

THE
COVENANTER,

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF

THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY

JAMES M. WILLSON:

"The law of the Lord is perfect."—PSALM XIX. 7.

"Whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing."—PHIL. III. 16.

PHILADELPHIA:
WILLIAM S. YOUNG, PRINTER, NO. 50 NORTH SIXTH ST.
1849-50.

THE
COVENANTER.

AUGUST, 1849.

CHURCH PROPERTY—BY WHOM OWNED AND
MANAGED.*

MODERATOR,—There are *three* points to which, in examining this case, I purpose to ask your attention. *First*, does Mr. Crozier teach what this libel affirms he does? *Second*, are such doctrines contrary to the standards of the church? And, *Third*, If contrary, are they so far wrong as to merit censure?

Before I proceed to examine these points, I premise a remark or two. And, 1st, Mr. Crozier mistakes altogether the meaning of the phrase "*circa sacra*." He speaks of "things" being "*circa sacra*," and seems to apply this phrase, as if it were the denomination of certain matters *round about* the church. He does not know its meaning or its application. The phrase signifies "about sacred things:" these "sacred things," moreover, comprehending *all* that is embraced within the limits of religion and morals; and, particularly, such things as the church has immediately to do with. Hence, we speak of the magistrate's *power* or *duty* "*circa sacra*," that is, his duty to recognise the church, to give a civil sanction to the church's doctrine and constitution, to furnish her support and protection, to hedge about the first as well as the second table of the law with appropriate civil sanctions, &c. &c. There are no "*circa sacra*" *things*, unless we call laws and their execution, things. And yet Mr. C. speaks of money as if it were, under certain circumstances, a *circa sacra* thing. Indeed he calls pecuniary affairs "*circa sacra* matters." He is ignorant on this elementary point, and, hence, in part, his error, as taught in the article on which the libel is founded. 2d, Mr. C. states, as if it were an axiom, that "trustees are subject to the will of those who instruct them, irrespective of their own will." Why? An executor is a trustee of an estate. Is he subject to those for whom he acts? In Great Britain, many large estates are in the hands of trustees. Are they subject to the will of him who has intrusted them?

* This article embraces the substance of the first part of the argument by the Editor of the *Covenanter* in the libel against Rev. J. Crozier, which occupied the Synod lately for some days. The remainder will be given in our next. It is due to ourselves to say that it has been written out and published, only at the earnest and repeated solicitations of many persons, members of Synod and others, who were present during the discussion. The phraseology will necessarily be somewhat different, inasmuch as it was delivered extemporaneously. Some slight changes have been made in the arrangement. The substance is the same.

We ask those of our readers who reside in parts of the church where the office of the deacon is not controverted, to bear with us in giving some of our pages occasionally to this subject. All sections of the church are not equally favoured. There are some where this is still a "present truth."

Certainly not. They have the entire management of the estate, and the owner who has made the assignment has no more to say in its future management until the ends of the trust are fulfilled, than any other man. Are the trustees of congregations chartered under the general act of the state of New York, subject to the will of the people who intrust them? Verily not. The people have no control whatever over their acts: the law does all—or rather leaves the trustees, within certain sufficiently wide limits, to do *all*. True, a trustee has certain limits and ends, prescribed by the nature of the trust; but this does not imply any *subjection* on his part to the will of the intrusting party, otherwise this Synod has long, very nearly throughout its whole existence, been under the government of the people. We have missionary funds, seminary funds, funds for travelling expenses—all of which receive from the donor a definite direction. Nor can this Synod change this by transferring the mission fund to the seminary—or the travelling fund to missions. This has been the great bugbear in Mr. Crozier's mind—he has imagined, through ignorance of the most elementary principles on this subject, that the management of funds by the deacon, upon the principle of carrying out the design of the donors, is to subject the courts of the church to popular control.

In these two mistakes—that about the meaning of the old phrase “circa sacra,” and that which I have just adverted to—Mr. C.'s whole system seems to have originated; certainly, on them it is built. To the last of these I shall refer again.

Having premised these remarks, I proceed to consider the points stated. And, *First, does Mr. C. teach the doctrines charged?* that is, does Mr. C. teach that the civil magistrate, of right, holds and manages the property of the church? and that no ecclesiastical officer, as such, can buy, sell, &c.? He does. His own language is,

“As an elder, he may not buy—sell—make civil contracts about church property, &c.”

Again he says,

“Are not those brethren aware that church officers (he does not except deacons) cannot be made trustees of a congregation?”

Again,

“Why continue the trustee in the person of the elder? Are not those brethren aware, that the elder, *as such*, never may be identified with and occupy the place of the civil ruler; nor do the civil ruling which the Head of the church has assigned to him? Is. xlix. 23.”

An attempt has been made to free Mr. C. from the charge against him by insisting upon the phrase, “church property,” as if no more was meant than that property, until dedicated, cannot be “church property,” and, of course, should not be under ecclesiastical control. True; but what bearing has this upon the case at issue? Mr. C. denies, and this is the burden of the charge against him, that any such property as that which is ordinarily managed by trustees can be dedicated so as to bring it into the church, and under her control. For what purpose did he write this article? Was it not to rebuke the Miami congregation for putting their property as *dedicated* into the hands of church officers? And why does he rebuke them? Because by so doing they authorized their elders to encroach upon the province of the civil magistrate: to him, says Mr. C., by a strange perversion of the meaning of Isa. xlix. 23, belongs the possession, and control and distribution of all such property

as is usually put into the hands of trustees. I do not quote his words: I give his doctrine, for he says referring to the plan on which the Miami congregation proceeded—"It is essentially anti-government." That is, for church officers to hold and manage this property and those funds by which the ordinances are kept up, and the ministry maintained, is "anti-government." But more than this, if more be wanted: Mr. C. calls the trustee,

"A substitute for the civil magistrate,"
and teaches that,

"In the absence of the civil functionary, the people, who, in their *civil* capacity, identify with him, must do all this:"

That is, attend to the pecuniary affairs of the church. According to Mr. C. the whole apparatus of trustees, managers, committees, &c., are merely temporary substitutes for a scriptural magistracy; of course when such a magistracy comes into existence, they are to disappear, and the magistrate, by divine right, will do all that they ordinarily do. The church, consequently, *as such*, never can hold, or control any of that property which is to be employed in her maintenance and in sustaining the administration of her ordinances: she has no property, and can have none—unless it may be a poor's fund. And even this, she would find it hard to manage upon Mr. C.'s principle; for he says,

"Where in all the standards is the deacon authorized to make or enforce civil contracts?"

Now, if this be true, the diaconate would be little worth. All that the deacon could do, would be to hand money to the poor for *their* disposal. He could not rent a room for the poor and helpless, nor buy medicine for the sick, nor contract for the passage westward of some poor emigrant. He could do nothing of most of those duties which devolve upon the active deacon, particularly in large towns.

Mr. C. does teach, very distinctly, the doctrine charged in the libel. He does teach that, of divine right, the magistrate has entire control of church property and church funds, such as are usually managed at present by trustees, and are known even in law as such.

Second, Is this doctrine opposed to the standards of the church? I hold that it is, and appeal (1.) *To the scriptures.* And here the question is, do the scriptures teach that the church, as such, can hold and manage by her own officers, funds for her own support? So far as the Old Testament and the Mosaic system are concerned, there can be no two opinions. The church then held property. The state did neither hold nor manage it for her. The priests had their cities, they collected and distributed their tithes. This property was the "Lord's," in a peculiar sense, and yet it went, not to the poor, but to support the church. Moreover, property might be freely devoted, and when so devoted, it became the property of the church. Is it necessary to quote texts? Turn to Lev. xxvii. 16—21. In this passage we have presented the case of a man who "sanctifies his house, or some part of the field of his possession, to be holy unto the Lord." Now whose was it? The magistrate's? No: but (verse 21.) "*The possession thereof shall be the priests'.*" Again, in 1 Chron. xxix. we have an account of a very remarkable transaction—the dedication by David and the chief men of the twelve tribes, of great treasures for a religious use, the building of the temple. Now, to whom were these treasures committed? Were

they put into the *national* treasury? No. They were given "to the treasure of the house of the Lord by the hand of Jehiel the Gershonite." Again, in Neh. vii. 70, we are informed that with "some of the chief of the fathers," "the Tirshatha (the chief magistrate, Nehemiah himself) gave unto the work" of completing the house of the Lord. Did these contributions go into the national treasury? Certainly not. It would have made the transaction a mere mockery, at least on the part of the Tirshatha. But what is conclusive, we are expressly told, chap. x. 38, 39, and xiii. 13, that all contributions for religious uses went into a separate treasury, and that under the charge of priests and Levites.

So much for the Mosaic institutions. But the Old Testament contains prophecies—prophecies about the church in New Testament—in millennial-times, and among them are some that bear upon the subject before us. Turn to Ps. lxxii. 10. What is meant by, "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts?" To whom? To Christ? Yes. But to Christ through his church. They "shall bring presents—offer gifts." Of course, the church must be at liberty to receive them: she has the right to hold property and use it for the promotion of Christ's kingdom. We may advert to Is. lx. where the same announcement is made in more ample terms, of course implying the same thing—the church's right to receive gifts and presents, not merely of silver and gold, but of any other kind that may be requisite to her maintenance and extension. We refer, lastly, to Ezekiel, xlvi. In this chapter there is given, in Old Testament phraseology, a prophetic description of the New Testament church. Among other arrangements, verses 9 and 10, is the following: "The oblation that ye shall offer unto the Lord shall be of five and twenty thousand in length, and of ten thousand in breadth, and for them, even for the priests, shall be this oblation." Will it belong to the national treasury? Will it be under magistratical control? No. And we add, that under this, partially symbolical, description, is clearly comprehended all contributions, including national, to the church for her support as an independent society: houses, glebes, churches, foundations of all kinds, as well as contributions to meet current expenditures. In the light of these prophecies, we do not see how any one dare assert that the church has no right, under the New Testament dispensation, to own property and manage it by her own officers for her own welfare.*

I appeal (2.) *To the history and subordinate standards of the church.* And, here, I have been largely anticipated, and am at liberty to touch very cursorily upon some, for the purpose of insisting more at length upon other, portions of this field less dwelt upon by those who have preceded me. Upon the whole history of the church down to the

* In regard to our argument from the prophecies, there can be no question as to its validity. The Reformers never hesitated to establish general principles by reference to the institutions of the Mosaic economy. Their views are contained in the following quotation from a discourse by Robert Pont, son-in-law of John Knox.

Having proposed the objection, that the Levitical law of Moses is abrogated, and that therefore his authorities from the Old Testament had no force under the gospel, he adds, "I answer concerning those lands or annual rents, out of lands delated and given to the kirk, that although the Levitical law, with the ceremonies thereof, concerning the outward observation hath taken an end and is fulfilled in Christ, yet the substance of the policy, concerning entertainment of the service of God, and up-hold of religion still remains."—*M'Crie's Life of Knox*, pp. 169, Ox. Ed.

reformation, I merely state that, from the opening of the New Testament dispensation, the church always claimed the right to hold, and always has held property. The same since the reformation down to our own times. To say nothing of other churches, this has been the doctrine and the practice of our covenanting fathers and brethren. And just now, funds for church purposes are managed, for instance, in Ireland, under the supervision of the session. In some the accounts are rendered yearly: in some oftener. On this subject I can speak to considerable extent from personal information. I give an example. At the close of the Sabbath's services in one of the largest and most respectable congregations connected with the synod, whose pastor holds a high place in the esteem of his brethren and of the people, an announcement was made of a meeting of *session* and *committee*. On our return, I asked the nature of the meeting. A meeting of the session, was the reply, and a member from each society. What is your business? To investigate the pecuniary affairs of the congregation. How often do you meet? Once in three months. In other words, said I, it is a *consistory* at which some in the United States are so much alarmed. Something like it, was the reply. Our Irish brethren know nothing of this dogma, that the church cannot look after money affairs in which her maintenance is concerned. In their letter to us, they state that at their meeting in 1848, they adopted the principle of a *common fund*—of course under the supervision of rulers as such—for ministerial support. So in Scotland, where such a fund is already in operation. And even more than that, they have, as a church, through their synod, taken action on the subject of *church debts*, and have raised for clearing of their congregations of debt, the sum of £8000 or £9000, by a plan devised by the synod in constituted court, and carried out under its direction! Their churches have not deacons, but, I am confident, they soon will, and at all events, they know nothing of this new-fangled dogma of Mr. C.'s. He has cut it out of whole cloth—it is a bold, and naked *innovation*.

It now becomes necessary to look at this subject as connected with the 2d Book of Discipline. This book is referred to in the libel, and the defendant has taken occasion to express himself very decidedly and not very favourably respecting its character and its claims to a respectful consideration in our attempts to ascertain the faith of the Church of Scotland on the point at issue. Now, what is this Book? And what has been its position as a standard all along in the sister churches in Great Britain, since its formation, until our own times? These topics I consider together: purposing, in the next place, to meet some allegations against it; and, finally, to examine its doctrines as they bear upon the doctrine of Mr. C.

In regard to the first matter of inquiry, I assert that no work on church government was ever compiled more carefully, or under circumstances as well calculated to give weight to its teachings. The 1st Book, drawn up rather hastily in 1560, although by competent hands, was confessedly imperfect; and hence, from the earliest periods, the attention of the most active minds in the church was directed to the compilation of a more complete work, embracing the same general system. The return of Andrew Melville from Geneva, in 1574, gave a new impulse on this subject. The work was then begun, and in 1578 it was completed and inserted in the registers of the church “in perpetuam memoriam rei,”

that it might be *ever* remembered. In confirmation of the remark above made, that this Book was prepared with the utmost care, I need only quote the following. It is from an address sent in 1584 by James Melville, then in exile, to some of his brethren in the ministry. Let it be weighed well. It will be found in Calderwood, vol. iv. p. 223, Ed. ed., 1845:

“To your great reproof I must call to mind the notable occasions of attaining the knowledge in these matters (of church government) that God offered unto you.

For besides your private studies in reading of the Scriptures, and so many learned men’s writings on these points, agreeing all in effect, in most sweet harmony, (which, if ye had been as diligently occupied as God gave time and occasion, ye needed not to allege ignorance for an excuse,) how were these heads handled in the Assemblies? has not the General Assembly, by the space of six or seven years almost, been hotly occupied in these questions? Were not the ministers, in all the quarters of the country, earnestly expected, and by public authority, commanded, to search and seek the Scriptures diligently, and all kinds of writers, old and new, for finding forth of the solid and undoubted truth? Were there not conferences appointed to be had in all parts among the brethren, in their weekly exercise and provincial assemblies, from which, men well instructed with reasons, and the judgment of the rest, where both by private and open reasoning, the opinions and sentences of all men were examined and tried, through every head of the Discipline of the kirk; and after long and often reasoning, all put on voting, and by a whole and uniform consent and agreement of the whole kirk in a General Assembly, and digested in conclusions, and inregistered in the books of the said Assembly, and extract thereof ordained to be given to every presbytery throughout the realm? Whether if this, joined with the continual practice of the self-same discipline these several years by-past may make us inexcusable before God, his kirk, and angels, the very blind world may judge.”

Certainly, this is not a Book to be despised. It cannot be overlooked. I go farther, however; this Book was not only adopted by the church, it was sworn to in the National Covenant, 1581. On this point, which some have ignorantly disputed, we have most conclusive testimony. I first quote from a letter written and published by James Melville in 1605. And, remember, he was a principal actor in all those things whereof he affirms.

“This cleareth sufficiently what was then the discipline of the Kirk of Scotland, meant and mentioned in the said Confession of Faith; so that far from all doubt or question, our General Assemblies were then most flourishing, frequent, and vigorous; full of reverence, gravity, and authority; the freedom and liberty thereof was the chief head and bulwark of all the discipline of our kirk, the which to impair or brangle, was indeed to intend the overthrow of kirk and religion. And this was so revered, so sworn and subscribed, yea, and published of new again, and ordained to be of new again sworn and subscribed, with a general bond in the year 1590, before the obtaining of the ratification in parliament in the year 1592.

“This then being the discipline sworn and subscribed, dare any of the swearers or subscribers come in the contrary thereof? or damn the faithful ministers of Christ for the use and practice of it, unless they would prove and profess themselves apostates and perjured? Yea, or can they refuse to obey and defend the same, according to their vocation and power, all the days of their life, seeing it is, and stands upon the danger both of body and soul, in the day of God’s fearful judgment, as the foresaid set down tenor of their oath bears.”*

To the same purpose, the renowned George Gillespie. We quote from his “Dispute against English Popish Ceremonies,” written in 1637, in reply to the pretended Bishop of Edinburgh, who, *with all the prelatical party at that time*, took the ground that this Book was *not* sworn in the National Covenant. And, let it be remembered again, that Gillespie’s testimony is, under the circumstances, the testimony of the reformers of the *second* Reformation. His language is most explicit:

* Cald. vol. vi. pp. 318, 319.

"The Bishop doth but needlessly question what is meant by the discipline whereof the oath speaketh; for howsoever in ecclesiastical use, it signify oftentimes that policy which standeth in the censuring of manners, yet in the oath it must be taken in the largest sense, namely, for the whole policy of the church: for, 1. The whole policy of this church did at that time go under the name of discipline; and these two books wherein this policy is contained, were called, The Books of Discipline. And without all doubt, they who swore the oath meant by *discipline that whole policy of the church which is contained in these books.*" *

If any more proof be needed, we have it in the "Apologetical Relation," by John Brown, of Wamphray, published in 1665. The author, again an actor in the scenes he speaks of. Opposing, like Gillespie, the arguments of the *prelatists*, he says:

"This is known, that both Assemblies and ministers understood that king and court, and all the land, were bound to own Presbyterian government, by virtue of that covenant, several times thereafter. There is a letter which Mr. Andrew Melville (who no doubt knew the mind of the Assemblies) wrote unto divines abroad, 1584, in which, speaking of the discipline of the church, he saith, (as reverend Mr. Petrie citeth in his history, p. 448,) 'And three years since was approved, sealed and confirmed, with profession of faith, subscription of hand, and religion of oath, by the king and every subject of every state particularly.' † ‡

Again :

"In that same Assembly, 1581, the second book of discipline was inserted in the registers of the church, and immediately after the covenant was inserted, that all posterity might see that the government which they swore to maintain and own in the confession or covenant, was the same which was contained in the book of discipline; and thus that book of discipline and the confession or covenant did harmoniously accord." ‡

He thus concludes a protracted argument :

"Now the reader may judge from these particulars what was the sense of the church of Scotland at that time of the confession or covenant, and whether these citations amount to any thing or not; and whether or not this author had any reason to slight and undervalue, so far as he doth, the pains taken by that reverend Assembly to clear the oath according to the sense of those who first took it." §

This is enough. He is a bold man, to say the least, who would contradict Melville, Gillespie and Brown of Wamphray. No member of this court will do it.

