. § John xvii. 21, 23. || Jer. xxxii. 39, 40. ¶ James iv. 1. \*\* Psalm cxxxiii. 1. †† Eph. iv. 2, 3. ‡‡ Amos iii. 3.

rial office and authority. The advocates of the practice do not plead for the warrantableness of receiving the sacraments from a minister of another church. And what is it that makes this unwarrantable? It is the profession which he, as a minister of that church, makes. But this profession does not affect *immediately* the sacraments as dispensed by him, but *mediately* through him, it affects him first, destroys the regularity of his ministerial authority and standing, with respect to us, and thereby the regularity of his administration of the seals of the covenant. But if the irregularity of his ministerial standing necessarily renders his administration of *these* ordinances irregular, why does it not also, nay, it must, render irregular, his administration of the word. The ministerial office and authority is *one*, and that which affects the regularity of his official character, affects the regularity of *all* his official acts: if we can regularly receive from him one ordinance, then can we regularly receive all ordinances from him: if there be one ordinance we cannot regularly receive from him, then there is none that may be regularly received from him. If the erroneous profession of a minister affects, primarily, the regularity of his official standing, and it is thereby his administration of an ordinance it affects, the above reasons must be regarded as sound, and the conclusion arrived at legitimate. But if it should be contradicted, that the erroneous profession of a minister does not thus affect his official standing, but only his administration of ordinances, then we are to receive or not receive from him such ordinances, as are not, or are, respectively, thus affected, and on determining what ordinances we are, or are not to receive, we must answer this inquiry, which of the ordinances do his errors concern? Upon this principle, then, there ought to be a reversal of the common practice, instead of receiving the teaching, and not the sealing ordinances, we ought to receive the sealing ordinances and not the teaching; for it is in the teaching ordinances that his errors mainly lie, or are exhibited.

Let us put this practice of separating the official acts of ministers into *full* operation on paper, and see how it will look. If it be proper for you to attend upon the administration of the word in other churches, it would be proper in you to invite a minister of some of those churches, especially in the absence of our pastor, to come and preach to us in our own place of public worship; if this would be proper in *you*, the giving of such invitation by our pastor himself, would, under such circumstances, be proper also; yea, farther, he might, especially in the absence of all his ministerial brethren, invite that minister to assist him in *preaching*, on a sacramental occasion; that minister might preach on the preparatory days, yea, he might preach the action sermon, yea, even debar, for this is still the teaching ordinance, and, still farther, he might, after the communicants are seated, direct their meditations by a suitable address, for this also is the teaching ordinance; but were he to go one step farther, were he to offer to take the elements and distribute them among you, you would, according to this practice of separating ministerial acts, refuse to receive them at his hands. Struck with surprise, might he not exclaim, You have acknowledged me in one kind of my official acts, my office, however, is one, and why refuse me in this? Should you reply, You are an erroneous minister—a minister of an erroneous church, he contends that he holds this sa-

crament as you do, and uses the same form which you acknowledge, the very form which Christ himself used ; but you persevere in your refusal, and he must now retire ; though you would allow him to preach to you doctrines which Christ never taught, nay, even the reverse of what he has taught, and yet you will not allow him to administer to you this ordinance, though he would administer it in the very form which Christ himself used. Out of this difficulty there is no way of escape, but by acknowledging the error of receiving him as a teacher *here or any where else*.

4. The practice in question is a violation of plain Scripture injunctions. To some of these passages we have already referred. That this practice is prohibited in Prov. xix. 27, is so plain and is so clearly shown in those papers to which we referred you, that it is unnecessary for us to say any thing on the passage. "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." We invite your attention to but one passage more, Hosea iv. 15: "Though thou, Israel, play the harlot, *yet* let not Judah offend; and come not ye unto Gilgal, neither go ye up to Beth-aven, nor swear, The Lord liveth."

Jerusalem, the place of worship where the three great annual feasts were kept, at which all the males were required to be present, was within Rehoboam's dominions, and Jeroboam feared, that, if his people continued to go up to Jerusalem to worship, their hearts might be alienated from him, and they revolt back again to Rehoboam. To confirm his kingdom, he conceived it was necessary to cut off this intercourse; and therefore devised and executed this expedient:—he made two calves of gold, and set them up—the one at Bethel, and the other at Dan, and said unto the people, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." We are not to suppose that Jeroboam believed, or thought that his people would believe these idols were really gods; they only regarded them as representatives of the true God, and they conceived it might as well be supposed that God would cause his shekinah to dwell in them as between the cherubim over the ark. It was not then, primarily, an avowed intentional change of the *object* of worship, but of the *place* and *means* of the worship of the true God. However, the plan succeeded, "This thing became a sin, for the people went to worship before the one, even unto Dan." This constituted the idolatry of Israel, in its beginning. In it they continued, and never wearied. When persons take one step in apostacy for the sake of ease and convenience, or any other cause, they can very easily, and will very likely take another, and even many. By the time of Hosea's prophesying, they had "set themselves up images, groves in every high hill, and under every green tree." No doubt, they had still their *principal* places of idol worship, but even these were subject to changes. It appears from the passage under consideration, that Dan was exchanged for Gilgal. Bethel, indeed, continued; but after the golden calf was set up in it, the prophets, as Hosea does here, called it, by way of contempt, not Bethel, house of God; but Beth-aven, the house of iniquity.