But, did not the Church of Scotland set aside this Book when she adopted the Westminster Form? No. For in the act approving the Directory, passed Feb. 3d, 1645, there is the following clause:

"It is also provided, that this shall be no prejudice to the order and practice of this kirk, in such particulars as are appointed by the books of discipline, and acts of General Assemblies, and are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory." ||

Again, the act approving the Form of Government, passed Feb. 10th, 1645, begins thus :

"The General Assembly being most desirous and solicitous, not only of the establishment and preservation of the Form of Kirk Government in this kingdom, according to the word of God, books of Discipline, acts of General Assemblies, and National Covenant," &c. ¶

Now, in view of these declarations, who will venture to affirm that this Book was laid aside during the second Reformation? So far from it, were not the Books of Discipline *expressly* recognised by the first quotation as existing law; and, in the second, as a standard to which attainments were to be brought and by which they were to be tried? But

* Eng. Pop. Cer. p. 213, Edin. ed. 1844.

† Apol. Rel. p. 202.

‡ Apol. Rel. p. 204.

§ Apol. Rel. p. 204.

|| Confession of Faith, p. 478.

¶ Confession of Faith, p. 504.

we have more evidence still. The Scottish parliament, whose authority on this question will not be doubted, quotes the second book, years after this, as law in the church. We refer to the act abolishing patronages, passed March 9, 1649, "considering that the same is contrary to the *second Book of Discipline*." This is conclusive: but we have not yet done. In what light did the Reformed Presbytery regard this Book, after its constitution in the last century? Did they reject it, or throw it in the shade? No, verily. Hear them. We quote from the *old Scottish Testimony*, pp. 9, 10:

"The Church, gradually increasing in beauty and perfection, did, with much painfulness and faithful diligence, labour after a more full establishment of the house of God, in all its privileges, until, by perfecting the second book of discipline, they completed the *exact model of Presbytery*, which, though they had enjoyed national assemblies for a considerable time, yet was not brought to such an *entire conformity to the divine pattern*, nor so generally acquiesced in till now, that it was unanimously approved by the assembly, 1590, and particularly enjoined to be subscribed by all who did bear office in the church; and, at last, they prevailed to get it publicly voted and approved in parliament, June, 1592."*

Mark the expressions which we have italicised. And say, whether the M'Millans, and the Thorburns, and the Fairleys, held the second Book of Discipline in light esteem? But did they recognise its authority as a standard? Yes. We quote their own explicit language:

"Again, the Presbytery hereby testify and declare their approbation of, and adherence unto all the different steps of reformation, that ever, in any period, were attained unto in this church and land; particularly, besides what has been mentioned above, they declare their adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, as it was approved by act of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, anno 1647; Catechisms, Larger and Shorter; Form of Church Government; Directory for Worship; and *Books of Discipline*, as agreeable to, and extracted from the Sacred Oracles."* †

To this many members of this Synod and private members in the church were sworn in connecting themselves with the church in Great Britain, or in taking office, and many by baptismal engagement. ‡

Here I pause. It is not my intention to trace the history of this Book any further. Nor do I mean to argue from it in this case as *formal* law in this church. My design has been merely to show that Mr. Crozier errs, in teaching, as he does in substance, that the church cannot hold or manage that property which goes to sustain her ordinances and worship, contradicts the sworn standards of the Church of Scotland during her first and *second* Reformations, and down to our own times. This I will soon show, when I come to compare the doctrines of this Book with those of Mr. C.

(To be continued.)

* Testimony, p. 174.

† "Books:" for the first remained obligatory, except where superseded by the second. This is not singular. The Old Testament remains *formally* binding, except as set aside by the New Dispensation. The same principle was acted upon in adopting the Directory, as we have seen above. Care must be employed in comparing documents so related; but, with care, all is sufficiently easy.

‡ We mention as members of Synod, sworn to the 2d Book of Discipline, J. Douglas, D. Scott, Wm. Sloane, T. Hannay, J. Blackwood, Robt. Johnson, and Andrew Bowden, with, perhaps, others.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMERS AND REFORMATION.*

The real history of Scotland begins at the Reformation. . . .

We have little respect for that kind of historical composition, which glitters, like a tournament, with armour and lances, and resounds with the clash of swords; and as little for the artist who will not degrade his pencil to portray any lineaments but those of the kings and princes, and nobles of the earth. That is not history, to our minds. We would rather watch and trace the gradual, but constant, growth to strength and maturity, of a hardy, deep-thinking, and strong-willed commonalty—less swayed by popular fickleness—less moved by the frown of power—less shaken by the vicissitudes of affairs—more firm and steadfast in the prosecution of their views and purposes throughout nearly three centuries, than any other people of modern Europe. How that deep and fervent spirit was first evoked, and how it grew and strengthened, gathering vigour from every fall, and drawing nurture even from the blasts of persecution,—how the flame was re-animated when low—how it scorched when it burned the brightest—and how intellect, education, morals, and social order have flourished or decayed under its beams—this, to be well and rightly told, is our idea of the history of Scotland.

The Scottish Reformation.—Its character and its Authors.—No doubt the prevalent feature in such a story is the deep Religious spirit which has always animated the people. But that was not a spirit which found vent merely in Scriptural phraseology, or fasts, or conventicles. It was the basis and groundwork of a great, and, in some respects, of a noble system of national polity—comprehending within it many of the essential elements of freedom in the civil, and of morals, order, and accomplishment in the social community. The men who founded it were no rude, unenlightened, or unlettered bigots. They were men skilled in the languages, familiar with the institutions, and not ignorant of the courts of Europe—as well as eminent, in many instances, among the scholars of that time. ‘Perhaps,’ says a well-known writer, ‘some of our literati who entertain such diminutive ideas of the taste and learning of those times, might be surprised if they could be set down at the table of one of our Scottish reformers, surrounded by a circle of his children and pupils, when the conversation was all carried on in French, and the chapter of the Bible at family worship, was read by the boys in Latin, French, Greek, and Hebrew.’ Knox himself was quite qualified to take his place among the men of letters of his day. His mind had been enlarged by long residence on the Continent, and he was no stranger in the highest and most courtly circles. The name of Melville stood side by side with that of Buchanan, and near the very head of European scholars. He was the friend of Beza and of Scaliger, and the correspondent of Cassaubon : and the man who,

* This article is made up of extracts from a review in the April No. of the Edinburgh Quarterly of the Duke of Argyll's late work on the history of Scottish Presbyterianism. The publication of such a work by a nobleman of so high rank, and a descendant of the martyred Argylls of the 17th century, is itself a very significant fact. And little less so is the publication of an article, in this influential magazine, so singularly favourable, in the main, to the Scottish Reformers and their cause. We publish these extracts, chiefly for their intrinsic value—though we would not endorse every word or phrase—and partly that our readers may see something of the tone and temper of the leading *liberal* periodical of Britain in regard to the principles and doings of our fathers.—ED. COV.

in open council, and to his own imminent danger, defied the coarse jeers of his too learned sovereign, and the threats and persuasions of his counsellors, is found in his exile at Sedan, when almost an octogenarian, awaking his neglected muse in an epithalamium on a royal marriage. But, above all, those who laid the foundation of Scottish Presbytery, were men acquainted with affairs, and possessed of thorough knowledge of the world. It was no system of mere bigotry or priestcraft which they proposed to establish; nor were they a society of Jesuits, who sought to bend and beguile all human institutions and relations to the purposes of their order. Their object was not merely to found a theological institute, but to provide a great system of religious and moral training for the people—much more than to carry out speculative views on civil and spiritual powers. How far the principles of their polity in the latter particular were sound in themselves, or practically expedient, is, of course, a question open to many opinions. But, with them, ‘New Presbyter’ was *not* ‘Old Priest writ large;’ whatever use it may in the course of our history have been afterwards turned. No one who candidly considers the fabric of the Church government founded by Knox, and matured by his successors, can fail to read there, vividly portrayed, the lineaments of strong practical sagacity and worldly wisdom—and both the outline and the substance of a great scheme of national instruction. The best memorial of their success, and the most lasting monument to their fame, is the fact, that, to this day, the spirit they inspired remains among us in all original intensity; softened only by the greater liberality and tolerance of a more polished age, and by the moral and social results which are among the fruits of their labours.*

* We add the following from pages 247, 248. It is true and well-timed:

“The popular impression is, that Knox, and those who followed him, were stern, austere, and dreary bigots; with no conceptions wider than the narrowest and most literal views of Old Testament history—chilling all the affections, and blighting the graceful acts of life by their severe and almost savage moroseness. The tears of a Queen too fair for her own happiness, and the ruins of the splendid but corrupt haunts of the Popish monks, are with many the principal memorials of the character and fame of the Scottish Reformers. Men forget that these, even to the extent to which they in any degree were characteristic of the men or of the times, are but incidental features in a great picture. They are episodal in the history of a great revolution, of which these so-called zealots were the successful leaders. Is it rational to forget, with such unmanly whinings over a woman’s beauty, or the ruins of an all but heathen temple, the brave and devoted contest which Knox and his companions, at the peril of their lives, waged for the people against kingly and courtly power? It is very well for antiquaries to lament, and semi-Protestants to decry, the events of that time; but the Scotch Reformation was not merely a religious revolution, either in its elements or its results. The liberties of Scotland were founded on it; and not of Scotland only, but of England also. But for the Scottish Reformation, Popery would most probably have regained its sway in both countries; and the British constitution, only then beginning to germinate, would probably have been blighted in its spring. Nothing but the unbroken firmness of Knox, individually, thwarted the intrigues of France and Spain for the overthrow, in Scotland, of the Huguenot heresy—which was not less alarming to the civil tyrants than it was to the spiritual despots of Europe. We may read in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the news of which reached the Scottish Reformer on his death-bed, and called forth his last and dying denunciation, the fate which was in store for the religion and liberties of our country, from which these men alone preserved her.”

Its Calvinism and serious morality.—The Presbyterian system, thus established at first, has produced two very prominent and notable effects on the national character. The first and most striking of these is the attachment of the people to their Calvinistic creed; and the independent logical turn of mind natural to the constant study of doctrinal and controversial theology. This is at the present day a popular feature of the Scotch; and it has been so throughout their history. We may attribute to this cause, taken in connexion with the system of parochial schools, the comparatively intellectual cast of the habits and recreations even of the peasantry. No system of priestly domination could ever have done this for them. Had the spirit of Presbytery been one in which the right of private judgment was surrendered into the hands of a privileged order, it never could have quickened the minds of its adherents, with that habit and love of intelligent inquiry which is so characteristic of our countrymen. It was the utter absence of such pretensions in her canons and her teaching, that led her followers to think, and judge, and decide, with such courage for themselves. Far more truly than the ancient philosophy, the spirit of Presbytery made the peasant a king to himself; the unmolested possessor and unchallenged expositor of the words of divine wisdom; treading with equal step, side by side with peer and proprietor, the path to their common inheritance. Even now, especially where the spread of manufactures has not yet let in the stream of an alien population, or levelled, by the vices or virtues common to vast aggregations of men, the distinctive types of the nation, a casual traveller may find, in a road-side cotter's hut—wanting, it may be, in many English decencies, unsightly to the eye, and gratifying to no other sense—the great dogmas of Calvin, Socinus, or Arminius, discussed with a clearness of intelligence, and precision of logic, that would not discredit a professed divine. Any one who knows the people will feel that this is no exaggeration. Practically, though not avowedly, theology is taught and studied as a science; and certainly no science, viewing it simply as such, is so fitted to call out and exercise the powers of judgment, reasoning and accurate and acute discrimination. Thus, as Sabbath after Sabbath returns, with its grave and becoming observances, its respectable family hearth, its thronged and intellectual public services, the Scottish peasant in reality undergoes, almost unconsciously, a mental training of a very high order; and in his honest search after the riches of futurity, lays up the habits and endowments of mind that often raise him to those of this world.

It is certainly true that the gravity and seriousness thus induced, detract considerably, in the eyes of strangers especially, from the external aspect of the people. There is often a certain sobriety, approaching, it may be, to gloom, in their external demeanour, and a self-reliance, tending to bigotry, in their judgments and opinions of others. Allowance, however, is seldom sufficiently made for national peculiarities of manner or temperament. We can well suppose that when Mary was first transplanted—the fairest flower in the gardens of France—to the frowning walls of Holyrood, her light and thoughtless spirit would recoil in disgust from the sombre countenances, grave discourse, and rigid observances of our early Reformers. Even still, a Presbyterian Sabbath wears a dismal appearance to those accustomed to the gaieties of continental customs; and it is rather fashionable for writers of our own time to affect the liberality of lamenting the puritanical and fana-

tical observances of Scotland. But such complaints will be sparingly made by those, whatever their own opinions, who look more closely to the people themselves, *and the result* of their stricter habits on the social condition. The grave courtiers of 1560 were men who, while they would and could have built a throne for Mary in the hearts of her people, were no enemies or strangers to the courtesies and pleasures of life, though they looked with probably a more scrupulous eye than their successors in our own times, on some of its lighter amusements. They had learned, in their reformed creed, that life had higher objects than to be laughed away in a circle of excitement or frivolity, and sought the recreations suited to strong and earnest minds. So, still, it would be vain, even were it at all desirable, to endeavour to make the Scotchman spend his day of rest, after the fashion of the thoughtless but gay Parisian. It would have no charms for him. Sound and glitter are not his conception of enjoyment—which is no where better painted than in Burns's Cotter's Saturday Night, in its spirit of cheerful, yet solemn and devotional comfort. Shallow observers not unfrequently make the mistake of insisting on men being happy and miserable in their way, not their own. But the Scotch character, if not gay, is substantially cheerful; and below the homely and sometimes repulsive exterior, is generated much well-regulated masculine sense, not less capable of enjoyment, and more capable of continued and persevering emotion, than his more brilliant neighbour. The gaieties of Versailles could not preserve the throne of the Bourbons from the Reign of Terror; nor could the light-hearted holidays of modern Paris save her from the most fearful of intramural massacres. In Scotland we feel ourselves safe from such scenes, chiefly because the anchors of public principle are more deeply and firmly fixed, and we have a security in the thoughtful and intelligent spirit of our countrymen, which would be ill exchanged for the splendid follies of a carnival.

Its Democratic Tendencies.—The other strong feature which we think was impressed on us by the system of Presbytery established at the Reformation, is the tendency of the people in favour of democratic or popular government. We have already remarked that prior to the Reformation, the feudal feeling was much stronger among the people of Scotland than that of personal independence. At this day the reverse is eminently the case: so much so, that since the Reform Bill threw open to her the system of popular election, there have been no more true and steadfast friends of progressive reform than the large constituencies of Scotland. Nor is it difficult to trace the causes which have led to this result. The Reformation in Scotland was a movement which, while religious, was essentially democratic. We do not use the term as at all synonymous with republican—for that it was not; nor were any of the principles of the early Reformers opposed to the lawfulness or the expediency of monarchy. But both the canons and the outward fabric of the Church of Scotland were strongly tinged with the popular element. The distinct assertion of the right of private judgment, the constant use of the Scriptures, the absence of gradations among the clergy and, what, with all the deference to the Duke of Argyll, we think characteristic of the institution, the disclaimer of mere priestly tyranny, naturally led to independence of mind on the part of the people so instructed. The whole system, indeed, of church polity was a large and wide-spread scheme of popular representation. The

individual congregations were presided over by the minister and lay elders, forming the Kirk Session; the elders being office-bearers in the church, as well as the minister, and being members of the congregation. Each Kirk Session sent a minister and elder to the Presbytery, a provincial court, meeting usually once a month, and composed of representatives from the different Kirk Sessions of a district. These Presbyteries, united, formed Synods, meeting twice a year; and last of all, the great superintending body of the Church, the General Assembly, is composed of ministers, and lay elders elected by the different Presbyteries, along with a number of lay elders returned, without any clerical interference, by the royal burghs.

Its Incompatibility with Tyranny.—It is plain that under such a system, the voice of the people must necessarily, sometimes to a greater, sometimes to a smaller extent, rule the deliberations and control the ambition of the clergy. It was impossible, while the system was fairly worked, that any arbitrary power should reign within the Church. The large proportion of lay members of which the General Assembly was composed, gave it, in fact, more the character of a convocation of estates, than of a merely ecclesiastical tribunal. Indeed, after the Union had removed the Legislature from Scotland, the General Assembly really possessed much both of the interest and the practical and moral power of a Parliament. Orators and debaters were trained there. From all parts of the island, from the distant Hebrides, and from Dutch Campvere, the members of Assembly came, through districts where even now travelling is no trifle, and where it was then far more laborious than a summer excursion to the Pyramids is now. Here sat a peer, whose slender rent-roll and miles of barren acres forbade him to carry his aristocracy southward; there, perhaps, flashed the keen eye of Scotland's greatest lawyer. All that was rising in intellect and learning sought distinction on those benches. The provincial provost, whose journey from the north was the great event of his life, gave his silent but assiduous attendance, and spent the remainder of his official and private life in recounting the debates. The judge descended from the bench to fill his place in the Assembly. The Westland laird left his crofts, and the Glasgow merchant his counting-house; and ever and anon, amid the crowd of gentle and simple in the great court of the church, would be seen the blue bonnet, and grave, sagacious, and solemnized face of a farmer from the Mearns or the Border.

The power of the magistrate.—Within this community the civil power obviously could have no standing or rule. Kings and princes, in the theory of Presbytery, were but fellow members of the same divine community, capable of acquiring rule within it in the same way as, but in no other way than, the humblest of the flock. There were, however, *duties connected with the Church* which were held to be incumbent on the civil magistrate. These were not privileges, but *duties*;—a distinction which his Grace of Argyll overlooks. The civil magistrate was bound, in the first place, to maintain and support the true Church—not that the magistrate was entitled to decide for any one which was the true Church—but that his duty, as the secular arm, was to protect the Church which was the true one; the truth of it being a certain fact, depending, not on man's opinion, but on God's Word. This is sometimes represented as mere bigotry, claiming for one side what is denied to the other. That it too often leads to such results is true; but ab-

stractly, the view itself is not illogical. The reasoning is this: Man may be fallible in his judgment, but the truth or falsehood of his religion is a certain fact, whether he can discover it or not. It is the duty of every one, especially of every government, to promote truth; it is not, and cannot be, the duty of any government to promote error, even though they think it truth. Error may be practically supported, conscientiously and ignorantly—but it never can be the duty of any one to promote it. This is the plain principle on which Knox called in the aid of the civil power to second and assist the childhood of Presbytery. He *assumed*, no doubt, as propositions too plain for dispute, that Popery was error, and the Reformed religion truth; and from that fact, as a postulate, he deduced the conclusion that the civil magistrate was bound to protect the true Church in the exercise of their functions, and to prevent, by a strong hand, the teaching and spread of error.

Our noble author appears, in the work before us, quite to have lost sight of this,—which is the real view on which Scottish Presbyterians, from that day to this, have held the duties of the civil power to be based. It is not wonderful that in the days of Knox, when from one week to the next, men could not be confident that they might not pass from their pulpit to a prison for life, the Reformers were more careful to enlarge on the duty of the civil magistrate to protect the truth, than on the right of the Church to declare it. They had not at that time seen, in the precocious yet promising boy, who even then stammered Latin with George Buchanan, that sage and oracular defender of the faith, whose kingcraft revolutionized England, and whose theological lore upset the Church of Scotland in the succeeding century. Protection and recognition were what they then wanted; the interference of the civil power with the intrinsic matters of the Church, was not the evil nor the topic of the day. But the Duke of Argyll concludes very hastily from this, that Knox held that the civil power had a spiritual jurisdiction; a right, in short, to deliberate *with* the Church and *for* the Church in spiritual matters. But he will search in vain, in the early Presbyterian Church, for any such opinion. All the passages he finds on assume that the truth or falsehood of particular tenets have been already clearly and definitely fixed by lawful authority; and they only assert what we suppose succeeding Presbyterians have always asserted, the obligation of civil rulers to promote and protect them.*

OLD AND NEW SYSTEMS OF EDUCATION.

“Of all the vulgar errors promulgated by authority, or accepted by credulity, none is more capable of refutation by experience than the belief that the old university instruction was the best conceivable preparation of the mind for the labours of active and professional life. . . . Is there any man alive who can say, not with truth but even with conviction, that the best or most laborious scholars and mathematicians of the University are the best

* The above extract is worthy of notice, not only as it contains a very clear statement of a very important doctrine, but also, and particularly, as showing the judgment of an intelligent and disinterested witness respecting the views of the Reformers as to the limits of the civil power. In this light the extract is of some value as testimony in behalf of our fathers against those pretended descendants who delight in holding them up to reprobation as half Erastians, as admitting the civil power *into* the church, and that with authority to control its deliberations and judgment.—Ed. Cov.

lawyers, physicians, philosophers, or statesmen of England? The very reverse is the plain, even if it be not the acknowledged fact. . . . It would be difficult to find at present among the most eminent leaders in Westminster Hall, any whose academical career was distinguished by studies, or crowned with honours, either mathematical or classical. The extent to which academical distinctions have latterly been thrown into the back-ground in the professional and public life of England, has gone lengths which indeed surprise us."

"Had our lawyers always laid the foundation of their learning in the comprehensive studies of an enlightened university—had they been taught there not the microscopic details of practice and technicality, but the axioms and the theorems of that noble code, which, originally derived from the moral sense of a great legislative race, has permeated and inspired the common law of England and the statute-book of every civilized nation in the world—we might have had more luminaries on the bench as illustrious as Holt and Mansfield, and have been spared the reproaches which have been not unjustly heaped on the prolix captiousness of English practitioners."

"The innovation (the introduction of a more extensive course in Mathematics and the Natural Sciences) may find favour with some who would have otherwise discouraged it, when we remind them of the opinion expressed some years ago by so distinguished a scholar and philosopher as Sir J. Herschel. It is contained in a letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. Adamson, asking for his advice upon the course he should recommend in the case of one of our foreign settlements.

"A good practical system of public education ought, in my opinion, to be more real than formal; I mean, should convey much of the positive knowledge with as little attention to mere systems and conventional forms as is consistent with avoiding solecisms. This principle, carried into detail, would allow much *less weight to the study of languages, especially of dead languages*, than is usually considered its due in our great public schools, where, in fact, the acquisition of the latter seems to be regarded as the one and only object of education. While, on the other hand, it would attach greater importance to all those branches of practical and theoretical knowledge, whose possession goes to constitute an idea of a well-informed gentleman; as, for example, a knowledge of the nature and constitution of the world we inhabit—its animal, vegetable, and mineral productions, and their uses and properties as subservient to human wants. Its relation to the system of the universe, and its natural and political subdivisions; and last and most important of all, the nature and propensities of man himself, as developed in the history of nations and the biography of individuals; the constitutions of human society, including our responsibilities to individuals and to the social body of which we are members. In a word, as extensive a knowledge as can be grasped and conveyed in an elementary course of the actual system and laws of nature, both physical and moral."—*Ed. Review.*

Thus write the Edinburgh reviewers in the No. for April, 1849. Their object is so to change the whole course of University education as to lay a better foundation, by the introduction of a larger infusion of science, for the active business and professional pursuits to which most graduates are destined; and, viewed from their "stand-point"—the fitting of students for this world's strife and honours—they are labouring wisely. We also wish to effect certain changes in the course of education, not by curtailing the amount of instruction in the dead languages, but by so altering the course as that, while a sufficient knowledge is acquired of these tongues, and a corresponding amount of intellectual training secured, there may be, at the same time, an exclusion of corrupting elements, and a much larger amount of Scriptural and sanctifying attainments put in the way of the student. Men of the world see the folly of employing young men, for years, in studies largely foreign to their future occupations; we see, or think we see, the folly and the sin

of employing them for years in studies not only foreign to their future occupations, but absolutely hurtful to their Christian and moral character. These men are not seduced by a blind devotion to the pagan classics to imagine that to know *them* is to be educated. Let them teach us. Besides, it is a significant fact, that "academical distinctions have latterly been thrown into the back-ground in professional and public life;" and that in England, where these "distinctions" have been so dearly won, and where, of course, they should have opened the best and shortest road to eminence, the "best lawyers" have not risen from among "the most laborious scholars (in the languages, meaning) and mathematicians of the University." Why not, if by these studies only mind can be polished, and invigorated, and fitted for forensic efforts? Let the hyper-admirers of pagan classical learning answer. We mistake the signs of the times, if we imagine opposition to pagan literature as the *basis* of a finished education is hopeless. It is gradually *wearing* out. *They* would substitute natural science, political economy, jurisprudence, &c.; without neglecting them, *we* would substitute the Bible, in the original tongues, and Christian literature.

EXTRACTS.

HOLINESS.—Holiness is the chiefest excellency of man, his highest advantage above inferior beings. It is the supreme beauty of the soul, the resemblance of angels, the image of God himself. In this the perfection of the reasonable nature truly consists, and glory naturally results from it. As a diamond, when its earthly and colourless parts are taken away, shines forth in its lustre; so when the soul is freed from its impurities and all terrene affections, it will appear with a divine brightness. The church shall then be glorious, when cleansed from every spot, and made complete in holiness.—*Bates on the Divine Attributes.*

THE TRUE REMEDY.—The gospel furnishes us with real remedies against all the evils of our present state. It is the true paradise wherein the tree of life is planted, whose "leaves are for the healing of the nations." We are assured that God disposes all things, with the wisdom and love of a father; and that his providence is most admirable and worthy of praise in those things wherein they who are only led by sense, doubt whether it be at all; for as it is the first point of prudence to keep off evils, so the second and more excellent is to make them beneficial. Christians "are more than conquerors through Christ that loves them." They are always in an ascending state; and believing, rejoice with an unspeakable and glorified joy. Death itself is not only disarmed, but made subservient to their everlasting good. Briefly, Christian patience endures all things as well as charity, because it expects a blessed issue. It draws from present miseries the assurance of future happiness. A believer, while he possesses nothing but the cross, sees by faith the crown of the eternal kingdom hanging over his head; and the "lively hope" of it makes him not only patient, but thankful and joyful. This sweetens the loss of all temporal goods, and the presence of all temporal evils. Paul in his chains was infinitely more contented than Cæsar or Seneca, than all the princes and philosophers in the world.—*Ib.*

THE HEAVENLY STATE.—In the present state we are not capable of receiving the full knowledge of heaven. What we understand is infinitely desirable, but the most glorious part is still undiscovered. The

apostle tells us, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Cor. ii. 9. All that is beautiful or sweet here, is but a shadow of that glory, a drop of that vast ocean of delights; for all that is desirable in the creatures, and is dispersed among them, is united in God as the original in an infinite and indeficient manner, with all the prerogatives that the creatures have not. Celestial blessedness as much exceeds our most raised thoughts, as God is more glorious in himself than in any representations made of him by the shadows of our earthly imaginations. There is a greater disproportion between the condition of a saint on earth and in heaven, than between the life of an infant in the womb, and of the same person when advanced to the throne, and attended with the nobility of a nation. John declares, "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be." 1 John iii. 2. Who knows the full signification of "being heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ," of partaking in that glorious reward which is given to him for his great services to the crown of heaven? Who can tell the weight, the number, and measure of that blessedness? "To him that overcometh," saith our Redeemer, "will I grant to sit down with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Rev. iii. 21. We have reason to break forth in the language of the Psalmist, "How great is thy goodness which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee!" and supply the defects of our understanding with a holy admiration, that is the only measure of those things that are above our measure. Psalm xxxi. 19.—*Ib.*

THE BEAUTIFUL VISION.—The vision of God in heaven is immediate. Adam was a spectator of God's works, and his understanding being full of light, he clearly discovered the divine attributes in their effects. The strokes of the Creator's hand are engraven in all the parts of the universe. The heavens and earth, and all things in them, are evident testimonies of the excellency of their Author. The "invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen." Rom. i. 20. And the knowledge that shined in his soul, produced a transcendent esteem of the Deity, in whom wisdom and power are united in their supreme degree, and a superlative love and delight in him for his goodness. Yet his sight of God was but "through a glass," an eclipsing medium; for inferior beings are so imperfect, that they can give but a weak resemblance of his infinite perfections. But the sight of God in heaven, is called the "seeing of him as he is," and signifies the most clear and complete knowledge which the rational soul, when purified and raised to its most perfect state, can receive, and outshines all the discoveries of God in the lower world. Adam had a visible copy of his invisible beauty, but the saints in heaven see the glorious original. He saw God in the reflection of the creature, but the saints are under the direct beams of glory, and "see him face to face." All the attributes appear in their full and brightest lustre to them: wisdom, love, holiness, power, are manifested in their exaltation. And the glorified soul, to qualify it for converse with God in this intimate manner, hath a more excellent constitution than was given to it in the creation. A new edge is put upon the faculties, whereby they are fitted for those objects which are peculiar to heaven. The intellectual eye is fortified for the immediate intuition of God. Adam in paradise was absent from the Lord, in comparison of the saints who encompass his throne, and are in the presence of his glory.—*Ib.*

REASONS OF DISSENT.

The following paper was laid upon the table of Synod the last evening of the sessions, but inasmuch as the attention of the officers of Synod was not drawn to it, it remained unnoticed until after the adjournment. Under these circumstances, the paper was not inserted in the records, but is now published, partly on account of its own merits, and partly as an act of justice to the parties signing it.

The undersigned respectfully dissent from the vote admitting Rev. Robert J. Dodds to a seat as a constituent member of Synod.

1st. Because his right to a seat is, to say the least, doubtful. Paley's rule is a good one, both for individuals and social bodies. "When there is doubt, suspend action." A higher authority says, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

2d. The argument and action of Synod go to subvert the great principle that the people should elect their own rulers. Mr. Dodds was not elected by any society or congregation to rule, nor by any court installed to rule in any portion of the church.

3d. It opens a wide door to corrupt the church. If Presbyterians can increase ministers as easily as the Queen makes peers, then any measure may be carried in Synod, contrary to the will of both pastors and people.

4th. It tends to subvert the great principles of ecclesiastical government, namely, unity and representation. It is certainly difficult to discover whom the man ordained *sine titulo* represents in a church court, and Synod during its present sessions has expressed its abhorrence of the claim set up that *he* represents the Lord Christ.

5th. Rev. R. J. Dodds was not admitted to his seat as a missionary under the care of this Synod, as some insinuate. He was introduced by the Pittsburgh Presbytery as one of its constituent members, and as such admitted to a seat in Synod.

6th. The argument and action of Synod confirmed the conferring of office power with its exercise. It is argued that because Mr. Dodds has been ordained, therefore he has a right, without election by the people, to exercise rule. David, though anointed of the Lord, and so God's king, yet did he not exercise the functions of a ruler till the people made him king, first at Hebron and then at Jerusalem.

7th. Because we find no warrant in the Bible, the subordinate standards, the footsteps of the flock or the practice of the Reformed Presbyterian Church till 1831, of rulers increasing their own number without the choice or consent of the members of the church.

8th. Because we think the statute which says a Presbytery is composed of ministers of the word, &c., &c., in a certain bounds means ministers duly called and settled, and not men ordained *sine titulo*, or ministers in the bounds either for business or pleasure.

ANDREW STEVENSON,
JAMES WIGGINS.

KENTUCKY.—DEBATE IN EMANCIPATION CONVENTION.

The Emancipationists in this state held a Convention about the close of the month of April, in the Capitol, in the city of Frankfort. One hundred and sixty delegates, representing twenty counties, were present. Among them, the two Drs. Breckenridge, Judge Nicholas, C. M. Clay, J. G. Fee, and other well-known names. The object was to

prepare a basis in which the Anti-Slavery strength of the state might concentrate itself in the coming Convention to amend the Constitution. They agreed to confine their efforts to two points.

1. The absolute prohibition of the importation of any more slaves in Kentucky.
2. The complete power in the people of Kentucky to enforce and perfect, in or under the new Constitution, a system of gradual prospective emancipation of slaves.

The discussions brought out some strong Anti-Slavery utterances, and a good deal of colonization wickedness. The majority seem to have fallen in with the views of Henry Clay—emancipation, but remote and gradual, and *only* with colonization. However, they have made a beginning. As the question is agitated, and especially, when the public caldron begins to boil, the scum will rise to the surface and be skimmed off. We cull a few of the strongest Anti-Slavery expressions.

Thomas M. Smith, of Louisville, said he was born a slaveholder—had owned as a fiduciary, and in his own right, a large number. He began in early life to believe there was something unnatural in the relation of master and slave; and that opinion has grown and strengthened with his manhood and old age. Nor can Slavery be defended upon moral grounds. No man has a moral right to his slave. And if you are attacked because of the alleged immorality of emancipation, you may promptly reply by demanding to know by what moral right the slave is and has been held.

James M. Todd, of Shelby, remarked, I confess I have never loved this institution of Slavery. I have felt that it has retarded immeasurably the onward, upward march of this great State. Besides, like all other evils, it is growing daily. The number is yearly increasing, while the outlets and foreign demand is diminishing. If we do nothing, is there not reason to fear that we shall soon be like old Virginia, where the great planter, failing to raise enough to eat, is compelled to eat up five or six of his best slaves every year!

Our large farms in Kentucky are yearly extending in size. We are forced to extend them to make food for our young negroes. When our children grow up, we cannot divide our plantations. We are forced to keep them to sustain our servants, and the necessary result is that our sons are compelled to go to the far West, and our daughters die old maids.

Mr. Robinson, of Franklin, remarked, there are but few who admire the Slavery of Kentucky; and with many of that few, it is a sentiment rather than a principle. Their birth-place is Old Virginia—there they spent their youth. Slavery was there, and every thing in Virginia was perfect. You know, sir, the strength of this feeling among Virginians. The immigrant from even those portions of it which Slavery has desolated—from the eastern sand hills—where the people subsist one half the year on fish and oysters, and the other half on *past recollections*—amid all the fertility of the west—sighs for the sand hills and fish and oysters of old Virginia.

Mr. Robt. J. Breckinridge, of Fayette, said, the consideration of these questions is of vast importance. Fifty years ago our fathers had this question up before them; it is now re-produced, and we come again to its consideration. Let us so act in regard to it, that we may transmit to our posterity, as we have received it, the most inextinguishable hatred of, and hostility to, this most atrocious of all human institutions. A large majority of the voters of the State are non-slaveholders. They too as a class had been poisoned against us. They have been appealed to—they have been told that we propose to rob the slaveholder of his property. They have been told that we disregard the vested right of the master in the slave—all these things are told to the non-slaveholder; but they forget to tell him that the highest property man can have, is the property in himself.

W. M. O. Smith, of Bourbon, was in favour of the proposed amendment, because it follows legitimately our first resolution. If we believe Slavery is the great moral, social and political evil we have declared it to be, our first and only aim ought to be to rid ourselves of it immediately, or as soon as the condition of the institution and the country will permit it to be done. If we express an opinion here at all, I see no good reason why we should not make our creed full, and say all that we have to say, and speak it plainly.

W. L. Breckinridge, of Louisville, said, the evidence is here, that there is in Kentucky, a strong, powerful, and intelligent party in favour of emancipation. You

have not seen any where a more respectable body of men than compose this body. All religious denominations—both the great political parties—all classes of society—the different interests are all represented. We are divided upon all other questions, but firmly united and of one heart upon this. Several eminent ministers have spoken, and never with more zeal and earnestness, when pleading for the salvation of souls. This demonstration is conclusive evidence of great power. I will not apply epithets to my brethren and kindred, else I might say, it is wild and visionary and mad, to say that such a party can be defeated? The sentiments here expressed upon the subject of Slavery, are not of foreign birth—they don't come from abroad—they were born here, in this land—they are deeply and firmly imbedded in the hearts of our own people. In the formation of our present constitution, this question was made, and was only defeated after a desperate struggle. The strong opposition to Slavery then exhibited has never died. There is, Mr. President, a strong feeling in the hearts of the religious people against Slavery. Not that they believe it against the Bible doctrine, or sinful according to God's law. That is the dogma of Abolitionists, and we renounce it. But there is, away down in the hearts of a large portion of the Christian people of this land, a feeling at war with the institution of Slavery.* There are many thousand benevolent people in the State, who, I care not what they may say, feel in their hearts that Slavery is wrong.

Mr. Sartain, of Garrard, felt that every thing depended upon the action of this Convention. The friends of Emancipation in all parts of the State are looking to you—from this hall they expect to receive encouragement to go forth and labour in the good cause. I firmly believe, said he, that the adoption of the amendment will bring out the friends of emancipation. It will show to them, that we are in earnest—that we really mean what we say, when we declare Slavery to be an evil. Give them this, and they will come out boldly and manfully.

This is the cream of the discussion. There are some Anti-Slavery men in Kentucky; but they are mostly in bonds yet themselves. Had they felt perfectly free to speak as they believe and feel, we would have heard more of the evil—of the sin of Slavery. It is well. Light begins to dawn; we have hopes of Kentucky.

THE LATE MEETING OF SYNOD.

Our readers have now had the minutes of Synod a month in their hands. They have, no doubt, read them with unusual interest, and have discovered two things: 1st, that the anti-deacon portion of the church is in the minority; and 2d, that in consequence of the controversy on this subject, but little has been done in carrying forward the church's appropriate work.

That this party is in the minority, none will now attempt to deny. We are aware, indeed, that the majorities of preceding Synods—those of '45 and '47—have been termed "accidental majorities." This can hardly be said again. Hereafter, few—none that have any accurate knowledge of the church—will venture to assert that the doctrines of the anti-deacon party† are not at variance with the judgment and con-

* It is humbling to read these contradictions from the same lips. Is it possible that Mr. B. is blind to the folly of this: "wrong and yet no sin," at war with what God has not forbidden?