Now notice the injunction laid upon Judah in regard to religious intercourse with Israel: "Let not Judah offend; and come not ye unto Gilgal, neither go ye up to Beth-aven, nor swear, The Lord



liveth." This injunction, contains, first, a prohibition of certain acts, and, secondly, a reason for the prohibition. First, a prohibition of the first, *bodily presence* at Gilgal, or Beth-aven, "*Come not ye unto Gilgal, neither go ye up to Beth-aven.*" Secondly, joining with them in one of God's own ordinances. Every one must admit that the Old Testament church was commanded to "swear, The Lord liveth," but still Judah is prohibited joining with Israel at Gilgal, or Beth-aven, in the observation of this acknowledged divine ordinance, "nor swear, The Lord liveth." Secondly, We have the reason of the prohibition of those acts: *it would be an offence*: "Let not Judah offend:" it would be an offence to God, would involve them for the time in the sin of idolatry; it would be an offence to themselves, would endanger their stability in the pure worship of God. In the light of this passage, let us endeavour to answer the following inquiries, viz :

1. What is it that constitutes real idolatry? It is the placing of any thing in the place of God. If we put our own wisdom in the place of His wisdom, our will, in the place of His will, our pleasure, in the place of His pleasure, *our authority* in the place of *His authority*, if we put any thing whatsoever in that place, in our regard, which God ought to have, we are as really idolaters, as if we set up "a graven image." Hence, the apostle calls covetousness idolatry.

2. Is there any idolatry in the churches around us? We believe there is. We believe they have, in more or less instances, placed their own wisdom, will, and authority in the place of God's. Have they not put these in the place of God's wisdom, will, and authority, in the case of every *truth* which they have *rejected*, in the case of every *error* which they have *embraced*, in the case of every *ordinance* which they either *deny*, *neglect*, or *corrupt*? Most certainly they have. This, then, has been done even by those churches whose profession approximates nearest our own: for we have seen, that by them precious *truths* are *rejected*, *errors* are *embraced*, some *ordinances* are *denied*, others are *neglected*, and others, again, are *corrupted*. If this has been done by these churches, how much more by those churches whose profession differs more widely from our own.

3. How far may a church go on in an idolatrous course before she is unchurched? This question we shall not attempt here to answer definitely. This only, we would observe, she may go very great lengths. Notwithstanding all the idolatry of Israel, at the time this injunction was given Judah, they were not unchurched. See the sixth and twelfth verses of this chapter. In each of these verses, God calls the people, *His people*, "*My people*," &c. On the sixth verse the learned Dr. Gill remarks as follows: "This is to be understood of the people of the ten tribes of Israel, who were nationally and nominally the people of God, were so by profession; they called themselves the people of God: and though they were idolaters, yet they professed to worship God in their idols; and as yet God's *lo-ammi* had not taken place upon them; he still sent his prophets among them to reprove and reform them, and they were not, as yet, finally rejected by him." Indeed, in this very verse, their rejection is spoken of as future.

4. Is it proper to attend upon the dispensation of ordinances in

churches which have backslidden? We think this passage furnishes us with an unequivocal answer in the negative: it teaches us that we must not, or we will "offend:" we will, for the time, be involved in the sin of their backsliding, and our own steadfastness in the pure profession and worship of God will be endangered. It is in vain to say, "that, by mere attendance, we do not join with them, or, in any way, countenance and encourage them." If this were true, we cannot see why Judah might not have *gone* up to Gilgal and Beth-aven: but even their *presence there* is here forbidden. It will not remove the difficulty, to say, "the idolatry of Israel was a much more aggravated sin than the sin chargeable upon many of the backsliding churches around us," unless it be at the same time proved, that smaller sins become altogether innocent things when compared with more aggravated ones. It is in vain to say, "some ordinances are dispensed in purity, in those churches, and it is proper to go in with them in these, though we should refuse to join with them in others." Judah was not to join with Israel in "swearing, The Lord liveth:" this was one of God's own appointed ordinances; and if Judah could not join with Israel in the observance of an acknowledged divinely instituted ordinance without "offending," we do think that the idea of attending upon ordinances, in a greater or less degree corrupted, and taking the good and leaving the bad, observing the pure and not the impure, must be abandoned. It certainly could not have been wrong for Judah to have observed an acknowledged divinely instituted ordinance in Gilgal or Beth-aven, if that act would not have involved them in the idolatries of Israel. Farther, it is in vain to say, "Other churches are churches of Christ:" this we grant; but we deny that it follows, that we may attend upon ordinances in them. If this were a correct conclusion, Judah might have gone up to Gilgal and Beth-aven; for Israel was not yet unchurched.

A few remarks about the exercise of discipline for this offence, and we have done. If it be a sin and scandal, as we conceive is shown, then the same arguments which prove the duty of exercising discipline in any other case, prove it to be a duty in this case. It is the church's defence—it is her hedge, and when it is broken down, or not kept up, "all they who pass by the way do pluck her; the boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it." The exercise of discipline is enjoined in 1 Cor. v. 6, 7: "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? purge out therefore the old leaven." Here it is plainly taught, that it is the duty of the church, in her judicial capacity, to separate from her communion such as are found to be leaven, or obstinate opposers of any truth, advocates of any error, or practisers of any sin, ascertained as such respectively in her public profession. To the same purpose is Rom. xvi. 17: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them who cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." And 2 Thess. iii. 14: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." In these verses we are taught, first, that it is the indispensable duty of the church to hold the person who will not abide by her attainments, as chargeable with *causing* divisions and offences; and, secondly, that those who persist in thus causing divisions

and offences, are to be *noted, marked* so with the mark of church censure, as will distinguish them as persons to be *avoided*, and with whom no company is to be kept, in a way of church communion.