† We have heard objections to the use of both terms in this phrase. They deny that they are anti-deacon men. We beg leave to say that actions speak louder than words. And, so long as they persist obstinately in refusing to ordain deacons, even to take care of the poor, they cannot expect to be regarded in any other light than as anti-deacon. "He that is not *for* us, is *against* us." We heard a great deal during the late sessions of Synod of their attachment to the standards, particularly to the Westminster Form. We would call their attention to the third paragraph of the section "on the officers of a particular congregation:" "It is likewise *requisite* that there be others to take special care for the relief of the poor." As to the term "party," it is sheer hypocrisy to deny the existence of such a body as we refer to in the church; and the term "party" is, certainly, milder than "faction," while it is sufficiently expressive.

victions of a large majority of her members. The last meeting settled this point. No effort remained untried to rally their strength; still they were not able to carry their *proclaimed* purpose, the repeal of the deacon acts of 1847. They did not even venture to propose such a thing, notwithstanding the flood of petitions to this effect from a few of the congregations of the Pittsburgh Presbytery, in the immediate neighbourhood of that city. Enough was shown respecting the mind of Synod, to render it highly probable that any attempt to repeal would be followed by an explicit and most decided reiteration of these acts.

But, more than this. Let it be remembered, in estimating the anti-deacon strength in the church, that those portions, which, on account of distance, are most feebly represented, are nearly without exception in favour of the deacon's office. Were the whole church as well forward in Synod as the Pittsburgh Presbytery, the real state of the church on this question could not be misunderstood, even by the most partial. And, again, let it be remembered that there have always been a few, who are in principle in favour of this office, some who have deacons in their congregations, who have, notwithstanding, acted with the anti-deacon party. That is, while professedly deacon men, they are always—or nearly always—found arguing and voting with those whom they believe to be wrong in their views of this office, and that even in reference to such measures as the repeal of deacon resolutions; and we do some of them no injustice when we say that they appeared to be ready to co-operate with them even in the suspension of the operations of the Seminary—the true reason of this attempt against the Seminary on the part of its movers being that the doctrines of the church in regard to the office of the deacon are taught in it! Deducting these, the opponents of the re-introduction of this officer, in all his appropriate and Scriptural functions, into our congregations, would be a very inconsiderable portion of our members.

Business is, however, hindered, in the mean time. A very small power can stop a carriage, or greatly impede its movements, as it goes up hill; and all active movements in promoting the testimony of Jesus are made, in these times, up hill. There are many important matters on which the energies of the church, in her courts, ought to be actively and heartily concentrated. We specify Covenant Renovation, Christian Education, and Missions—Foreign and Domestic. All these claim immediate attention. Yet all are, for the time, kept in the background by the necessity of strengthening the stakes of the church's tabernacle, lest a part of them be shaken loose, or even torn out of ground. During the last Synod, there was little, if any, opportunity to forward any of these objects. Three days were occupied, with a few intervals, in reading papers, most of them long ones, except Presbyterial reports, being petitions for the repeal of the deacon resolutions, or for that sort of elective affinity congregations which this party favours. Three days more were taken up in the investigation and consideration of the "civil capacity" doctrine—the present stronghold of anti-deaconism—and, finally, a large part of another day, the last of the session, was spent in endeavouring to sustain a libel for slandering the standards, against a member of Synod who has been zealously employed in vindicating the attainments of the Reformation, and urging *practical* conformity to the footsteps of the flock!* leaving about seven hours, according to the time

* In regard to this libel, every intelligent and impartial reader knows that the

fixed the day previously, on motion of T. Sproull, for final adjournment, in which to do the business of Synod! But, why not sit longer? Perhaps Synod might have sat until the following evening, but still much must have remained incomplete. Besides, the ordinary time had already been exceeded, and the members were exhausted by an unremitting attention of many successive days to business of exciting and absorbing character. But, while some business was left unattended to or unsettled, still the time was not misspent. The tide of anti-deaconism has been met at the flood, and turned back. The church breathes more freely as the tide recedes, and will come up to the next meeting of the supreme judicatory in her full strength to carry forward her appropriate work. In the mean time, the Seminary lives and thrives—Geneva Hall, a Christian College, invites to its privileges the youth of the church, of other churches, of all who desire to have their children Scripturally and thoroughly trained; and if the work of missions has been suspended for a season, contributions can still be thrown into the Lord's treasury for this purpose, in the confident expectation that a way will soon open, in Providence, for their useful expenditure.

Our position is encouraging. The Lord has not forsaken us. He will bless us still.

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

THE SYNOD OF OHIO.—This Synod has passed some good resolutions upon voting, and drinking, and deacons. We give extracts of them. On voting, they say:

“Whereas, civil government is an ordinance of God, and the civil magistrate is the minister of God, appointed for the preservation of the rights of the people over whom he exercises authority: therefore, resolved,

“1st. That no candidate for civil office should receive the suffrages of Christian voters, who is guilty of the crimes of slaveholding, duelling, or other scandalous offences against the law of God.

“2d. That to assist by our votes in electing such persons to offices of honour and authority in the land, is a violation of the law of God, and a censurable offence according to chapter 1, section 3, of our Book of Discipline.

“4th. That we affectionately entreat the Sessions of the Churches to confer with and admonish any of our members who may be guilty of this sin, and that if, after due time for consideration, and after faithful exhortation on the part of Sessions, such offenders will still persevere in wrong doing, it is the duty of the Sessions to proceed to the use of such further disciplinary measures as will either produce reformation, or effectually remove them from our communion.”

As far as they go, these are right; but they must come up a long step higher before they occupy the firm platform of eternal truth. On temperance, they say:

“1st. That in the judgment of this Synod, it is the duty of the sessions of churches, in the watch and care they constitutionally exercise over the flocks committed to their oversight, to guard carefully against the seductive habit of using intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and also becoming accessory to that crime by making or vending intoxicating liquors, or furnishing facilities for the same.

“3d. That the Church of Christ being the agency established by God for reform-

design of Mr. Johnston's articles was expressly to call attention to the standards, and enforce their claims; and in that particular section, on which the libel was founded, to show that the Scottish Church had never designed to recede from past attainments, nor to substitute any *general* outline for her own definite and established doctrines. Had the libel been even regularly drawn, it should have been dismissed for want even of *plausible* testimony to sustain it.

ing the world, we consider that membership in the Church is a pledge on the part of every professor to exert his influence, not only against the sin of drunkenness, but in favour of total abstinence from the use of all intoxicating liquors as a beverage."

On deacons, they also present a part of the truth; but even that is weak:

"We recommend to all our Churches that a fund be raised, by stated contributions on the first day of the week, for the supply of the wants of the indigent; and that the Scriptural officers called deacons be appointed in each of our churches, whose duty it shall be to receive and appropriate the contributions of the church for this object."

CHOLERA.—This scourge seems to be diminishing. It has cut off its thousands. That it is a judgment of God, few doubt. And it is gratifying to see that, in so many instances, this has been publicly acknowledged by the observance of days of fasting.

INQUIRY AND ANSWER.—We have been asked why we did not notice the resolutions passed by the New York Presbytery condemnatory of the spirit, &c., of an article in the May No. of the *Covenanter*. For the plain reason that the person implicated had appealed to Synod, and we cannot see the justice in spreading out before the church *unfinished* business of this kind. We now state, moreover, that the Committee on Discipline reported in Synod a REVERSAL of the deed of Presbytery—in other words, sustained the appeal, at the same time expressing disapprobation of the article. The report of this committee, consisting of a number of items, was postponed. We give the above, of course, as their action, not as that of the Synod. Let all the facts, if any, be stated.

BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.—These have been, in the main, quite as actively employed this year as usual.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.—The thirty-third anniversary of this venerable and truly benevolent institution was celebrated in New York, the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen presiding. The following were among the facts stated:

The *Receipts* of the Society have been, from all sources, \$251,870 16.

The *Issues* of Bibles, 205,307; of Testaments, 359,419—total for the year, 564,726.

During the 33 years of its existence, it has issued 2,510,610 Bibles, and 3,683,530 Testaments, making a total of 6,347,140 copies.

"Missions of the American Board are in operation among the Indians in Lower Canada, in Western New York, among the Ojibwas, the Sioux, the Cherokees, Choc-taws, and Pawnees, in the Oregon Territory; the Sandwich Islands; at Fou-Chou, Amoy, and Canton, in China; in the Island of Borneo, at Madras, Madura, Ceylon, Bombay, Ahmednuggur, Oroomiah, in Persia; at Erzroom, Trebizond, Constantinople, Broosa, Smyrna, and Salonica; at Athens, Beyroot, Mount Lebanon, in South Africa, and on the Gaboon river, just under the Equator, on the Western side of that dark continent. The Missions thus encircling the globe are shedding, it is believed, some light upon the benighted nations.

"In September last, the number of missionaries, assistant missionaries, and native helpers in the employ of the Board, was 557. Since that time, fifteen missionaries and assistant missionaries, with their wives—making thirty persons—have been sent into the field; some to India, some to Africa, and some to the Turkish empire.

"The Board has now under its care 75 churches, with 26,000 members. There are 12 seminaries for training native preachers and teachers, 18 other boarding-schools, 302 free schools; whole number of pupils under instruction, about 12,000. The schools at the Sandwich Islands do not come into this account, being provided for by the Government of the Islands. It has eleven printing establishments, with facilities for printing in nearly thirty languages.

"The ordinary receipts, irrespective of the debt, for the nine months of the financial year ending April 30, amounted to \$178,387—making the total receipts for nine months \$217,000."

ASSOCIATE SYNOD.—This body met in Allegheny, May 24th, and continued its sessions until June 2d. There were present sixty-six ministers, and thirty-six or seven ruling elders. A good deal of business appears to have been transacted. 1. *The Basis of Union.* This was indefinitely postponed. The reason assigned in the report is, the fact that the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church had “declined to adopt this testimony, or to propose any amendments with a view to its adoption.” The whole subject, together with some propositions by the above Synod, were referred to another committee, who afterwards proposed a plan on which it was thought that a union might still be effected. The essence of the plan is contained in the first and second resolutions. They are as follows:—

1. That the text of the Confession of Faith, relative to the civil magistrate’s power, *circa sacra*, be printed as heretofore, but that the views given in our Testimony, and the Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church, on this point, be embodied in a new statement, to be adopted as the standard of the Church on this subject, which shall be printed in parallel columns with the text.

2. That Synod proceed to compile, as speedily as practicable, a brief but plain Testimony on Psalmody, Church Communion, Slavery, Covenanting, Secret Societies, and other subjects, on which there is not such a full and explicit assertion of Divine truth contained in the Westminster Standards, as the circumstances of the Church at the present time require, supporting the statements with pertinent texts of Scripture, as nearly as possible in the manner of the Confession of Faith, and taking care, also, to abandon no attainment made by this Church in her testimony for truth and against error, and also to compile a book of Church government and discipline.

We think these bodies will unite. If we do not mistake, the second resolution shows a tendency on the part of this Synod to yield, what seems to be the chief matter even in controversy—the having or not of a fixed testimony. *The Foreign Mission.*—This does not appear to be in a flourishing state. They have but one missionary in Trinidad, and he is in bad health. They were unsuccessful in getting new missionaries. The following resolutions were adopted:—

1st. That in as much as the health of Mr. Banks, our present missionary in Trinidad, has for a considerable time past been very feeble, is yet declining—and, according to his own statement to synod, not likely to be restored, therefore, Resolved, That he have leave to return, with this condition, that he be desired to continue at the station until another missionary arrives, if sent within six months from this time, and if consistent with his health and convenience.

2d. Resolved, That the board of foreign missions be required by synod to endeavour to obtain one or two missionaries to go to Trinidad, and if successful at the close of six months from this time, report in the Repository the amount of funds needed for the present year; but if unsuccessful, report this fact, and notify Mr. Banks to return.

3d. Resolved, That in case of the failure of the mission, the board be authorized to dispose of the property in Trinidad as they shall judge best.

Domestic Missions.—To these, the Synod is also very attentive. The report on this subject is long and somewhat tedious, but indicates that a great deal of work has been systematically done. In these last two particulars, we hope the example of this Synod will be of use to us.

The General Assembly, (O. S.)—There are a few items of general interest in the doings of this body at its late sessions. Its board of missions, &c., are all thriving. On slavery, it is as obstinate, and we must say, as heartless, as ever. Resolutions were passed discountenancing reading sermons, and sitting in public prayer. The practice of sending children to Popish schools was very pointedly condemned, and the exercise of discipline recommended, when other means fail to effect reformation.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

India.—The missions in India appear to flourish. Some late accounts are very favourable, particularly as it regards the success of the mission schools in Calcutta. Mr. Freeman, a missionary of the Presbyterian Board, says,

“By these various schools the leaven of truth and righteousness is working extensively, and the effects are becoming more and more apparent. The people begin to appreciate the value of missionary schools. But recently the missionaries of the London Society, who have a large central school, with branches in the suburbs of Calcutta, numbering over seven hundred boys, received from the respectable people of the place a paper expressing their thanks to the missionaries for establishing these schools, and their high gratification in their success.”

Of course opposition is awakened, but, judging by what follows, without doing much injury.

“Near the Free Church Institution, Muti Lal Seal, a wealthy native gentleman, and others, have opened an opposition school, where every effort is made to attract boys from the Free Church Institution. The school is free to all, and yet they have only about three hundred boys, while the Free Church Institution has about twelve hundred.”

There are “in Calcutta, and its immediate vicinity, nineteen stations and sub-stations of different missionary societies, with thirty-five missionaries and their assistants: and these have a native Christian community of 2,285, and of these 520 belong to the fellowship of Christ.”

Turkey.—Great efforts are making by Russian diplomatists to keep Turkey quiet while the Autocrat puts his feet upon the rising liberties of Europe. Still Turkey is restless. She not only persists in refusing a passage through the Dardanelles to a Russian fleet, but has also refused to permit the march of more Russian troops through her territories into Hungary. The Sultan is turning his attention towards the improvement of the social condition of the people. He is planning a system of railroads. He is also undertaking seriously a system of primary instruction; and is encouraging the cultivation of the Turkish language and literature by every means, and especially by offering prizes for the best translations of the standard works in ancient and modern literature. Protection is given to converts to Christianity from the Armenian churches. The days of Islamism are nearly numbered. Its spirit is rapidly evaporating.

Sicily.—Thus far the Sicilians have not met with much success in their efforts to emancipate their Island from Neapolitan control. The war—which has been conducted with more than usual atrocity—has resulted favourably to Naples. The final issue is, however, uncertain. In the mean time we present the following views respecting the religious condition of the people. It is from the pen of the correspondent of the Evangelist.

“The present is not the moment to look for extended spiritual inquiry among the Sicilians; there has been no incitement to such inquiry, either from the press or the pulpit. We have reason to believe, however, that there is a readiness, if not a hopeful preparation, on the part of some to read the scriptures when presented to them, particularly when commended in private conversation. Since the revolution many thousands of copies have been distributed upon the Island, many monasteries have been visited, and many monks and priests have accepted the Bible with apparent gratitude. There are plainly two classes among the ecclesiastics—the dupes and the knaves; and among the dupes are a considerable portion of se-

rious, well-disposed men, worthy of being sought out, and susceptible of great improvement from intercourse with pious and liberal-minded protestants. If our object were first of all to detach men from the Romish Church, we should do well to send some apostle of infidelity into the island; for his appeals would be echoed from all the halls of science, from every club-room, and through the whole rank of the educated class, inasmuch as Romanism is felt to be at war with reason, justice, and love, and no other presentation of Christianity has yet been made here."

Another extract will show what kind of an exhibition the priesthood sometimes make.

"A coarser spectacle of brute force among men than the companies of priests under arms in Palermo is probably not to be found any where. Their ugly dress, made infinitely ridiculous by their military trappings; their affected solemnity of march, two by two, with heads drooping as in a funeral procession, and their bungling way of handling their guns, must put to flight what little reverence their profession may have hitherto inspired. But these men inspire a certain respect, in contrast with the frantic priests to be met in the streets, bawling *war! war!*"

Rome.—Our readers are all aware that the young Roman republic has been attacked on all sides by foreign armies. Austria on the north—Naples on the south—and France on the west. Of the Neapolitans Garibaldi, the Roman leader, soon gave a good account—driving them back with great loss into their own territories. In the north the Austrians have succeeded, after hard fighting and bombardments, in getting possession of the cities of Bologna and Ancona. At the last accounts the French armies had only succeeded in fixing themselves within the outer walls of that portion of the city which lies to the west of the Tiber. Another wall had been erected during the siege: should this be stormed, the French armies from the commanding heights of the Janiculine would have it in their power to throw their shot and bombs into the very heart of Rome. The Romans have fought with great bravery—disappointing both friends and foes. The professed design of the French is to take possession of Rome, that they may establish a liberal government, with the Pope at its head—separating the temporal and the spiritual powers. Of course they refuse to acknowledge the Roman republic. In France this expedition is highly unpopular. The Romans appear to be unanimous. If there is any party in favour of the Pope, or even against the republic, it keeps profoundly quiet. The executive is in the hands of three men, called *Triumvirs*, of whom Mazzini is the chief. In the mean time the revolutionary authorities are opening the way for the spread of Bibles—all custom-house duties having been taken off foreign books, and all restrictions on the press removed. Achilli—a converted priest—has published there the *Epistle to the Romans*, with notes. An edition of Diodati's Translation of the Scriptures, is also being printed. This alone constitutes an era in the history of Rome. Who could have imagined but a few months ago, that in 1849, the Scriptures in their own tongue, would be accessible to every Roman? Truly we may say, "What hath the Lord wrought?"

In regard to the probability of the restoration of the ancient code of things, we are afraid it cannot be done.

The Edinburgh Witness says,

"On the testimony of every traveller—on the testimony of ministers of the Church of England, and of the Free Church—on the testimony of all the correspondents of the London journals—the feeling in Italy against clerical government is universal and intense. The population of the Roman states are resolved, to a man, to throw off the sacerdotal yoke. How hopeless the matter must be, may be

judged of from the fact that the correspondent of the London Times, himself a Roman Catholic, can see no other solution of the difficulty than the disjunction of the temporal and spiritual authority. 'I cannot find a single person,' says he, 'who does not shrink with dismay at, and protest against, the bare idea of a clerical government. There is nothing like the plain truth; and I speak it the more freely because I am a Roman Catholic, attached to the religion of my forefathers, and determined to adhere to it to the last; but I should be devoid of all intelligence if I did not comprehend the utter impossibility of now governing a great people by churchmen.'

The Pope may, possibly, be replaced by force; but it will be to his own enduring infamy as a man, and the abiding shame and disgrace of that system of which he is the head. We add, that the papists in this country—the priesthood, and particularly Bishop Hughes—find themselves in rather a dilemma. They applauded to the skies, the Irish papists—but what of their Italian brethren? Of the laity many applauded them too. Hughes can find no better epithets for them than "assassins," and "infidels." So the body is divided, and the spurious republicanism of the wily Jesuits at least in part exposed.

Florence.—This is a most interesting part of Italy. It borders upon the papal states; lying north and west of them. Here, the revolution has failed. The Grand-Duke has been replaced, but light has entered. The Bible had free circulation during the reign of the Provisional republican government. Many copies were sold, and an edition was already prepared for publication. It has been seized, but with singular inconsistency—imported Bibles were left untouched in the depository. These, unless further measures of suppression are adopted, will be circulated. The Free Church have established a mission in Leghorn, the capital, and on the 1st of last April the meeting-house of the mission was opened for regular religious services. They are to be conducted by Rev. Mr. Stewart, and thus far have not been interrupted. Mr. Wingate, missionary to the Jews, thus confirms previous accounts respecting the rapid circulation of Bibles in the Italian states. He says,

"Thousands of Bibles (chiefly Diodati's) are finding circulation. While priests, princes, nobles, and citizens were digging the trenches in Palermo, a few days ago, two individuals were writing out orders, the first for four hundred, and the second for eleven hundred copies of the word of God, to be immediately forwarded from Leghorn to Sicily. During the last short year more copies of the word of God have found their way to Italy, we believe, than has been the case for centuries."

Switzerland.—We have almost lost sight of the persecuted Vaudois; for they are still persecuted, systematically, and pretty severely by the infidel authorities of the Canton. A law was adopted by the Canton, May 20th, containing, among others, the following sections:

"*Art. 1.* All religious meetings, out of the National Church, and not recognised by the constitution, or not virtually authorized by law, are prohibited within the Canton, until new orders.

"*Art. 5.* Persons who shall have resisted the authority ordering a dissolution of a religious meeting prohibited by the present decree, and they who shall have formed a meeting again, after the assemblage had been dissolved, shall be punished conformably to the provisions of the penal code on acts of resistance to the authority."

This law is no dead letter. It is carried out, and subjects the faithful to no small difficulty.

"Two persons have been condemned by the tribunal of police at Lausanne, as proprietors of houses where religious meetings have been held, in connexion with the Free Church. M. Mègroz, a minister of that church, resident at Payerne, is sent back, like many of his brethren, to the commune whence he came. Emigra-

tions continue; and many other families are on the point of crossing the Atlantic, to seek homes in America, where they may worship God in safety. The government of Neuchâtel emulates that of Vaud. It imposes a political oath on the pastors and elders of the national church, and, to make the matter worse, requires that oath to be taken on Sundays, in the churches, and during divine service!"

France.—1. *The Sabbath.*—Strange to say, the government of Louis Napoleon seems to regard the Sabbath with favour. The minister of public works in Paris has invited all citizens to refrain from work on the Sabbath, and has prohibited labour on the public works on that day. The religious journals applaud it, and some of the secular papers are pleased with it. 2. *Its social state.*—This is by no means settled. An outbreak took place on the 14th of June, in Paris, evidently concerted with the design of overthrowing the present administration. Many members of the Assembly, of the Mountain or Red Republican party, were concerned in it. It was put down with little difficulty in Paris, but proved rather troublesome in Lyons and in some smaller towns. The ostensible reason of the movement, was the violation of the Constitution by the attack upon the Roman republic. Apparently, the government has been strengthened by the result of this *emeute*; but it is evident that the nation is at heart opposed to the attempt to force the Pope upon the reluctant Romans, and also with the manifest tendency on the part of the administration to monarchical, and even despotic alliances. The press has also been assailed. A law has been just enacted nearly as stringent in its provisions as the ordinance of Charles X., which cost him his throne in 1830. There will be—must be—another revolution in France. France will have blood to drink—the blood of civil feuds and wars. 3. *The gospel.*—The gospel still spreads. The anniversaries of the societies held in May last, present, generally, very encouraging prospects. The Bible and Missionary Societies appear to be particularly prosperous. The Evangelical Society, as the latter is termed, has extended its efforts very largely. Accounts were received of a most interesting state of things in the departments of Sens, Yonne, Upper Vienne, Sarthe, Aube, &c. Respecting one station, we quote the following:

“At Villefavard the schools contain upwards of a hundred pupils. In winter, they come at seven in the morning to the Sunday school, where the pastor meets fifty-three of them, many of whom understand and love their lessons. At present, a person cannot pass through one of the villages of the commune without hearing some child singing, with all its might, some Christian hymn, or without lighting on some little shepherds, reading and learning verses from the gospel. They always attend worship regularly, and in particular, the evening worship, which is held in the large school-room. There more than two hundred and fifty persons are packed together. In winter, they prefer this place to the more spacious premises of the church, because at that season the latter is very cold and damp. It was formerly the Roman Catholic church.”

Nearly every where the people are “eager” to hear Protestant preachers—in some instances the greatest joy is manifested. Still, we must remember, that, compared with the entire population of France, those who have even the opportunity to hear the gospel or get a Bible are very few. The great mass of the French are yet sitting in the thick darkness of Popery or infidelity. We should not forget them.

England.—1. *The Jew Bill.*—This bill for admitting Jews to Parliament, which had passed the Commons, has been again rejected by a majority of 24 in the Lords. Baron Rothschild then resigned, but is again a candidate for the city of London. 2. *Marriage of a deceased wife's sister.*—A bill, legalizing these marriages, has passed the Commons to a second reading, by a large majority. The Free Church Assembly remonstrated unanimously against it. Four petitions were presented in its favour, signed by upwards of 30,000; against it, by 12,000. It will probably soon become a law. Another downward step, illustrating the infidel tendencies of that empire.

Scotland.—The Sessions of the Free Church Assembly were, as usual, interesting; chiefly from the great success attending their missionary schemes and home efforts. 1. *Their contributions.*—These have been on a very liberal scale. The whole is as follows:

" Sustentation Fund	£87,519	0	10
Building Fund—Amount raised for local purposes	43,981	6	0½
Congregational Fund	71,379	6	9¼
Missions and Education—Amount Collections, Subscriptions, Donations, &c.	43,123	18	4½
Miscellaneous	22,076	0	8½
Total	£275,079	12	8¾

2. *Sites.*—Considerable progress has been made in procuring sites. There are now only four or five landlords in Scotland who refuse sites.

3. *Schools.*—To these the Free Church has given great and unremitting attention. At the present time, says the Free Church Magazine:

"We may mention that we have now 428 congregational schools; 177 district schools; 12 missionary schools; 7 grammar schools; 2 normal schools; 30 female industrial schools; a few agricultural schools in Sutherland and Ross; 102 evening schools reported (besides others not reported.) We have 659 salaried or assisted teachers; and 190 teachers reported who are not salaried, but connected with the Free Church. An exact statement cannot be made of the number of scholars, in consequence of many schedules not having been returned.

Number of scholars in school from which schedules have been received	36,518
Number of scholars in normal schools	1,409
Number of normal students	182
	38,102
Add average for schools whose schedules have not been returned	17,276
Number reported as attending the 190 non-salaried schools	4,999
Number supposed to attend similar schools not reported	5,200
	65,594

Add to this the number attending the evening schools, and the result is at least 70,000 of the youth of Scotland receiving their education from members of the Free Church, and mainly at her expense. In 1847, the number was 50,000; now it is 20,000 more."

There are about the same number of schools in connexion with the Establishment, but with a smaller average of students. Is the following—we take it from the same article—correct? If it is, the education of Scotland is not at so high a point as we thought. Of course, the reference is to the best educated parts of our country:

"It was well shown (in Dr. Candlish's report) that to educate Scotland, thoroughly—up to the scale of Prussia or America—not only is there need for the parish schools, and the schools of the Free Church, but that no fewer than 6000 schools would be required for this purpose."

INDEX TO VOL. IV.

	Page.		Page.
Acquired Territory,	188	Letter from the Editor,	23, 50, 77
Affairs Abroad, 29, 59, 85, 124, 153, 181, 222, 246, 279, 316, 345, 398		Look at Home,	151
Affairs at Home, 31, 64, 92, 126, 157, 188, 254, 284, 320, 347		Memoir of the Rev. Thos. Donnelly,	46
American Politics and Moral Law,	338	Minutes of Synod,	353
Apostacy,	96	Missionary Intelligence,	122
Appeal in behalf of the Theological Seminary,	17	" " Hayti,	216
Arrival of Rev. J. W. Morton,	352	New York Presbytery,	121, 397
Assembly's Hymn Book—Its Ortho- doxy,	97	New York Episcopal Convention,	189
A Wife's Power for Good or Evil,	124	Notices of Books, 160, 191, 223, 285, 350	
Baptism for the Dead,	242	Notices of Congregations,	217
Bible Arithmetic,	302	Nullification Movements,	213
Brotherly Love,	118	Obituaries,	
Causes of Fasting for the Theologi- cal Seminary,	234	Mary Jane Ewing,	32
Christian Education,	109	Mrs. Stavely,	127
Christianity,—Why Inefficient?	244	Mrs. Grace McGaw,	192
Christian Perfect, the,	144	Mrs. Cameron,	224
Church and her Indigent Members, the	47	Mr. Thos. Duncan,	256
Church Discipline,	145	Our Christianity—Its Reproach,	245
Congress,	190	Pagan Classics,	213
Correspondents,	192	Pittsburgh Presbytery, 29, 152, 176, 341	
Covenant Secure, the,	244	Preamble and Resolutions of the Miami Congregation,	122
Days of Thanksgiving,	177	Presbytery of the Lakes,	393
Deacons,	29	Professor's Report of Theological Seminary,	21
Deacons and Managers,	129	Purged Branch, the	175
Domestic Missions—The Field— The Urgency,	275	Reformed Presbyterian Synod— Ireland,	59, 146
Domestic Correspondence,	313	Reformed Presbyterian Synod— Scotland,	105
Draft of a Covenant,	71	Reformed Presbyterian Catechism,	199, 236, 262
Emancipation in Kentucky—H. Clay,	335	Religion, Practical	144
Essays on Romans xiii. 1—7, de- fended,	3, 33, 65	Religious Education,	95
Extravagant Views, &c.,	337	Report of the Board of Managers of the Ref. Pres. Tract Society— Cincinnati,	340
Facts of the Western Presbyteries,	120	Signs of the Times,	137
Faith—Dying Faith,	338	Scriptural Government and True Religion,	28
Foreign Correspondence, 114, 139, 167, 208, 229, 270, 299, 342		Terms of Communion,	321
Franklin College, New Athens, O.,	93	Terms of Communion—Extent of Obligation,	289
Future Relations of Christianity,	305	Terms of Ecclesiastical Commu- nion,	226, 257
Geneva Hall,	255	Theocracy, or the Principles of the Jewish Religion and Polity adapt- ed to all Nations and Times,	161, 193
Gentleness—Faith,	172	Theological Seminary,	307
Honour the Lord with Your Sub- stance,	174	Valleys of Piedmont,	221
Huguenots, the	49	Visionary Reformers,	150
"If I perish, I perish,"	173	What is Schism?	305
Importunity in prayer,	148	White Stone, the	92
Infant Baptism,	14		
Late Meeting of Synod, the	395		
Lays of the Covenanters,	179, 246, 278		

THE
C O V E N A N T E R.

SEPTEMBER, 1849.

CHURCH PROPERTY—BY WHOM OWNED AND
MANAGED.

(Continued from page 10.)

Before proceeding to apply the doctrines of the second book to the case before us, I advert to its teachings in reference to the office of the “doctor;” for the assertion has been made on this floor, that between this book and the Westminster Form there is a direct opposition on this subject; and that we are bound to follow the latter, and not the former. Now, what are the facts? 1. Both documents recognise the “doctor” as a distinct office in the church. The second book says:

“There are four ordinary functions or offices in the Kirk of God,—the office of the pastor, minister or bishop, the doctor, the presbyter or elder, and the deacon. These offices are ordinarily and ought to continue perpetually in the Kirk as necessary for the government and policy thereof.” *

The Form says:

“The officers which Christ hath appointed for the edification of his church, and the perfecting of the saints, are, some extraordinary, others ordinary and perpetual, as pastors, teachers (or doctors—see section on this office)—and other church governors, and deacons.” †

2. Of this officer, the second book affirms:

“His office is to open up the mind of the Spirit of God in the Scriptures, simply, without such applications as the ministers use, to the end that the faithful may be instructed, and sound doctrine taught, and that the purity of the gospel be not corrupted through ignorance or evil opinions. He is different from the pastor, not only in name, but in diversity of gifts; for, to the doctor is given the word of knowledge, to open up by simply teaching the mysteries of faith; to the pastor the gift of wisdom, to apply the same by exhortation to the manners of the flock, as occasion craveth. Under the name and office of a doctor, we comprehend also the order in schools, colleges and universities, which hath been from time to time carefully maintained, as well among the Jews and Christians, as among the profane nations. The doctor being an elder, as is said, should assist the pastor, in the government of the Kirk, and concur with the elders, his brethren, in all assemblies, by reason, the interpretation of the word, which is only judge in ecclesiastical matters, is committed to his charge. But to preach unto the people, to minister the sacraments, and to celebrate marriages, pertain not to the doctor, unless he be otherwise called ordinarily.” ‡

The Form goes further. It makes him, in most respects, a gospel minister, in the ordinary acceptance of the phrase. It says:

“The Scripture doth hold out the name and title of teacher, as well as of the pastor. Who is also a minister of the word, as well as the pastor, and hath power of administration of the sacraments. The Lord having given different gifts, and

* 2d Book of Discipline, p. 13.

† Confession of Faith, p. 507.

‡ Do. p. 17.

divers exercises according to these gifts, in the ministry of the word; though these different gifts may meet in, and accordingly be exercised by, one and the same minister; yet, where be several ministers in the same congregation, they may be designed to several employments, according to the different gifts in which each of them doth most excel. And he that doth most excel in exposition of Scripture, in teaching sound doctrine, and in convincing gainsayers, than he doth in application, and is accordingly employed therein, may be called a teacher or doctor, (the places alleged by the notation of the word do prove the proposition.) Nevertheless, where is but one minister in a particular congregation, he is to perform, as far as he is able, the whole work of the ministry."*

The inquiry now arises—and this is the point at issue—Did the Scottish Church adopt the doctrine of the Westminster Assembly, or did she adhere to that of the second book? Her adopting act settles this question, and settles it in favour of the second book. It says:

"Provided always, That this act be no ways prejudicial to the farther discussion and examination of that article which holds forth, that the doctor or teacher hath power of the administration of the sacraments, as well as the pastor." †

Can any thing be plainer? They made no alteration then, *nor since*, in reference to this officer, as defined in their fixed polity, taught in the second book of Discipline. For what was the great line of demarkation between the offices of doctor and pastor in that book? Was it not, that to the one belongs, in addition to the preaching of the word, the administration of sacraments? And what now constitutes the *distinctive* feature of the office of the gospel minister? Is it not the right to administer sacraments? According to the second book, the doctor might rule. So says the Form. The latter went further; but the Scottish Church refused to follow; and we receive the Form as "adopted by the Church of Scotland." ‡

Now, what says the second book of the rights of the church in reference to the holding and administering of church property? He that runs may read.

"By the patrimony of the Kirk, we mean whatsoever thing hath been at any time before, or shall be in times coming, given, or by consent or universal custom of countries professing the Christian religion, applied to the public use and utility of the Kirk. So that under the patrimony we comprehend all things given, or to be given, to the Kirk and service of God, as lands, buildings, possessions, annual rents, and all such like, wherewith the Kirk is doted, either by donations, foundations, mortifications, or any other lawful titles of kings, princes, or any persons inferior to them, together with the continual oblations of the faithful. We comprehend also all such things, as by laws or custom, or use of countries, have been applied to the use and utility of the Kirk; of the which sort are teinds, manses, glebes and such like, which, by common and municipal laws, and universal custom, are possessed by the Kirk." §

* Confession of Faith, p. 513.

† Confession of Faith, p. 504. Observe: they leave open the whole "article;" not merely one line of it, but every thing in that section dependent upon the assertion that the doctor has power to administer sacraments.

‡ Another objection has been brought against the second Book of Discipline, that it makes some rather singular statements respecting building bridges, &c. This may be disposed of in a word. The passage occurs on the last page; and, as the reader will see, it is that part of the book which relates to certain heads of reformation then desired. One of these was the *right* appropriation of all the ecclesiastical property. If this were done, they speak with the assurance that it would more than suffice for religious purposes, and that an overplus would remain, which, instead of going into the purses of the nobility, would be available—in the hands of the proper civil officers—for public uses. The compilers of this book had too much sense to suppose that it belonged to deacons to do *all* that is contained in that section. Some things they might and did do, but not all.

§ 2d Book of Discipline, p. 24.

Can there be a plainer contradiction than we find here between the Reformed Church of Scotland and the doctrines of Mr. C.? "The *patrimony* of the kirk," "lands, &c., with which the church is doted, (endowed,)" "given to the kirk." These great men knew nothing of the hyper-spiritual notions of Mr. C. His is a new discovery, indeed. Is any more proof asked for on this point? We have it in the doctrines of this book in regard to the distribution—the management of ecclesiastical property. Do they commit this to the civil magistrate? No, indeed. We give their own language:

"The goods ecclesiastical ought to be collected and distributed by the deacons, *as the word of God appoints*, that they who bear office in the Kirk be provided for without care or solicitude."

"We desire therefore the ecclesiastical goods to be uplifted and distributed faithfully to whom they appertain; and that by the ministry of the deacons, to whose office the collection and distribution thereof properly belongs; that the poor may be answered of their portion thereof, and they of the ministry live without care and solicitude; as, also, the rest of the treasure of the kirk may be reserved and bestowed to their right uses." *

What were these uses? This also they define:

"To see that sufficient provision be made for the ministry, the schools, and the poor; and if they have not sufficient, to await upon their charges, to supply their indigence even with their own rents, if need require." †

And, finally—and this for the very purpose of precluding any such claim as Mr. C. sets up for the civil magistrate, they add:

"And to the effect this order may take place, it is to be provided, that all other intrumitters with the kirk rent, collectors, general or especial, *whether it be by the appointment of the prince, or OTHERWISE*, ‡ may be denuded of further intrumission therewith, and suffer the kirk rents, in time coming, to be wholly intrumitted with by the ministry of the deacons, and distributed to the uses before mentioned."

Whatever merits the discoveries of Mr. C. may possess, even *he* must admit that they are in direct antagonism with the doctrines of Melville, Gillespie, Rutherford, and Henderson—the framers or the maintainers of the Books of Discipline.

An attempt has, however, been made to weaken the influence of the fathers of the Scottish Reformation by some historical references. I allude to the quotations made by Rev. T. Sproull, from the Notes to M'Crie's Life of Knox, to show that this reformer himself received his salary, not from the church or through her officers, but from the city of Edinburgh. True. His quotations were accurate, *as far as they went*. But did Mr. S. intend to teach us that John Knox approved of this mode of administering finances? If so, he knows little of that reformer's principles or proceedings in regard to this matter. The fact is, John Knox submitted to existing arrangements as a matter of *necessity*, but *under protest*—the strongest of all protests; for this very question whether the ecclesiastical goods should be administered by the church or by the civil power, was one of the *prime* topics of controversy between the intrepid reformer and the court, as it continued to be with his successors,—a controversy which began with the adoption of the first Book of Discipline, and lasted, with intermissions, for generations. Let us look at the facts. They will be found to have a closer bearing upon the case now before this court than many may imagine. The truth is, *we* are now fighting, on this floor, the same battle that Knox and his coadjutors fought in the sixteenth century. In the first

* 2d Book of Discipline, pp. 24, 34.