Objections. 1. "There is no sufficiently *clear* condemnation of the practice in question, in the word of God, to make it warrantable to censure for it." This objection, admits that the practice is condemned in the word, but then, not with *sufficient clearness*. And shall we, indeed, dictate to God the amount of clearness which must attend his condemnation of a sin, before we will submit to the exercise upon us, or agree to exercise upon others that discipline which he has commanded to be exercised for it? The question is not, and should not be, what is the measure of clearness attending the condemnation of any particular practice, but, is it condemned at all? Apply this principle to other things, and how sweeping would be its work: The most precious truths might be cast away, and the most important duties neglected, as *too obscurely revealed*.

2. "The exercise of discipline for this practice does harm—it makes more occasional hearers than it prevents." We will not deny that some may be provoked merely to offend in this way, who otherwise would or might not have done so; but, in such a case, this exercise of discipline is only the *occasion* of the provocation, the *cause* is in the corrupt heart: this is no evidence that such exercise of discipline is wrong, or not a duty: for the same may be said about the law of God: when it would stop the current of corruption, it operates as a breast-work thrown across a stream, it may check the flowing for a time, but the water will soon even *overflow*: when the corrupt heart feels the encroachments of the divine law, it is provoked to more unrighteousness. "Sin taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence." Rom. vii. 8.

3. "Better leave it to ministerial instruction and reproof,—people will not submit to discipline on this subject." This cannot be done with faithfulness; faithfulness as much requires the exercise of discipline on the part of church courts for the maintenance of truth and righteousness, and the suppression of error in principle or practice, as it does ministerial instruction, exhortation and reproof: besides, the same causes which lead to rebel against the faithful exercise of discipline, will very soon lead to rebel against faithful preaching.

4. "There is such want of uniformity throughout the church in this particular. But very few sessions censure for this practice." We admit the fact here alleged to some extent, and we lament it, but we cannot admit it to the extent many expect. But supposing the want of uniformity was even greater than it is, is it the way to induce sister sessions to do their duty, for us to neglect ours; and should we be induced to neglect our duty, because others neglect theirs? This was neither the principle nor practice of Joshua: "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

By order of Session,

S. WILSON, *Moderator*.

JOHN CHARTERS, *Session Clerk, P. T.*

ART. V.—*In what Way may a Preacher sink his Audience?*

The following anecdote, which the writer of this article had from the lips of the individual concerned, may aid your readers, Mr. Editor, in coming to the proper answer. It may even benefit the venerated incumbents of the highest office in the sublunary gift of God; it may prove salutary to many, as it has to some of the commissioned ambassadors of Jesus Christ. To them the question is practical, and every man shall kiss his lips "that giveth a right answer."

I was once designated, said the narrator, to preach the annual election sermon, in the metropolis of my native State (Hartford, Ct.) and before its Governor, its Legislature, and its other professional dignitaries. The weather was fine, the concourse numerous, and composed of the intellectual nobility, civil and ecclesiastical, of the whole commonwealth, including strangers of distinction, and constituting an audience of the highest respectability. I, of course, tarried with the pastor of the place, the late Rev. Dr. Strong. As the bell began its monitory tolling, I left the study and descended to the parlour. There I was ushered into a circle of clergymen, few of whom I knew, and none of whom, at that moment, I rejoiced to see. The conversation turned upon my feelings in view of the speciality of the service. Some sympathized, others prophesied, others encouraged and others counselled—how many *prayed* for me I know not. At last said one, "Fear nothing; be bold and independent; just imagine them to be a patch of cabbages, and treat them as such, and my word for it, you will succeed." O, thought I, "if I could sink them upon this principle, and bring my feelings just there, it would do!—but—At this instant Dr. Strong entered the room, and informed those present that it was time to proceed to the church. As the preacher and pastor are ever partners in the procession, according to our good habits, I had the privilege of walking with the doctor. He soon inquired the state of my feelings; having learned their perturbation, and wishing to assuage them, he thus accosted me: "Well, my brother, can you not sink them? You have not forgotten the advice of Mr. —, which I overheard just before I summoned you to move?" "No," I replied, "but they are such a select assembly, and will expect so much, and criticise so sternly? and what if I should fail?" The doctor rejoined: "I am not surprised that you find it difficult to adopt that counsel, and preach under the inspiration of a lie. It is folly, falsehood, and stupidity! and to which of these ingredients the poisonous composition is most indebted, it were hard to resolve. They are not cabbages, nor cannibals, but a collection of cultivated men and immortal souls; and to you pertains the responsibility of addressing them as such, and propounding to them their duty, under the sanction of their Creator's will. You must face them, and "speak boldly, as you ought to speak." And you need not fear their faces. Take my counsel: when the sun rides at his meridian, the stars are lost in the glory of his beams; and when *God* is exalted, his creatures are forgotten. Fill your thoughts with a sense of *his* presence, *your* obligations; think of *his* goodness and his promises; let *God* fill your whole field of vision, and man will appear in his proper diminutiveness. This is truth and grace: this will sink your audience without injuring them, or inflating you, and in truth I know of no other mode of sinking an audience *legitimately*, than that I have suggested. He paused; and I was relieved. His counsel pervaded my willing

soul. I was enabled to magnify my office and my Master, and I have since retained it, and practise upon it with the happiest and most durable satisfaction.