† Do. p. 34.

‡ By the appointment of unordained trustees, for example.

Book of Discipline, the church claimed as her patrimony, the ecclesiastical goods. The claim was not allowed by the nobility and the court. We give, in the words of Hetherington :

“They were by no means equally satisfied with the remaining main propositions of the reformers,—the regulations of discipline, and especially the appropriation of the patrimony of the suppressed Church to the purposes, ministerial, educational, and charitable, of the new ecclesiastical establishment. They had for some time cast a covetous eye on the rich revenues of the popish clergy. Some of them had seized upon church lands, or retained the tithes in their own hands. Others had taken long leases of them from the clergy for small sums of money, and were anxious to have these private bargains legalized. From this arose one great cause of their aversion to have the Book of Discipline ratified, lest they should be obliged to surrender the spoil they had unjustly obtained. The plan of the Church was, they said, a ‘devout imagination,’ a mere visionary scheme, which showed indeed the goodness of their intentions, but which it was impossible to carry into practical effect. In short, they determined to retain by force the greater part of the Church revenues, thus fraudulently seized upon, for their own advantage.”*

Under these circumstances, the most that could be got was a division of the revenues—not the whole of them, but those which had not been seized by the nobles—assigning two-thirds to the ejected popish clergy, the remaining third to be divided between the court and the Reformed ministers. This third, moreover, to be taken up, apportioned, and paid by civil officers. Against this arrangement Knox protested; or, in his own language, “I see,” he said, “two parts freely given to the devil, and the third part divided between God and the devil.” The Church struggled on for five years, until Murray became Regent, when the arrangement was so far altered—and to this we call special attention—that (I quote Hetherington) “the thirds of benefices were appointed to be paid, at first-hand, to collectors nominated by the Church, who, after paying the stipends of the ministers were to account to the Exchequer for the surplus.” This was not all the Church wanted. It came short in many particulars. But it was a great advance, and, had it been faithfully carried out, would have given her no little relief. Other regents, however, came in. Some of them, particularly Morton, who assumed the regency in 1572, far less favourable to the Church, and, as a consequence, the old ground of controversy was re-occupied, and even enlarged. Finally, Morton succeeded “in drawing into his hands the thirds of benefices;” and thus, by a series of steps which the historian records, that great controversy was commenced respecting the office of bishop, which terminated so favourably to presbyterianism in the adoption of the second book of Discipline.

But, even then, the dispute respecting the management of the temporalities of the Church did not cease. The court persisted in its demands. It would hold the purse. It would act on the principle of Mr. C.—hold all the Church property, and manage all the Church funds, and pay the stipend of ministers. Hence, for fourteen years, the court refused to sanction the second book of Discipline. They were opposed to it for the very same reason that Mr. C. is—it takes away the management of church property from the magistrate and puts it in the hands of the deacon.†

* Heth. Hist. p. 57.

† “The heads *patronage*, *divorce*, and *the office of deacons*, were the most offensive to the court, and consequently were made the subject of longest discussion. The ground of objection to the last of these heads was that it gave the management of the patrimony of the church to the deacons.” M’Crie’s Life of Melville, p. 235. Ox. Ed.

These are the facts: Knox, the Melvilles, the Church of Scotland, none of them ever abandoned, ever overlooked—the principles of the book of Discipline. Far from it. For thirty years they contended, almost incessantly, in behalf of the Church's rights as claimed in the first compilation on church government, and inserted in her second;* and against these very claims, on the part of the civil authorities, which Mr. C. maintains in the article before this court. Is it fair, then, is it just, is it true to represent John Knox as satisfied with the manner in which the temporalities of the Church were managed during his ministry in Edinburgh?

We have now done with our second topic; having shown, if we do not greatly mistake, that the doctrines of Mr. C. are at variance both with the Scriptures and with the footsteps of the flock: that instead of having made a new discovery that would throw light upon our darkened minds, he has only been following the footsteps of kings and bishops, in their warfare upon the Church's rights and privileges. This brings me to the

Third inquiry. *Is the error of Mr. C. of a serious character—so serious as to demand the notice of this court?* It is: and that for many reasons. And, 1. It is opposed to one grand principle, which runs through the whole organization of the Church, Old Testament and New—the management of ecclesiastical matters by ecclesiastical officers. 2. It perils the independence of the Church: for who imagines that the Church would long remain an independent body, while every dollar expended for ecclesiastical purposes was collected, apportioned and paid by civil functionaries? Indeed, we have only to recall Mr. Crozier's own argument in his defence, to see this as the inevitable result. He leans upon Isaiah xlix. 23, "Her kings shall be nursing fathers, and her queens nursing mothers." Interpreting this passage, he spoke of the Church, not as a person of mature age receiving an endowment, but as an infant—a babe in arms! Hence his triumphant reference to the care of the nurse. She must not only provide food, she must *feed* the child; she must not only provide clothing, she must *put it on!* He did not say—this would have been too gross Erastianism—that the nurse must hedge the child in, restrain it, and, if it disobeys, chastise it; yet all this would have been equally logical. Mr. C. forgets that the church is a child of mature growth—disciplined too by long conflicts waged with the powers of this earth—able to feed herself, able to dress herself, and take care of her own steps without any higher *human* power to do all these for her. She needs supplies—she has other wants. These the civil power can and ought, at least in part, to furnish,—that they will do it is the doctrine of that consolatory text which Mr. C. so much abuses.† But no earthly power dare claim to treat the church as a helpless infant. A principle so dangerous to the church's independence, which would bind her to the care of magistratical authority and influence, is a *serious* error. 3. By his teachings on this subject

* See quotation on page from 2d Book, p. 34. It has direct bearing upon this point.

† Mr. C. had *almost* stumbled upon the truth in the course of his defence. Speaking of clothing the child, he said, "the nurse puts it on, unless the child was large enough to put it on without help." If he had not been carried away by a theory he could not help seeing, with the least reflection, that this admission destroys his whole system, *unless he really believes* the church is incapable of helping herself.

Mr. C. puts himself on the side of Mary, Lethington, Morton, James VI., of the Scottish court from 1561 to 1592, *against* Knox, Andrew Melville, and the entire church of Scotland. On this I need not now enlarge. No one acquainted with the above controversy will deny this. The matter at issue now before this court is the very same that was for thirty years so earnestly contested by the above parties. The one claimed for the church the right to hold and administer church property—the other denied this, and maintained its own paramount claims. Mr. C. sides with the court and the crown—we prefer to battle with the reformers. 4. If Mr. C.'s doctrine be true, then is there no need of deacons, as that office is defined in our standards, in the Scottish Testimony,* in the resolutions of this Synod: the magistrate does all except take care of the poor. In view of this one fact it is vain to speak of Mr. Crozier's error as a trivial one. Claiming for the magistrate, by divine right, a title to the entire control of church funds, he assails we can hardly say insidiously, the office of the deacon as this church holds it. He makes, in fact, the civil power to be the true deacon of the church, acting not within the church, and so subject to her control, but in his own sphere and so independent altogether of her direct influence. No man who holds that to the deacon belongs the management of the ecclesiastical goods can regard this error of Mr. C. as one of trivial importance. It cannot be; for it would set aside, as to the greater part of his functions, an appointed officer of Christ. 5. Admit this doctrine, and you must abandon altogether the management of missionary operations, or, at all events, of the funds connected with their prosecution. What are missionary operations? Are they any thing more than ministerial labours in preaching the word, performed under circumstances somewhat peculiar? Certainly not. There is nothing more sacred, more spiritual, nothing more properly ecclesiastical about them than about the ordinary preaching of the gospel. True they are undertaken among the destitute—for the sake of those who have no concern for themselves. But even in this do they really differ from the labours even of a settled ministry? Certainly not. To whom do I minister? To the congregation that calls and supports me? True. But not to them alone, but to all who enter these walls. And more than that. To whom does the right of entering these walls belong? To the congregation alone? Not at all. Every passer by has an equal right with any member of the congregation to enter and occupy, if vacant, *any seat* in this edifice. True again: for mutual convenience different parts of the building may be allotted to different persons, but not for their *exclusive* use. Unless otherwise fully occupied, I repeat, any passing stranger has, by the very constitution of the church, a right—he is called upon, it is his duty—to enter, take his seat, and hear the word. In short, the whole Christian ministry is on a mission. Their work is ever missionary work. It occupies the same high level as a sacred function with that to which the title is ordinarily appropriated. But what of all this? I answer, that according to Mr. C. the whole business of erecting houses of worship, of ministerial support, &c., are all affairs lying out of the range of ec-

* Scottish Testimony, (now it is also the Irish, as their members are sworn to it,) p. 65.—“Deacons are ordained upon the choice of the congregations, and are associated with the teaching and ruling elders in distributing to the necessities of the poor, and managing other temporalities of the church.” Here is not only deacons, but consistory too.

eclesiastical affairs—they are civil affairs. Where then the right of the church to collect, appropriate, and disburse mission funds? How can we escape, if Mr. C. be right, the high charge of undertaking to do, as a court of Christ, duties which belong to the civil magistrate, or, in his absence, to the people acting for him. A doctrine that leads to such results is most grossly anti-presbyterian, tends directly to the highest Erastianism,* and cannot pass unrebuked. This court will rebuke it. 6. The scheme of Mr. Crozier involves, when all put together, the ground-work of the entire patronage system. He maintains that every thing relative to the support of the gospel ministry belongs of right to the Christian magistrate. In the mean time, however, while such magistrates are wanting, to the people acting in their "civil capacity." Now, every one familiar with the manner in which these affairs are managed, knows that the people acting in their congregational capacity not only make arrangements for the payment of the minister's salary, but also make out a call for the person of their choice. Are these two transactions capable of being separated? Do the people as church members call a minister, and then pay him *as citizens*? Certainly not. In whatever capacity they call him, they pay him. It would be a strange anomaly, indeed, if the contract between the minister and the congregation, *involving their right to his services*, was in one capacity, and the same contract, as it *involves his right to a maintenance*, was in another and totally distinct capacity. The fact is, in whatsoever capacity the one party makes the contract, and the *whole* contract, the other does the same. And hence one of two things is certain,—either the people are bound as church members to support the minister, or they make out a call for him as citizens; or, to use Mr. C.'s phrase, in their "civil capacity." To the latter alternative every faithful disciple of this new scheme will inevitably be driven. Now this was the very origin of the patronage system. Kings and nobles erected churches, and, holding Mr. C.'s doctrine, that ministerial support was not through the church, but was a civil matter,—holding, not as they should have done, that they are bound to make gifts to the church, but that their donations conferred upon them a power over the induction of the ministry, they withheld from the members of the church the right to call their own pastors—they retained this in their own hands. Let Mr. C.'s doctrine prevail, and we will see, in some new form, perhaps, but equally ruinous, the monster of *civil* patronage again rearing its head—some new class of patrons rising up to set aside, on the ground of furnishing pecuniary support, some, be it more or less, of the rights of the faithful, and even of ecclesiastical courts. 7. The scheme of Mr. C. would introduce an irresponsible power into the very midst of the church. Remember his doctrine is, that in managing their pecuniary affairs the people act as substitutes for the civil magistrate. Of course every congregation possesses the same independency of the direct control of the courts of the church as would the Christian magistrate in a reformation period. Of their acts no human power

* To get rid of some arguments on behalf of the deacon's office, a distinction has been got up between a missionary's salary and that of an ordinary minister—a more groundless distinction. The principles above stated demonstrate that both are benevolent contributions. A people support a minister not for their own good merely, but that the gospel may be enjoyed by the few among them who contribute nothing, and the careless may be brought to the knowledge of the truth. For the same reasons precisely that missions are prosecuted.

could take any cognizance. As individuals the actors in any congregational meeting would be amenable for immorality to the censures of the church, but every congregation, as such, in all its congregational actings, would be entirely beyond human supervision. Are we prepared for this? Is the church prepared for this? The Christian magistrate is the ally of the church, he occupies his own independent position, and has his own independent prerogatives, as she has hers. These two powers are co-ordinate, each acting in its own sphere. But if Mr. C. be right, we have in every congregation such a power, at least as it relates to pecuniary affairs, a power not "round about" the church, but absolutely in its very midst. An independent sovereignty, swaying, although it may be in a limited sphere, a supreme and unquestionable authority.

On these grounds I have no hesitation in saying that Mr. C. has taught serious error—and not the less because it reaches far, and may not be followed with entire ease to its remote consequences. Still, I am disposed to deal leniently with Mr. C.,—to take some course that will not bear too heavily upon him, while it will mark his doctrine with the unequivocal disapprobation of this court. The fact is, Mr. C. has been driven into his present position by his opposition to the office of the deacon as the fiscal office of the church. There is no middle—no neutral ground. Provision is most assuredly made in the divine institutions for the support of the Christian church. Covenanters never can be persuaded that the church's Head has left this whole matter to the action of irresponsible voluntary associations, or even to congregations acting in that character. They can with difficulty admit of such associations even in these times, and in reference to matters that do not come immediately before the church. Will they ever be persuaded that in the millenium the maintenance of the church will be received through such associations? No. They will—they do believe—that somewhere among the institutions of the church or of the state will every agency be found by which the fiscal operations of the church may be scripturally and harmoniously conducted. There is no other alternative. Mr. C. saw this. He was in a dilemma. He must either admit that church funds are to be under church control, and so embrace the office of the deacon, or he must give up the whole into the hands of the civil power. To maintain his consistency he chose the latter—and so turned his back upon scripture example, Presbyterian principle, and the footsteps of the flock. Still, I do not think him incorrigible. The subject was new to him in this aspect. He was under constraint, and cut, without due reflection the Gordian knot. Further reflection, aided by the judgment of this court, may correct his error.

THE MAN OF FAITH.

The Christian is a man of faith, and therefore a man of principle. His creed is principle. His practice is the same. Roots and branches make one tree; and faith and practice make one Christian. And those are the noblest and most serviceable Christians whose convictions are so firm, and whose characters are so strong, that nothing can affright them from their faith, and nothing deter them from their duty. In this respect, that father of the Church was a goodly cedar, who, when nearly the whole of Christendom had yielded to the God-denying heresy, lifted up in banishment his solitary voice, proclaiming the Saviour's Deity, "*Athanasius against the world!*" And they were goodly cedars, those Waldensian worthies, who, amid the rocks and snows of Piedmont, through five-and-thirty persecutions, held fast the faith of Jesus, and though gashed by the Savoyard spear, and scorched by the Romish fagot, carried down from earliest time to the present hour Christ's pure Gospel. And he was a goodly cedar, that Knox, who never feared the face of man.

—*Hamilton.*

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CATECHISM.—SECT. VIII.*

BY REV. W. L. ROBERTS, D. D.

[Continued from p. 242—vol. iv.]

The duty of nations, in their national capacity, to acknowledge and support the true religion.

Q. 1. Is civil magistracy, as the ordinance of God, conversant only about the transient and paltry affairs of merely animal gratification?

A. Such a view, though common, is utterly incompatible with the origin and design of the institution, which has descended from the throne of God, for the express purpose of preserving moral order among men.

Q. 2. Is there any institution given by God to men, so happily adapted to preserve moral order among mankind as the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ?

A. There is none—for its very nature is—to promote, “peace on earth and good will towards men.”

Q. 3. Are the two great institutions—civil government, and the Christian religion, or church and state, hostile to, and in their nature and action calculated to frustrate each other, in the benign influence which they may respectively exert upon the human race?

A. No. They are friendly powers under the same moral regimen,—the law of God, and designed in their respective spheres, and by the means peculiar to each, to advance the same objects, the glory of God on earth, and the best interests of mankind.

Q. 4. Are they distinct powers?

A. Yes. They are distinct powers, and independent one of the other (as will appear in its place,) and each has its distinctive and particular sphere of action.

Q. 5. Is it not the custom of independent civil powers to form treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive against a common enemy and for mutual benefit?

A. Yes. This is a common practice, and generally, if the principles of the treaty are just, tends greatly to the peace, security, and mutual interests of the contracting parties.

Q. 6. Have not church and state their common enemy?

A. Yes. *Sin* is their common enemy, presenting itself in the specific forms of ignorance, immorality, and religion. “Righteousness exalteth a nation, *sin* is a reproach to any people.”

Q. 7. May not church and state form, and is it not their duty to do so, such friendly alliance for the promotion of intelligence, morality, and religion, and the suppression of the baneful influence of their common enemy?

A. Certainly. As they have a common enemy, and (as stated) a common object, they ought to form such friendly alliance, that they may have a mutual understanding of their legitimate and distinctive spheres of action; and co-operate, encourage, and mutually strengthen each other in the advancement of the common good.

Q. 8. Should the true church of Christ, “the bride, the Lamb’s wife,” form such an alliance with a heathen, anti-christian, or immoral state?

A. By no means. The same law applies to the church collectively, which applies to the individual member, *not to be “unequally yoked with unbelievers;”* even as God’s ordinance of civil government in

* We have omitted some of the intermediate sections.—Ed. Cov.

operation in Judea, was forbidden alliance with an apostate and idolatrous civil power. Isa. viii. 12, "Say ye not—A confederacy—to all them to whom this people may see—A confederacy." 2 Cor. vi. 15, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?"

Q. 9. May God's ordinance of civil government form an alliance with a corrupt, heathenish, and anti-christian church?

A. By no means: any more than a Christian man should ally himself in marriage with a polluted harlot, impenitent, and unreformed.

Q. 10. Has not the church of God, in past ages, received detriment, and does she not in some nations at the present time sustain injury by being thus unequally yoked with immoral anti-christian civil powers?

A. Yes. She has been and is still greatly injured, and from the very nature of society, she must suffer in such connexion, until both learning and power are transferred into the hands of godly men, and so made subservient to piety. Independently of the impressive lessons of long and painful experience upon this subject, it is quite reasonable to expect that if unsanctified men incorporate revealed religion with civil government, such a form will certainly be given to religion as may suit unsanctified power. The daughter of Zion is much better without such an alliance, for it is the very essence of anti-christianism. The Bride, the Lamb's wife, cannot be supposed to escape pollution, if taken into the embraces of unholy men, and rendered dependent upon a government which they administer. It is safer for the friends of religion to continue like the witnesses prophesying in sack-cloth, faithfully struggling in poverty against the frowns of power, than to become the stipendiaries of irreligious statesmen.

Q. 11. As you do not approve of every kind of union of church and state, and as no existing union receives your countenance; for what kind of union of these distinct and independent powers—do we plead?

A. We plead only for a union between God's moral ordinance of civil government, duly constituted as his minister to men for good, with pure Christianity, or the Bride, the Lamb's wife.

Q. 12. As both of these institutions, *church* and *state*, are from God, is it not a just inference, that they are designed by Him to dwell together in harmonious union, and co-operate, for the promotion of the good of mankind—like the "two olive trees"—that through "the golden pipes" pour their oil into the common bowl?