Believing, as I do, Mr. Editor, that every audience must be sunk, and God alone exalted, where the preacher is free and fearless or the preaching effectual; and that the above counsel of an illustrious preacher may benefit his successors and juniors in office—perhaps private Christians, and even editors—I have sent it, with my respects, as a contribution to your valuable miscellency.—*Religious Chronicle*, for 1840.

#### ART. VI.—*Lucy Goodale Thurston.*

Died in the city of New-York, on the 24th of February, 1841, (at the house of A. P. Cumings, one of the editors of the New-York Observer,) LUCY GOODALE THURSTON, aged 17 years.

The following note was addressed to the deceased by one of her scholars, (a native girl living in the family of Dr. Andrews,) a short time before her departure. We give it as a specimen of the native language, and as exhibiting the social and religious affections of a converted heathen. The names mentioned in connexion with Mrs. Thurston are those of her other children now living, and remaining with her in the family where this daughter died.—*Eds. Obs.*

HAILUA, June 29, 1840.

*Aloha oe e Luke, kuu kaikuaana ilako o ka Haku.*

Ua nui kuu, aloha ia oe. Ke aloha aku nei au ia oe i ka hiki ana mai o kau palapala iau. Aloha aku ia Tatina wahine, ia Pakeke, a me Aka, a me Mele, a me Koma. Ua pilikia makou i ka mai o ke keiki a Kauka.

Ke palapala nei au i keia palapala me kuu waimaka. Aloha oe i ka hele aku ma ka aina malihini, aole makou i ike. Ua pau ko kakou halawai ana ma keia ao. Ua nele au i ka mea paipai ole. Nui kuu hoomanao ana ia oe. Auhea oe e ke kumu aloha, mai hoopoina i kau haumana aloha. Aloha oe ka mea mana i kuhikuhi mai ma ka pono o ke Akua. Aole ke Akua i hoopai mai i kou noho ana. I keia wa, he naho ana aloha ia oe i ka makua ao mai i ka pono. Aole manao e hana i ka hewa, aka o ka naau, ua hana hewa i ke Akua.

Ke aloha aku nei o Hana ia oukou a pau. Aloha oe ka hoahela o na kai ewalu mai Hawaii a Oahu. E ke kumu aloha e, aole hiki ke palapala i keia we, he pilikia. Aloha oe ka i manao mai i ka haumana.

Na kau haumana aloha,

\* KEALOHA.

[TRANSLATION.]

*Love to you Lucy, my elder sister in the Lord.*

My affection for you is very great. I loved you when I received the letter you wrote me. Give my love to Mrs. Thurston, to Persis, Asa, Mary and Thomas. We are in straitened circumstances on account of the sickness of the Doctor's child.

\* Her name, Kealoha, means love.

I write this letter with tears. I have great love for you, because you are going to a strange land which we have never seen. The time for our meeting together in this world has passed away. I have lost the one who often reminded me of my duty. I often remember you. Where are you, my beloved teacher? forget not your scholar who loved you. Love to you who instructed me in the righteousness of God. God has not rewarded me according to the manner in which I have lived. At this time I am swelling with love to you the mother (teacher) who taught me the right way. I do not desire to do wrong, but my heart sins against God.

Hana sends love to you all. Love to you my fellow voyager in the eight seas† from Hawaii to Oahu. Beloved teacher, I cannot write more now, for it is a straitened time. Love to you who thought on your scholar.

Your affectionate scholar,

KEALONA.

None of the children of the missionaries have remained at the Islands after they have reached the age of twelve or fourteen, except Mrs. Thurston's family. The other children have been sent to this country to be educated.

They have remained under their father's roof, secluded from the world, deprived of the advantages of society, except that which they enjoyed from occasional intercourse with the families of other missionaries, until the eldest was nineteen, and Lucy seventeen years of age. But in their "quiet home at Kailua," they enjoyed the society and instruction of intelligent parents; and while we may not speak of the living, the testimony of the dead bears witness that even in these circumstances, children may make extensive and valuable acquirements.

It had been her practice for many years to keep a journal. We have only seen that of her voyage to this country, a few extracts from which will illustrate many interesting traits of character, and exhibit in some degree the powers and improvement of her mind. We regret that they must necessarily be brief and few.

*Sunday, August 2d.*—This is the last Sabbath that we spend on these shores. Before another we shall be wafted far from the loved land of our childhood. We have this evening had family prayers together for the last time. Can it be that this happy family which have for twenty years dwelt under one roof is to be separated? I cannot realize that we are to part before another sun shall set. The thought is exceedingly painful. Our happiest days are gone. Our circumstances will be peculiarly trying, situated as we shall be during a voyage of six months without a father on whom to depend.

*Thursday, August 6th.*—Last Monday we saw the sun arise for the last time upon the Sandwich Islands. Our family were invited to Dr. Judd's to breakfast. After prayers we went down to the vessel. We returned again at 10 o'clock as the bell was ringing for the meeting. Our friends were already assembled at Mr. Oastles'. The emblems of the broken body and shed blood of the Saviour, were placed upon a table in the middle of the room. We sat down for the last time around the table of the Lord with our

† The "eight seas," are eight channels, situated between Hawaii and Oahu, over which they had passed together at a former period.

dear father and other friends with whom we had often enjoyed such seasons. Father led the meeting and preserved his usual composure, though once or twice he was so affected as not to be able to proceed. He referred to the two families which were about to be broken up. Children were to be separated from parents, a wife from a husband, a minister from his people. It was a most tender and solemn scene.

### ART. VII.—*New Metrical Version of the Psalms.*

A new version of the Book of Psalms containing a variety of metres, long, short common and proper, was placed in our hands about a year ago for examination. Multiplicity of employment, joined with great distrust of our own judgment, respecting the merits of this production, has prevented an earlier notice of the work. It is evidently the result of much care and industry, joined with a sincere desire to promote the cause of a Scripture Psalmody. We understand the work is to be laid before the Synod at the ensuing meeting; we shall, therefore, decline the expression of any opinion for the present.

#### PSALM V.

1. Give to my words an ear;  
O Lord, consider me,  
When I to meditate draw near,  
My King, my God, to thee.
2. The voice hear of my cry;  
For I to thee will pray,  
When morning light breaks from the sky,  
At early dawn of day.
3. My voice then shalt thou hear,  
Directing prayer to thee,  
Mine eyes shall upward look, to where  
My King, my God, shall be;
4. For thou art not a God,  
That pleasure hast in sin,  
Neither shalt evil have abode,  
Thy holy place within.
5. The foolish shall not stand  
In presence of thine eye;  
Thou hat'st the wicked of the land,  
Who work iniquity.
6. Under destruction's ban,  
The liar's place shall be,  
The bloody and deceitful man  
Abhorred is by thee.
7. I'll to thy house repair,  
Where many mercies be;  
And worship in thy temple, where  
Thy fear shall fall on me:  
Because of all my foes,
8. Lead me in righteousness,  
And thy straight path, O Lord, disclose  
Before thy servant's face.
9. There is no faithfulness,  
Within their mouth, at all;  
Their inward part is wickedness,  
With flattering tongues they call,  
Their throat's an open tomb;  
Let them destroyed be.

10. By their own counsels cast them down,  
O thou my God, from thee.  
In multitude of sin,  
And deep transgression, they  
Rebel against thy holy throne;  
O cast them forth away.
11. But let all those rejoice,  
Who put their trust in thee,  
In songs of joy with shouting voice;  
Thou their defence shalt be.
12. And let their joys abound,  
Who love thy holy name;  
For thou defendest them around:  
Thou art a shield to them.
13. LORD, to the righteous man  
Thou wilt thy blessing yield,  
With favour thou wilt compass him  
About, as with a shield.

#### PSALM LIV.

1. Save me, O God, by thy great name,  
And judge me by thy saving strength;
2. My prayer hear when I complain,  
O God, give ear to me at length.
3. For strangers up against me rise,  
Oppressors seek to kill my soul;  
Nor have they set before their eyes,  
That God, who doth all things control.
4. Behold, the Lord my helper is;  
God is with them who aid my soul;
5. He will reward my enemies,  
And in his truth cut off the whole.
6. I'll freely sacrifice to thee,  
Thy name, JEHOVAH, I will praise;  
For it is good, and unto me  
Deliv'rance he commands always;
7. From all my former troubles he  
Hath me deliver'd, and mine eyes  
Have his desire been brought to see  
Upon my cruel enemies.

**WORK OF THE SPIRIT.**—The *Raven* voice of the old man sometimes imitates so successfully the “voice of the dove,” that it requires a fine and practised ear to detect the raven’s voice in such melodious sounds. Even mental conflicts and states of feeling occur, in which the Holy Spirit has not the slightest share, and which must be ascribed entirely to nature, and not to grace; and yet they so strongly resemble the operations of the Spirit, that the clearest sight is often deceived, and the nicest discernment frequently baffled. After Jephthah had scattered the Ephraimites—Judges xii. 1,—he took possession of the passages of Jordan. The Ephraimites, obliged to cross the river or perish in the desert, approached the fort, and were put to the test,—for all of them were required to pronounce the word *Shibboleth*; but they said *Sibboleth*, “for they could not frame to pronounce it aright, and were slain.”

What a serious and important truth does that scene present to us! Before him who holds the fort, beyond which lies the Canaan of God, all may depend upon an *apparent trifle*! On the existence or non-existence of something within us, irrespective of all other considerations, will it depend, whether we shall be permitted to pass over, or whether the sword of his indignation shall descend upon us. The spiritual difference between the man who is rejected and the one who is accepted, may be no greater than between *Shibboleth* and *Sibboleth*. Who can detect any material difference? But God is a keen discernor.

Behold here two men! Both smite upon their breasts, and both call themselves the chief of sinners. We see their tears and hear their confessions. To us no difference is visible. Both appear at the passage of Jordan—both stand before the Judge—and behold! one is crowned, and the other is lost. Why should this be? The one said *Shibboleth*, the other *Sibboleth*. We observed it not; but the difference causes an eternal separation. One smote upon his breast from fear, the other from love. *Hell* made one to weep, the *Cross* the other. The one lamented the consequences of sin, the other mourned over the transgressions themselves. When their characters were developed, it was evident that selfishness produced repentance in one, but the other’s tears flowed from love. In one was concealed a *Cain*, in the other a *Magdalene*. Nature predominated in one, and in the other, grace. To our dull senses that was not perceptible.

Therefore, we cannot say that true heart-felt Christianity consists in penitence, in tears, or in an earnest longing after the bliss of heaven. We cannot say that it consists in prayers, in evangelical knowledge, or in Christian deportment. Neither does it consist in love for the gospel, in the emotions which it awakens within us, or in zeal for the spread of divine truth—nor in an open confession of Christ, and the ability to testify and speak of him with eloquence, instruction, and edification. All those things may constitute only the imperfect *Sibboleth*; and *wo be to us*! if at the passage of Jordan it should so appear. It may all proceed from the natural man alone, and be the mere workings of selfish nature. But nothing will stand the Divine scrutiny, that is not the work and produce of the Holy Spirit, and the essence of which is not the love of Christ.—*Solomon and the Shulamite*.