A. It cannot be justly questioned. Because, if not allied as they exist in the same community, they must frequently come into conflict with each other, and thus mar their influence respectively: for if the state has no regard, in its administration, for religion, it will desecrate its most sacred institutions, as is the case in this land with respect to the Christian sabbath.

Q. 13. Is it not a dictate of nature (among those notices of God and our duty which we have independently of revelation) that God is to be worshipped by man, not only in his individual, but also in his social capacity?

A. Yes. Hence we find, even the most savage and benighted tribes have their social, and even national religious observances and festivals.

Q. 14. Have we not the substance of sabbatic institutions taught us by the light of nature?

A. Yes. Heathen nations have their stated times to offer public national homage to their gods.

Q. 15. Must not these times of social and public assembling for religious worship be appointed and regulated by national law?

A. Yes. Because upon no other principle could there be a general concurrence of the community in the times of meeting, and the enjoyment of tranquillity and order when assembled. Hence all nations have had their times of meeting for religious purposes fixed by a national decree.

Q. 16. Is not the idea of a nation destitute of the religious sentiment shocking to our moral nature?

A. Yes. Religious sentiment and practice is absolutely essential to national happiness, and even its existence—of the truth of which we have an awful illustration in the history of Revolutionary France: where the leaders of the dominant factions discarded the religious sentiment, when iniquity in every monstrous form raised its head, and stalked through the land; virtue and piety were crushed; and the blooming plains of France were saturated, and its rivers flowed with blood.

Q. 17. Did not Greece and Rome bear decided testimony to the high importance of a national faith; and incorporate with their constitutions laws respecting religion?

A. Yes. The Heathen teach us. These nations, so celebrated in history, yielded a national allegiance to their gods, and aimed at the sanctification of their civil institutions, and all their national enterprises by the approbation of their gods. The state was the guardian of their religion, and upon every victory they brought their national "votive offerings" to the temples of their gods.

Q. 18. Is there an object on the earth so sublime in its character and so worthy of national care as the Christian church?

A. No. There is not among the ranks of created being one object worthy of comparison in point of sublimity with the Christian church—"A moral empire consisting of members animated by the Eternal Spirit, the Mediator person, God manifest in the flesh, as its head, the vast machinery of creation moving in regular subordination to its interests, and exhibiting the ineffable glory of the Divinity, is an object to be contemplated with admiration and awe."—"Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined."

Q. 19. Is not the Headship of Christ over the nations a convincing argument in proof of the duty of nations to maintain and cherish His religion?

A. There cannot be any thing more conclusive. Christ's dominion over the nations, as over all other things, is for the good of the Church. "He is Head over all things to the Church;" and certainly so important a part of his empire, as *national society*, is not exempted from the duty of exerting its influence for the welfare of that Church, for the special benefit of which Christ is exalted "*Lord of all.*" As civil government is subjected to Him, it is with the intent that, in its administration, it shall contribute to the welfare of Zion. And this is done by a national embrace of his religion to the exclusion of all others, and an engagement to its support.

Q. 20. Have we not examples in the Old Testament scriptures, of this happy alliance between church and state?

A. Yes, several. 1. The patriarchal system of government prevailed generally in the world until the time of Moses. The Patriarch was King and Priest, exercising a species of extended family government,

in which, among the godly, all temporal affairs were managed in subserviency to religion. Such were Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, who "commanded their households to keep the way of the Lord." What an ancient Patriarch, and his patriarchate or family did for advancing among themselves the interests of godliness, every nation as a body may and should in substance now do, for the present mode of government has succeeded this primitive institution—is merely an enlarged family. 2. Melchisedec was King of Salem, and at the same time Priest of the Most High God. His civil dominion was subservient to the interests of piety. 3. By divine authority the civil government of the Jews succeeded the primitive patriarchal institution—which was also rendered completely subservient to the religion of the Son of God. Legal countenance and support were given to the institutions of religion; and Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah and others, concerned themselves in the capacity of civil rulers about the interests of the Church. The erection of places of worship—the support of the ministers of religion, the removal of obstacles—and the correction of abuses, occupied much of their attention. A clear evidence that union between church and state is not necessarily, and in itself sinful—else it never could at any time have received the divine approbation and sanction. 4. The union and co-operation of the King and the Priest. Moses and Aaron, Joshua and Eleazer, David and Abiathar, Solomon and Zadok, Hezekiah and Azariah, Zerubbabel and Joshua—and Samuel "who judged Israel and built an altar unto the Lord," vii. 19. 5. The example of Cyrus and Darius, Ezra i. 1, 4; vi. 9, 12. Approved of God, vi. 12, 16, 20, 24, also viii. 10. 6. The King of Nineveh, when God's prophet denounced judgment, proclaimed a fast, giving an interesting example of the duty of magistrates to exercise a care about the moral and religious interests of their people.

Q. 21. Were not these examples, especially that of the subserviency of the Jewish civil policy to the true religion, designed to be limited to that dispensation?

A. By no means—as is evident from the consideration, that it was founded in reason, or the immutable principles of Christian philosophy; for religion is intimately, yea, vitally connected with all that should be done by man in this life, and lies at the foundation of all that regards his prospects of future blessedness and glory: and it is unreasonable to suppose that he should lose sight of it utterly the moment he acts as a member of the civil community. An immortal being should act every where with reference to his immortality. The reason is as valid to day as in ancient times, and these examples are therefore to be copied in all succeeding ages. "What was written of old time was written for our instruction."

Q. 22. May not the duty of nations to acknowledge and support the true religion, be conclusively reasoned from the character of civil magistracy, as the ordinance of God described by the apostle in Rom. xiii. 2, 3?

A. The passage is conclusive, as is evident, 1. From the title given of the ruler. "The minister of God." Can the ruler be the minister of God, and yet in his rule have no regard for religion? 2. From the objects of his office. "A terror to evil doers,"—a "revenger,"—"a terror to him that doeth evil." Are not offences against the first table, which relates to God and his worship, evils? He is also to be "a praise to them that do well." Are not the deeds of piety worthy of his coun-

tenance? If the magistrate is "the minister of God," and "a terror to evil doers," he must be so not only to the immoral, but to the profane and irreligious; and if "a praise to them that do well," he must be so not only to the *moral*, but also the *religious*,—inasmuch as the works of piety are incomparably more excellent and worthy of fostering care than those of cold morality. 3. Moreover the passage teaches that civil magistracy is especially designed for the good of the saints. For they are particularly addressed,—"*to thee,*" "*the saints.*" Rev. i. 7.

Q. 23. Is not this argument confirmed by the reason given for the prayer for the conversion of magistrates who were notorious enemies of Christ and persecutors of his religion? 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

A. Yes. For this is not a prayer for the success of an ungodly, immoral, civil power, but a prayer for the conversion of civil rulers to Christianity; that their government being founded upon Christian principles, and its administration regulated by the Christian law, the subjects may live under its jurisdiction "a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." The government must evidently be subservient to "godliness," or which is the same thing, the practice of true religion.

Q. 24. Is not idolatry punishable at the judicial tribunals, and is not this a proof of the care civil rulers should exercise about the true religion?

A. Yes. Job declares it, xxxi. 26, 27, to be "an iniquity to be punished by the judge," and thereby teaches that the civil ruler should exercise a guardian care about religion in the suppression of idolatry.

Q. 25. Does not the prophet Isaiah, xlix. 22, 23, "Kings shall be nursing fathers," etc., forcibly teach the duty of civil governments to acknowledge and support the Christian religion?

A. Most clearly. The passage manifestly refers to New Testament times, and predicts that a prominent feature of those times shall be the subserviency of civil rulers to the church. The figure employed, of "nursing fathers," is a similitude which imports the most tender care, the most anxious solicitude, not mere protection, but active and unwearied nourishment and support.

Q. 26. Does this passage give countenance to the opinion entertained by some, that the best thing the state can do for the church is "to let her alone?"

A. Certainly not. Such an idea is utterly inconsistent with the figure. Strange and unnatural nurse, indeed, who takes no interest in the welfare of her feeble charge, but lets it alone, to shift for itself! On the contrary, the just import of the figure clearly teaches that in New Testament times, it will be esteemed one of the most important and interesting functions of men in the most exalted civil stations, to nourish and cherish the church of Christ, as a tender nurse the beloved child committed to her charge.

Q. 27. Is the opinion of some correct, who, to neutralize the force of this passage, hold that rulers are here spoken of not in their official but in their private and personal capacity, inasmuch as "queens" may be here viewed not as queens regnant, but consort?

A. We answer in the words of Dr. Symington, "It is, however, far from self-evident that queens are spoken of here in the latter capacity; for every candid person will admit that the very same phraseology

might as naturally be employed in speaking of queens regnant in relation to their husbands as of kings regnant in relation to their wives. It is, therefore, not by any means clear that queens are here to be understood as consorts only; or, admitting this, will the inference follow from it legitimately that the kings are to be understood merely in their private domestic capacity, as consorts of the queens. When subjects pray for the blessing of God on their king and his queen, as they are every day in the habit of doing, the queen is of course queen consort, but surely it cannot for a moment be supposed that they do not refer to the monarch in his official capacity. Because his partner can only be viewed as associated with him in her private capacity. Yet it is only on such a supposition as this that the meaning we attach to the passage before us can be evaded. Even admitting then, for the sake of argument, the interpretation proposed with regard to queens, that they are referred to only as consorts, the inference drawn from it with regard to kings does not follow. It does not follow that kings are referred to only in their private capacity. The kings may still after all be kings regnant, and the utmost that the passage can be made to bear is, that both kings and queens, whether regnant or consort, are bound to exert all the influence they possess, in their own proper spheres, to aid and foster the interests of Messiah's kingdom in the world. Because queen consorts can do this only in their own private sphere it does not follow that kings regnant, in their proper sphere, are not also bound to do the same. On the contrary, the prediction before us leads us to conclude that, in the times of the gospel, persons of the most exalted public stations shall exert their influence in behalf of the church of Christ."

Q. 28. Does not Isaiah, lx. 11, 12, 16, "Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night: that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that *their* kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted. Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, *and shalt suck the breast of kings,*" powerfully enforce this doctrine?

A. Yes; with great power. "Here there cannot be the shadow of doubt about the sense in which kings are spoken of. The pronoun '*their*' in this sentence, at least, is decidedly in favour of the view that they are to be regarded in their public capacity; they are spoken of as the people's kings, or kings in the possession and exercise of official power and influence. In this capacity they are represented as ministers to the church of Christ in various ways. Nor is this passage less decisive that it comprehends *a threat of awful judgment* denounced on such nations and rulers as shall refuse to yield the service required."

Q. 29. Have we not an additional argument of great weight in Ezek. xlv. 17, "It shall be the *prince's* part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all the solemnities of the house of Israel, and *he* shall prepare the sin offering?" &c.

A. Very weighty indeed. The mysterious prophetic vision with which the words quoted are associated is believed by all judicious commentators to refer to the church in New Testament times. Some portions of the figurative allusions are to us mysterious, but the passage quoted plainly teaches that in those times the civil ruler, in his official

capacity, will contribute largely to the support of religious institutions.

Q. 30. Does not Psalm xlv. 12, "And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift, even the rich among the people shall entreat thy favour," beautifully instruct us in the same grand truth?

A. It does. The church in this psalm is exhibited in the splendid array of a queen, the consort of Christ, the king of glory. The accession of the Gentiles to the church seems to be here predicted under the name of Tyre, a neighbouring city, and at that time the mart of the world; for even the richest of the nations will in due time submit to the Messiah, "consecrate their gain" to him, in support of his religion and his kingdom, and court the friendship, and solicit the prayers of his church. "*Thy favour,*" *תניך*. The pronoun is feminine, and the queen, the church, is especially meant.

Q. 31. Have we not a further conclusive argument in Is. ii. 2, "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the tops of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it?"

A. Unquestionably. "The last days," or latter days, signify the time of the Messiah. As Solomon's temple, the centre of Israel's worship, was placed upon a mountain, to which the people resorted with their sacrifices from distant places, so the church of Christ and its instituted worship are represented as a temple built upon a mountain. "Mountains" and "hills" are scripture symbols of the greater and lesser kingdoms of the earth, (Amos iv. 1, Jer. li. 25,) and the passage plainly teaches the establishment of the church by these kingdoms, or the national acknowledgment and support of the religion of Christ.

Q. 32. Does not Rev. xi. 15, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ," forcibly teach this duty of nations?

A. Very forcibly. Because its manifest interpretation is, that it teaches a national recognition of the authority of Christ, and a national profession of his religion as kingdoms promised to Christ. It is not the private and individual regard of many of the inhabitants of the land that constitutes it the kingdom of its Prince, but the publicly declared and pledged allegiance of the people, and of their representatives. "It imports their becoming Christ's as formerly they had been antichrist's. As the nations under antichrist did acknowledge and submit to antichrist in a national way, so shall they as solemnly reject antichrist, and take Christ in his room, and become his people in a national capacity," by submitting to his authority, and embracing and supporting the true religion.

Q. 33. Does not Rev. xxi. 24—26 beautifully seal this argument in proof of the duty of nations nationally to acknowledge and support the true religion?

A. Yes. Here are glorious blessings promised. "The kings of the earth in the church." "The nations walking in the light of Zion." The kings of the earth promoting the prosperity of the church by consecrating the wealth and glory of their empires to the Son of God, to beautify the place of his sanctuary.

GEOLOGICAL THEORIES.*

In the glance which we shall give at this great science, (physical geography,) we look only to the external structure of the earth; briefly protesting against all those theories which refer its origin to an earlier period, or a longer process, than the "six days" of Scripture. It is true, that Moses may not have been a philosopher, though the man "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," may have known more than many a philosopher of later days. It is equally true, that the object of the Book of Genesis was not to give a treatise on geology. But Moses was a historian—it is the express office of a historian to state *facts*: and if Moses stated the "heavens and the earth, and all that therein is," to have been created and furnished in "six days," we must either receive the statement as true, or give up the historian as a fabricator. But if we believe, in compliance with the Divine word, that "all Scripture is by inspiration of God," by what subterfuge can we escape the conclusion, that the narrative of Genesis is divine? Or if, in the childish skepticism of the German school, we require a more positive testimony, what can be more positive than the declaration of the commandment of the Sabbath, "that in six days God made heaven and earth;" founding also upon this declaration, the Sabbath—an institution meant for every age, and for the veneration and sanctification of every race of mankind? If such a declaration can be false, what can be true? If ever words were plain, those are the words of plainness. The law of Sinai was delivered with all the solemnities of a law forming the foundation of every future law of earth. It would have been as majestic, and as miraculous, to have fixed the creation at a million of years before the being of Adam. But we can discover no possible reason for the history, but that it was the truth. That truth is divine.

If the geologist shall persist in repeating, that the phenomena are incompatible with the history, our reply is, "Your science is still in its infancy—a science of a day, feebly beginning to collect facts, and still so weak as to enjoy the indulgence of extravagant conclusions. There have been a thousand theories of creation—each popular, arrogant, and self-satisfied, in its own time; each swept away by another equally popular, arrogant, and self-satisfied, and all equally deserving of rejection by posterity. You must acquire *all* the facts, before you *can* be qualified to theorize. The last and most consummate work of genius, and of centuries, is a true theory."

But, without dwelling further on this high subject, we must observe, that there is one inevitable fact, for which the modern geologist makes no provision whatever; and that fact is, that the beginning of things on the globe *must* have been totally different from the processes going on before our eyes. For instance, Adam must have been created in the full possession of manhood; for, if he had been formed an infant, he must have perished through mere helplessness. When God looked on this world, and pronounced all to be "very good"—which implies the completion of his purpose, and the perfection of his work—is it possible to conceive, that he looked solely on the germs of production, on plains covered with eggs, or seas filled with spawn, or forests still buried in the

* We commend this article. It contains a great amount of truth in a nut-shell. We are gratified to find paragraphs like these in a magazine so widely circulated as Blackwood. It is high authority.—ED. COV.

capsules of seeds; on a creation utterly shapeless, lifeless, and silent, instead of the myriads of delighted existence, all enjoying the first sense of being?

But, if the first formation of the world of life *must* have been the act of a vast principle, to which we have no resemblance in the subsequent increase and continuance of being, what ground have we for arguing, that the common processes of material existence in our day must have been the same in the origin of things? On the whole, we regard the declaration—"In six days God made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is," as an *insuperable bar* to all the modern fantasies of the geologist," as a direct rebuke to his profaneness, and as a solemn judgment against his presumption.—*Blackwood's Magazine*.

EXTRACTS.

CHRISTIAN GROWTH.—A living Christian grows. His character confirms. Duties, which when first performed were a crucifixion of the flesh, and a triumph of faith, become easy and familiar habits. Promises, the fulfilment of which he at first credited on the mere authority of God, have now received the yea and amen of a long experience. In the homely words of Robert Bruce, "When I was young, the Lord compelled me to live by faith, but now he feeds his old servant with great morsels of sense." Religion has become his better and more beautiful nature. He is past the danger of being ashamed of Christ. The awkwardness and fear of man which made him once so fond of obscurity, and so afraid of the Jews, have passed away, and he is no longer averse to be ranked among the peculiar people, and regarded as a disciple of Jesus. There are apologies which he has ceased to make, and difficulties which he has ceased to feel. The lions of his youth have disappeared from the street; and the grasshopper, which was a burden to his early faith, is no disturbance to his maturer piety.—*Rev. James Hamilton*.

MEANS OF CHRISTIAN GROWTH.—When you come to look closely into the matter, and inquire to what secret cause these lofty cedars owe their growth; whence is it that their influential and impressive characters have derived their admirable grace, you always find that communion with God is the comprehensive source of their pre-eminence in piety. They are abundant in religious exercises. They are mighty in the Scriptures. They are men of prayer. They are frequenters of the sanctuary. They are lovers of Christian fellowship. They are delighted observers of the Sabbath. But, after all, ordinances are to them but avenues or audience chambers. It is a Bible in which God speaks, a closet in which God hearkens, a sanctuary in which God's countenance shines, which they desire of the Lord, and seek to attain. And finding these, they find the living God himself. Their fellowship is with the Father and the Son. They grow into the knowledge of the Divine perfections. They grow in reverence, and trust, and love. They grow in perceptions of their own infinite vileness, and consequently in appreciation of the blood which pardons, and the Spirit who cleanses. They grow in self-distrust, and in dependence on God. They grow in self-condemnation, and in longings for that world where they will sin no more.—*Ib.*

CHRISTIAN GROWTH—HOW KNOWN.—Would you know whether you are growing in grace—improving and advancing in personal Christianity? Then tell us, Is your faith more firm? Have the truths to which you once consented strengthened into settled convictions? Have they become first principles, and do they instinctively prompt you to corresponding action? Is your piety more persuasive? Does it decide your conduct, and give the casting vote in doubtful conjunctures of your history? “Does it regulate your daily demeanour as a husband, wife, parent, child, master, servant? Does it come abroad with you, out of your closets into your houses, your shops, your fields? Does it journey with you, and buy and sell for you?” Does it stand at your elbow, and keep watch at the door of your lips? Is your heart larger? Instead of looking merely on your own things, have you learned to look on the things of others? Do you love the brotherhood? And however much you may prize your own denomination, do you rejoice to hear that godliness revives and religion spreads in other communities? Have you a public spirit?—a missionary spirit?—a spirit of zeal? In the efforts made to protect the Sabbath,—to rescue missionary stations from Romish intrigue and warlike rapacity;—in the efforts to educate the ignorant, and reclaim the vicious, and ameliorate the condition of the working classes, do your whole souls accord? Have these present objects of philanthropy your suffrage, your sympathy, your prayers? But, above all, does your love to the Lord Jesus grow?—*Ib.*

SLAVERY DEFENDED BY U. S. CONSTITUTION.