“**THE WORLD THAT LIETH IN WICKEDNESS.**—Missionaries leave their home and go out not knowing whither they go. Herein we differ. But in addressing a *Christless* world we differ but little. Gross superstition; false deities, senseless idolatry; ignorant sensuality and savage brutality; they may have to encounter abroad. We have the lust of the eye: false refinements; idolatrous devotion to what is wrong; over civilization to encounter at home. If they have barbarous idolaters to address, we have the devotees of a more dangerous idolatry. Self and Christ are every where opposed. If Satan reigns by means of an ignorant idolatry, he reigns also by means of a corrupted refinement. The ambassadors to both need the same qualifications; they must “put on the Lord Jesus.” We want that zeal, that boldness, for the glory of Christ crucified which shone in Latimer, and Ridley, and Bradford, and Philpot, and the other martyrs of the Reformation.”—*Budd*.



ART. VIII.—*The Church of Scotland.*

The Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had a recent meeting, in which they made preparations to review and try the Strathbogie case, and in which they expressed their very decided opinion of the Marnoch case as follows:

"Mr. Candlish then rose, and proceeded to state, that he meant to propose a resolution for the adoption of the commission relative to the recent settlement of Marnoch. It was at this time about eleven o'clock at night; and after some objections upon this ground being overruled, Mr. Candlish proceeded with his statement, and a motion which led to a debate that lasted till nearly one o'clock next morning. The purport of the resolution proposed was condemnatory of the recent decision of the Court of Session, in the case referred to, and of sympathy with the people of Marnoch.

"Dr. Bryce, after a good deal of discussion, moved, that it was inexpedient to adopt the resolution proposed, and after some altercation, the question was brought to a vote, when the division was—

Motion of Mr. Candlish,	-	-	-	-	72
Dr. Bryce's amendment,	-	-	-	-	1
					—
Majority,					71

An action for heavy damages has been brought against the Presbytery of Auchterarder for not recognising the principle of intrusion. It is thus spoken of by a hostile print:

"The first division of the Court of Session has unanimously sustained the relevancy of the action of damages against the Presbytery of Auchterarder, at the instance of the Earl of Kinnoul and Mr. Young. The collision thus goes on rarely. The case will now go before a jury to have the amount of damages assessed. To this part of the affair the public will look forward with much interest. The rebels would probably prefer being put in a gaol, as a penalty more easily borne, and more likely to excite ignorant sympathy: but good round damages will be better fitted to bring them to their senses."—*Glasgow Chronicle.*

Another case is thus spoken of, which is intended to aim at the legality of the organization of the General Assembly itself.

"No later than Thursday last, the Supreme Court has stepped in to adjudicate in the case of the legal presence to the parish of Lethendy, and has declared Mr. Clarke entitled to the presentation in preference to Mr. Kessen, who has been in possession. The Presbytery of Dunkeld will, therefore, under pain of imprisonment, be compelled to take Mr. Clarke on his trial, with the view to his induction. Mr. Edwards, in the event of deposition by the Assembly, will again appeal to the Supreme Court for protection: and the seven suspended ministers have determined on sending a representative to the Assembly, as the legal majority of that Presbytery. Should the Assembly refuse to acknowledge him, it is ascertained that by applying to the Court of Session, against the deeds and acts of that Assembly, the whole will be declared null and void, from its not being constituted according to law! This is confusion worse confounded; and if we add the Kemback case, where the St. Andrew's Presbytery, though moderates, have allowed the veto of the parishioners against Mr. Cook, for the purpose of bringing the Church into another litigation, we shall have six or seven positive and expensive proofs that the Church's independence is yet but a dream, and must

be realized, if they desire its realization, by a line of conduct different from the paltering and dishonesty of their recent struggles with the civil courts."—*Scottish Pilot*.

**FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS.**—No slight commotion has been excited in the University of Oxford, and in the English Established Church at large, by the last and most daring development of Oxford divinity. This has been communicated to the public in a Tract, which, professedly endeavours to prove that the doctrines of *Purgatory*, of *Pardons*, of the adoration of *Images and Relics*, of the *Invocation of Saints*, and of the *mass*, as authoritatively taught by the Church of Rome, are not condemned by the articles of the Church of England, and may with consistency be held by her clergy! As a specimen of the Jesuitical reasoning of Mr. Newman, let the following on the subject of the *mass* suffice. First the article, and then his comment:

"The sacrifice of masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.' This is the Protestant doctrine of the Thirty-first Article of the Church. Now hear the conclusion to which the tract writer comes: he says—

"On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the *mass* in itself, nor against its being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin; but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of or distinct from the sacrifice of the Cross, which is blasphemy; and on the other its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is an imposture in addition!!!".

The effects produced by the appearance of this Tract on the authorities of the University, may be seen from the following act, and the spirit of obstinate error which characterizes Mr. Newman, may be seen from his letter of confession, which the decided expression of opinion on the part of the University seemed to extort.

"At a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses, and Proctors, in the Delegates' room, March 15, 1841.

"Considering that it is enjoined in the statutes of this University (tit. iii., sect. 2; tit. ix., sect. ii., § 3, sect. v., § 3) that every student shall be instructed and examined in the Thirty-nine Articles, and shall subscribe to them; considering also that a tract has recently appeared, dated from Oxford, and entitled *Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles*, being No. 90 of the *Tracts for the Times*, a series of anonymous publications, purporting to be written by members of the University, but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself:

"Resolved, that modes of interpretation such as are suggested in the said tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above mentioned statutes.

P. WYNTER, Vice-Chancellor."

"Mr. Vice-Chancellor—I write this respectfully to inform you, that I am the author, and have the sole responsibility, of the tract on which the hebdomadal Board has just now expressed its opinion, and

that I have not given my name hitherto, under the belief that it was desired that I should not. I hope it will not surprise you if I say, that my opinion remains unchanged of the truth and honesty of the principle maintained in the tract, and the necessity of putting it forth. At the same time, I am prompted by my feelings to add my deep consciousness that everything I attempt might be done in a better spirit, and in a better way; and, while I am sincerely sorry for the trouble and anxiety I have given to the members of the Board, I beg to return my thanks to them for an act which, even though founded on misapprehension, may be made as profitable to myself, as it is religiously and charitably intended.

"I say all this with great sincerity, and am, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, your obedient servant,

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

"Oriel College, March, 16."

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"E." "C." "J. D." and "J. M." have all come to hand, and will be inserted in the order of time in which they were received. We have also received the First and Second Parts of "A Tract on Church Government by the Rev. Robert Reid of Erie, Pa., author of "The Seven Last Plagues." The Third Part is yet to come. It is a valuable and seasonable production; we sincerely hope the author may receive a remuneration for his labour and expense. This work will be noticed more *in extenso*, if we should be permitted to go on with another volume. Our Patrons will perceive that we have already on hand some valuable materials with which to commence THE EIGHTEENTH VOLUME OF THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR. Will they make corresponding efforts to circulate the work?

When we entered upon it for the second time, two years ago, we then gave a pledge to avoid personalities, and every thing touching the character of individuals. This pledge we have laboured to redeem, and have checked as far as possible the first symptoms of a disposition to depart from it, whenever they have been manifested by correspondents. The good effects of this course are already beginning to be felt, and we again promise to pursue the same policy; we have long doubted the expediency of the course, hitherto pursued by the Synod, of publishing in a work designed for all classes those cases of discipline which so frequently come before them. And we anticipate, from a resolution adopted at last meeting, respecting the publication of the minutes, that this course of policy is to be abandoned. It is hoped this will be the case. It is not, then, the design of the Monitor to injure the feelings, reputation, or usefulness of any man; not to elevate or depress any man; not to foster party spirit, but frown upon it, in whatever quarter it may show its hideous form, with iron heart and brazen visage. But it is our design,

1. To maintain the doctrines and order of the Associate Church.
2. To permit a free discussion of any of the doctrines and practices inculcated in the word of God, so far as that discussion is restrained within the bounds of reason and propriety, and conducted

with candour, irrespective of personal considerations. Partisan and sectarian divisions in the church, generally have their origin in the unhallowed ambition of men.

3. To disseminate the most important and best authenticated intelligence of the day, respecting the state of the Christian church in all parts of the world.

In the prosecution of these objects, the best materials that can be procured, whether original or selected, will be laid before our readers. We have some names on our subscription list, which have stood there for seventeen years; to such, we think long acquaintance must have kindled a fraternal feeling in their bosoms, towards the humble, and in general, we may say, unobtrusive monthly visiter. Will not such persons make some attempt, to introduce their old friend to the favourable notice of some of their neighbours?

---

ART. XII.—*Duty of Submission to Church Rulers explained and enforced. A Sermon by Rev. JAMES MARTIN, Pastor of the Associate Presbyterian Church in Albany, with an Appendix. 8vo. pp. 57. Heb. xiii. 17.*

This pamphlet came to hand, after the present number was nearly all in type, and we only have room to say, that it is an important and seasonable production. We regret exceedingly, that it was not received a few days earlier, that a portion might have been transferred to our pages. It is hoped, however, that it will be in the hands of the members of the Synod generally, previous to their ensuing meeting, on account of the important matters contained in the Appendix. The Sermon is worthy of its author, who is already favourably known to the church as a lucid and able writer: without adopting *every thing* in it, as one or two points comparatively unimportant, stand on debatable ground, we give it a cordial commendation.

We allude more particularly to the position assumed in the paragraph commencing on the 14th page. As we have not room at present, to be more particular, an early opportunity will be sought to give this sermon a more extended notice. In the mean time, however, it is necessary to declare explicitly, that we are unable to discover any thing in it which has the least bearing on the cases referred to in the Appendix, that will not be readily adopted, by all sound Presbyterians. Among such, we see not how there can well be any difference of opinion, respecting the *true character* of those cases which have so long and so grievously afflicted the church.

It is believed this discourse will be regarded as a standard work on the subject of which it treats. His principal positions are impregnable; the illustrations clear and forcible. The work, taken as a whole, would not detract from the reputation of any author of the present day, known to us; and should be extensively circulated. It is presumed the author will take measures to supply any demand which may be made for the work, at the meeting of the Synod.

# INDEX TO VOLUME XVII.

<b>A.</b>		<b>Page</b>	<b>Dr. Chalmers,</b>	<b>224</b>
Act for a fast		42	Dr. M'Crie, life of	337
Act to incorporate seminary		46	Dying wife	192
Address on foreign missions	62, 102		Dutch Reformed church	92
Address to Mr. Walker		53	<b>E.</b>	
Address to the congregation		59	Ecclesiastical records	923, 382
Address to J. T. Cooper		365	Editor rebuked by a presbytery	327
Albany, presbytery of		7	England	129
Allegheny, presbytery of		5	<b>F.</b>	
Anecdote		143	Family worship	433, 481, 529
Answer to Quero		172	Fancy sketch	381
Answer to Respondo		216	Father Matthew	352
Appeal of Wm. M. M'Elwee		20	Flogging	430
Appeal of J. Clokey		27	Foreign missions	62, 102, 390
Application of the measuring reed		303	Forgiveness of injuries	112
Apocrypha	226, 376		Free communion	235
Appointments, scale of		34	<b>G.</b>	
Ardent spirits, report on		33	General Assembly of the church of	
Associate S. of O. S.		49	Scotland	86
Associations, voluntary	212, 236, 421, 448, 513, 538, 552		Genesis iv. 7.	355
<b>B.</b>			Gordon, D., report of	12
Baptism, a question		849	Guilty conscience	140
Baptism, salvation by		425	<b>H.</b>	
Beauties of slavery		239	Hamilton, Rev. Thomas	133, 441
Biblical criticism		290	Hearing, occasional	142, 181, 201
Board of managers, report of		9	229, 267, 289, 356, 361, 453, 506, 556	
Book of death		292	Highland psalmody	190
Book of life		271	History of the Apocrypha	296, 376
Boston, Ass. Ref. church in		138	Holiness	517
British covenants		282	Horrors of the slave trade	95
<b>C.</b>			Houston, D., report of	17
Caledonia, presbytery of		142	<b>I.</b>	
Cambridge, presbytery of		6	Illinois, presbytery of	8
Catechism on government	323, 401, 544		Immortality of Jehovah	431
Chartiers, presbytery of		14	Index,	575, 576
Church of Scotland	86, 187, 275, 280, 319, 523, 571		Indiana, presbytery of	5
Church psalmody		350	Indulgences	142
Church rulers,		574	Injuries	112
Commission of Synod		185	Ireland	221, 130
Communion		235	Islands, Society	430
Constantinople		141	<b>J.</b>	
Correction		239	Jews at Damascus	330
Correspondents, to	96, 143, 192, 237, 384, 480, 528, 432, 573		Jews in North Africa	332
Correspondence between the As- sociate, and Associate Re- formed Churches		409	Jewish Converts,	239
<b>D.</b>			<b>K.</b>	
Deacon's office	382, 427		Kempis, Thomas A.	429
Death, book of		292	Kirk of Scotland	487
Death of an Infidel		432	<b>L.</b>	
Defence of the Church of Scot- land		275	Letter to Original Seceders	49
			Letter to the Editor	184, 257, 479
			Letters of Scots worthies	377

Life, Book of	271	Remarks on the vindication of	
Life of Dr. M'Crie	337	C——	171
Lynching at Oberlin	525	Reports, Miscellaneous	9, 12, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 37
		Reports of Presbyteries	5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14,
M.		Resolutions of students	374
Madagascar	232	Respondo, answer to	183
Martyrdom	432	Richland, presbytery of	11
Maryland hospital	394	Roman Catholic claim	469
Method of preaching	49		
M'Laren on the Psalms	68	S.	
Metrical version of the Psalms	569	Salvation	120, 156, 193
Measuring reed	303	Scale of appointments	34
Miami, presbytery of	8	Scotland, Church of	86, 187, 275, 290, 319, 523, 571
Micah vi. 8	355	Scripture elucidated	287
Ministers of Christ	84	Scriptures	322
Ministers and politics,	418	Scriptural preaching	95
Miscellaneous	334	Sermon by T. Hamilton	133, 441
Mission, report on	22	Slander	192
Mission to the Jews	125	Slavery in Britain	521
Murphy, D., report of	18	Slavery in New School Assembly	126
My son be wise	85	Socialism	129
		Society Islands	430
N.		Speak evil of no man	239
New school assembly	89	Stamford, presbytery of	10
Notes of a Sermon	97, 145	Statistical tables	38
		Submission to Church rulers	574
O.		Symbolical language of scripture	196, 241
Oberlin	525		
Occasional hearing	149, 181, 201, 229, 267, 289, 356, 361, 453, 503, 555	T.	
Ordination address	53	Tappan on the will	294, 320, 346
Oriental illustration of scripture	240	Ten virgins	420
Original seceders, letter to	49	The Christian mind	207
Our present position	159	The election	295
Oxford tracts	499, 541, 572	The infidel	142
		Theological students	521
P.		The theatre	236
Papal bulls	142	Thurston, Lucy	567
Pastoral letter	29	Times, signs of the	480
Patrons	144	Tracts, Oxford	499, 541, 572
Persecution for righteousness' sake	233	Two sabbaths on the Continent	347
Perseverance of the saints	475		
Philadelphia, presbytery of	14	U.	
Plan of a school	246	United Secession Church	463
Plea of presbytery	286		
Political ambition	321	V.	
Preacher and his audience	566	Vacant seats in heaven	236
Popular preacher	126	Vindication of C's. position	166
Presbytery rebuked	328	Voluntary associations	212, 236, 448, 513, 421, 538, 552
Presbytery of Philadelphia	371		
Presbyterian Church	88	W.	
Presbyteries, reports of	5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14	Wodrow, Francis	397
Progress of Christianity	239	Worship, family	433, 481, 529
		Work of the Spirit	570
Q.		World in wickedness	570
Queries	190, 431		
Queries and answers	382	X.	
Quero's queries	115	Y.	
		Young, Wm. S., Report of	72
R.			
Re-baptism	489		
Reflections on 1 Thess. iv. 7,	260		
Reformed Pres. Church	183		