“It is impossible for the reflecting Southern planter not to see that even slavery cannot long exist in the United States, without and independent of the guarantees of the federal constitution. The whole world, save this constitution, is against the institution. All South America, save Brazil, has abolished it. The English have cut loose from it in all their islands. The French have, in a revolutionary fervour, denounced it and sacrificed it. The literature of all nations disowns and declaims against it. It is not exaggeration at all to say that the common sentiment of all mankind is against it, save in Brazil, the United States, and the island of Cuba; and that the whole struggle of modern civilization is to get rid of it. But slavery stands protected by the federal constitution of the United States; and as long as that constitution exists, every American who respects that constitution will respect all the guarantees in it, be he of the North, East, or West.”—*New York Express.*

True: all but two clauses. The constitution is not the *only* refuge of slavery: we would include a large share of the churches. And as to every American “respecting” the guarantees of the constitution, we are American by a descent of nearly a century and a half, and yet we take the liberty of saying that we abhor these guarantees. With these exceptions, the article is true, and yet how disgraceful. The whole world against slavery except the nation whose free principles are its great boast! And what are we to think of the public morality when respectable men can coolly talk of respecting guarantees given to robbery, oppression, and all manner of debasing immorality?

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD IN SCOTLAND.

The following brief abstract of the doings of the Scottish Synod in May last, is from the pages of the Scottish Presbyterian. The reports on the Sustentation Fund, Foreign Mission, Jewish, &c., are long; but contain nothing that, in an abridged form, would interest our readers. The report on the Deaconship was

laid over to next meeting. We look for it in the next No. of their Magazine. It will be seen that the prospect of union with the Original Seceders, is rather faint.—
ED. COV.

Professor La Harpe, of the Theological Seminary of Geneva, having been introduced by the Moderator, addressed the Synod in reference to the labours of the Evangelical Society of Geneva, in diffusing the Gospel in various parts of France and Switzerland, for which God has been affording remarkable facilities in consequence of the Revolution of last year. He stated that one of his chief objects in visiting Scotland this season, as a deputation from the Society with which he is connected, was to meet this Synod, and give them information respecting the important and inviting field of Evangelistic labour opened up on the Continent of Europe, and set forth its claims on whatever aid they might have it in their power to give. It was agreed, that as the report of the Foreign Mission Committee would bring the same subject under consideration of Synod, the final decision should be deferred till it was heard, and meanwhile it was unanimously agreed to thank Professor La Harpe for the address delivered and the information communicated by him, and to express the respect felt by the Synod toward himself personally, and the interest cherished by them in the labours of that excellent body, the Evangelical Society of Geneva. The Moderator communicated the decision to M. La Harpe, which he suitably acknowledged.

The report of the Foreign Mission Committee, was read by Dr. Bates. The Committee was re-appointed and somewhat enlarged. The following points engaged the serious and lengthened consideration of the Court:—

1. Whether this Church is willing to authorize Mr. Inglis to attempt the organization of a church among the colonists in Wellington, in connexion with the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland.

The Synod, after serious deliberation, adopted the following motion, viz.:—

“That the Synod still adhere to their original purpose of missionary labour among the Aborigines, and so adhering do not deem it expedient to authorize the attempt to form a congregation in connexion with this Church among the colonists in Wellington, nor to support Mr. Inglis as a missionary among them; but that in the event of Mr. Inglis proceeding to organize a congregation on his own responsibility, the Synod reserve to themselves the power of judging of the principles on which it is organized, and of the relations to be maintained with it; or that if Mr. Inglis find it impracticable to resume his labours on heathen ground (which they hope will not be the case,) and prefer returning home, that the Committee be instructed to afford him the means of doing so.”

2. Whether the Synod is disposed to engage in Evangelical efforts on the Continent of Europe. The Synod unanimously responded to the question in the affirmative, and agreed to authorize a collection throughout the Church on the second Sabbath in July, or some Sabbath before the end of that month, in behalf of the diffusion of the Gospel throughout the Continent, leaving it to the Committee to dispose of the funds as they may think proper. Also, that the Committee consider the whole matter, and be prepared to report on a plan according to which aid may be given in diffusing the Gospel on the Continent.

CHEAP PUBLICATION SCHEME.—In consequence of the death of the convener of the committee on this scheme, Dr. Orr, and other circumstances, no matured report was submitted. It was, however, stated by Professor Symington, that some progress had been made in the preparation of the projected volume, though not, owing to various obstacles, so great as he could have wished; and that the whole matter would be submitted to an early meeting of the committee, which was re-appointed.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH ORIGINAL SECEDERS.—The Report having been called for, Professor Symington, Convener of the Committee, presented it. The Minutes of the Meetings of the Joint-committee were read, together with the Propositions which they have had under their consideration, and also a communication from the Synod of the Original Secession Church to the Court, containing the following Extract of the Minutes of that Church on the subject of the conference:—

“At Edinburgh, Davie Street Church, 4th May, 1849.

“The Synod of United Original Seceders being met, and constituted, *inter alia*,
“Received the Report of the Committee for Correspondence with other Churches. The Committee produced the minutes of two conferences they had held with the Committee of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and also some propositions drawn up by the joint Committees. After several members had expressed their minds, it

was moved and agreed to:—That the Synod regret to learn that so little progress has been made towards agreement in sentiment between the two Committees, yet anxious to do all in their power to remove present differences, re-appoint the Committee for correspondence with other churches, with instructions to meet with the Committee of the Reformed Presbyterians, should there be any opportunity presented of meeting with them, or any prospect of matters being riper for agreement in the profession of the truth."

The Committee of Correspondence was re-appointed; although we are sorry that the terms of the foregoing Minute appear to hold out very slender encouragement. According to it the meeting of the joint Committees is made to depend on the "prospect of matters being riper for agreement in the profession of the truth." We had always considered the conferences as means of "ripening for agreement," by the opportunity which they afforded for mutual explanations, and of promoting confidence and brotherly love; and by the efficacy of united prayer in drawing down the influences of the Spirit of truth and peace. It is only thus, in our humble opinion, that agreement can at all be expected; and it were worth while to spend years in such intercourse for the sake of a consummation so desirable as the union of those who professedly maintain the covenanted Reformation.

OVERTURE REGARDING PREACHERS.—The following overture was submitted by the Glasgow Presbytery. It was deemed expedient, however, that it should lie on the table for consideration till next meeting of Synod:—

"Whereas it is of importance to the success of the Gospel, that the instruments employed in publishing it should be in some good measure acceptable to those among whom they labour—not only in the case of ministers, but also in that of preachers. In order to provide as far as possible that this may be the case, it is expedient that a definite and limited time should be fixed, at the expiration of which, the name of the preacher who has not obtained a settlement, should be dropped from the Synod's roll; it is therefore overtured by this Presbytery to Synod, to meet at Glasgow on Monday the 7th May current, to pass an enactment that the name of any preacher who has not obtained settlement within a period of years from the time of his being licensed, shall be dropped from the Synod's roll, provided always that the validity of his license shall not be affected thereby, and that it shall be competent to any minister to employ him in his pulpit, or to any Presbytery, to appoint him to a vacant congregation, at the desire or with the concurrence of the people."

MINISTERS AND PROBATIONERS FROM OTHER DENOMINATIONS.—In consequence of an overture from Glasgow Presbytery on this subject, it was unanimously resolved, "That no minister or probationer shall be admitted from any other denomination to public service in this Church, except through the Supreme Court." In all such cases Presbyteries will of course report the applications made to them to Synod, by which they will be finally disposed of. It is worthy of remark that of the only three ordained ministers that have for a great length of time left the communion of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, two have been received from other denominations, the one as a probationer, and the other as a minister. The greater caution thus seems necessary.

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD—IRELAND.

The following abstract of the proceedings of this Synod are taken from the Banner of Ulster. It will be seen that the attention of Synod was called to a great number of interesting matters, and that much business was transacted. We need not call the attention of our readers to the doings in reference to the office of the deacon. Our anticipations are verified. Our brethren abroad are not afraid of *discussion*. They enjoin it. Deacons will, ere long, be found in the congregations of our church in Ireland, *performing their appropriate functions*. The step they have taken secures this. It will also be seen that our brethren are moving unitedly on the subject of missions. We rejoice to find that another labourer is to be sent out to strengthen the hand of the Presbytery in the colonies, and that a promising student has devoted himself to the foreign missionary field. When the published

minutes come to hand, we will be able to furnish more complete information on some points, particularly from the statistical reports.—Ed. Cov.

The annual meeting of this body was held in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, South College Street, Belfast, and was opened on Monday evening, the 9th July, at seven o'clock, with an appropriate discourse, by the Rev. William J. Stavely, D. D., the Moderator. The subject was Galatians v. 1—"Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." From this theme, Dr. S. first showed the nature of the liberty in which we are commanded to stand fast, and, secondly, our duty in relation to it. Under the first head were pointed out the characteristics of the liberty enjoyed by the members of the Church, whether under the promise, the law, or the Gospel. This was shown to consist in deliverance from the dominion of Satan, the world, and sin, in the members. The nature of Christian liberty was then exhibited, as comprehending freedom from obligation to observe the ceremonial law, and from the inventions of men in matters of religion. It was shown, moreover, that the exercise of an arbitrary power on the part of men, prescribing to the Church a religious faith, is inconsistent with Christian liberty—that this liberty is freedom from the trammels of tradition, and that Christian liberty is to be regulated by the Divine Word. Our duty in relation to Christian liberty is to claim it as our patrimonial inheritance—to hold it steadfastly without wavering—to fortify our minds against every attempt to impose on us a yoke of bondage—and to resist all seductive influences, whether they originate in the world, or the desire to enjoy honour, &c. The discourse, which was throughout Scriptural and practical, was concluded with suitable directions to the ministers, elders, and people who were present. The Synod being afterwards constituted and the roll called, the Rev. Robert Wallace, of Newry, was unanimously elected Moderator for the ensuing year.

Presbyterial Reports, &c.—On Tuesday the Synod was chiefly occupied with reports of Presbyteries and matters arising out of the minutes of the former year. Arrangements were made for the ordination of Mr. Robert Stewart, a licentiate, who had engaged to the missionary board to go forth as a missionary to the British North American colonies. Drs. Stavely and Houston, with the Moderator, and Messrs. Sweeny and Russell, were appointed a committee to take the preliminary steps, and to ordain Mr. Stewart, and the ordination was fixed to take place on Thursday evening.

Theological Students.—Dr. Houston, on the part of the committee that had been appointed to superintend the students who attended the Royal College, Belfast, during last winter, gave in a report on the subject. They had read with him, critically, portions of the sacred originals, and the Rev. Wm. McCarroll had exercised them regularly on the evidences of Christianity. The students had, besides, held missionary prayer meetings, and had taken an interest in the cause of missions. The theological library had been considerably increased by donations of books from public-spirited individuals of various sections of the Church. This report was approved, and the substance of it ordered to be engrossed in the minutes. The sum of £10, out of the interest of the education fund, was voted for the use of the library, and a catalogue was ordered to be printed.

Next Meeting of Synod.—Belfast and Derry were named as places for holding the next annual meeting of the Synod; and on the matter being put to the vote, Belfast was chosen by a considerable majority. The committee on discipline were ordered to have an abstract of discipline prepared by the next meeting of Synod.

Re-introduction of Deacons.—A lengthened and interesting discussion took place respecting the revival of the order of deacons throughout the different congregations. Mr. Simms submitted a full report on the subject. All the members admitted the Divine appointment of the deaconship, and the propriety of having deacons in the Church, when the circumstances might seem to require them—while some appeared to think that there is at present no urgent call to appoint such officers. The Synod at length unanimously adopted a motion, which was proposed by Mr. Russell, and seconded by Dr. Houston. It was as follows:

“Resolved, That this Synod affirm the minute of 1828, which asserts the Scriptural character of the deacon’s office, and recommend it to the ministers and elders of this Church to use their best endeavours in their respective places, to have the congregations under Synod’s care instructed in respect to the nature and duties of the deacon’s office; that as soon as practicable, consistently with the peace and edification of their respective congregations, deacons may be appointed in them.”

Terms of Communion.—The report of a committee on the terms of communion occupied the attention of the court during the remainder of the session this day, and for a part of the forenoon session on Wednesday. It was finally agreed, unanimously, on the motion of Mr. Toland, seconded by Mr. M·Carroll, that the alterations suggested should be transmitted to the sessions of the Church, to report in writing on the matter to the next meeting of Synod.

Covenant Renovation.—On Wednesday, besides other business of minor importance, the report of a committee on Covenant Renovation was considered. A “Confession of Sins,” suited to an act of covenanting, which had been prepared by a committee, was read by Dr. Houston, the convener; and it was afterwards considered in separate paragraphs, with the view of preparing it to be sent down to the inferior judicatories. Several alterations were made in this paper, and it was adopted by Synod. At a subsequent stage of the proceedings the following resolutions were unanimously adopted in relation to this important subject:

“That this Synod, having still in immediate view the work of Covenant Renovation, and with the desire to prepare the Church for the performance of such a work, so soon as the aspects of the times, and the internal condition of the Church may warrant us to enter upon it, recommends ministers to preach in their respective congregations two discourses at least on this subject before next meeting of Synod, and to connect therewith importunate fervent prayer to God for the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Church, that ministers, elders, and people, may be prepared for this solemn duty.”—“Resolved further, That the committee be continued, and instructed to make the corrections agreed upon in the paper styled ‘The Confession of Sins,’ and send it down without delay to the sessions of the Church; and, moreover, recommend them to direct their special attention to the Church’s precedents, in relation to Covenant Renovation, with a view to ascertain the order of procedure in this solemn transaction.”

Sabbath Sanctification.—In the evening the report of a committee on the Sabbath was submitted by Mr. Dick, the convener; and Mr. Wallace, the Moderator, afterwards read an able and well-written paper, entitled “An Expostulation with Directors of Railways,” in re-

lation to the violation of the Sabbath, by means of the travelling of trains on the Sabbath. General satisfaction was expressed with the diligence of the committee, and especially with the faithful remonstrance which had been presented. The committee was continued, and directed still farther to turn their attention to this subject; and the "Expostulation" was ordered to be printed, and circulated as widely as possible.

Missions—Foreign.—The proceedings of the Synod on Thursday had relation almost exclusively to the missions of the Church. The twenty-first annual report of the Board of Directors was read by Dr. Houston, the foreign secretary. This, besides containing select information concerning the progress of the missionary cause throughout the world, exhibited the state of the missions of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, both at home and abroad. The account of the colonial mission was peculiarly interesting, showing the zeal and faithfulness of the missionaries that had been sent out to British North American colonies—the spiritual destitution of the people of those regions—and the earnest desire of the people to enjoy more plentifully the means of grace. The subject of a proposed mission to Hayti was also adverted to, and the Synod expressed its determination to go forward in a mission to the heathen. In connexion with this last matter, the foreign secretary reported the application of Mr. Andrew Tait, a promising theological student of the Western Presbytery, to be received as a missionary to the heathen. The Synod regarded this application with much interest, and accepted with great satisfaction Mr. Tait's tender of services, and agreed to remit him to the Western Presbytery and the missionary board for special instructions. Some time will yet elapse before a missionary can be sent by the Synod to the pagan world, as there is need to make some inquiries further respecting the field of labour. But we cordially rejoice in the prospect of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod entering upon the great work of spreading the Gospel throughout the dark parts of the earth. Though comparatively few in number and of limited means, yet, from the character of the body, we anticipate from them a valuable accession to the cause of converting the nations. We trust that, in this important undertaking, they will enjoy the benefit of the prayers and pecuniary assistance of others; as we hope they will enter upon the work, and prosecute it in a spirit worthy of the descendants of the men who accounted not their lives dear to themselves in their efforts to advance the kingdom of Christ.

Manchester Congregation.—The case of the Manchester congregation occupied the attention of the Synod, at the close of the missionary proceedings, for some time. A large debt unliquidated is against the house of worship; and the congregation being at present without a pastor, are struggling with great difficulties. Mr. James Hurst, merchant, Manchester, appeared as commissioner from the congregation, and gave a clear account of the state and prospects of the congregation. After much deliberation on the subject, at this and in a subsequent session, it was agreed to furnish some aid to the congregation in Manchester, a number of members of Synod becoming responsible for the repayment of the money, and a supply of preaching by different members in succession was likewise appointed for Manchester.

Ordination of a Missionary.—The evening of Thursday was spent by the Synod chiefly in a solemn and interesting service. This was the ordination of Mr. Robert Stewart, licentiate, as a missionary to the North American colonies. The ordination services were performed in the presence of a numerous and deeply attentive audience, by the committee that had been appointed by Synod for this purpose. The Rev. Robert Wallace, the Moderator, first preached a very appropriate and impressive discourse from Psalm lxxii. 19—"Let the whole earth be filled with His glory." This delightful assurance was first considered as promised and sure, as still future, to be expected from the nature of true religion, and from the character and perfections of God; and the nature of the great change that will be effected was likewise exhibited. The import of the pious wish expressed in the text, and the means of accomplishment, were then strikingly shown. Among the means of filling the earth with the Redeemer's glory were noticed—religious instruction, the preaching of the everlasting Gospel, fervent, individual, and united prayer, and the abundant outpouring of the Spirit. The Rev. Dr. Stavelly afterwards gave a brief narrative of the circumstances which led to the designation of Mr. Stewart as a missionary to the colonies, proposed the formula of questions, and ordained the candidate by solemn prayer, and with the laying on of the hands of the committee. In conclusion, Dr. Houston addressed to the newly-ordained missionary a solemn and affectionate charge, and commended him and the work to the blessing of God by solemn prayer. These services appeared to produce a deep impression upon the assembly. Mr. Stewart will leave his native land, whenever he sails for the colonies, with the affectionate regards of all who know him; and we trust that, in the important field in which he goes to labour, he will be honoured to gather many wanderers into the fold of the Good Shepherd.

Days of Thanksgiving, &c.—On Friday, a variety of important business claimed the attention of the Synod. The first Wednesday or Thursday of August, as may suit the convenience of congregations, was appointed to be observed as a day of special fasting by all the people under the care of the Synod, because of the pestilence and other Divine judgments that are prevailing throughout the land. The fourth Thursday of November was also appointed to be observed by the different congregations as a day of public thanksgiving; and the fourth Thursday of January, 1850, as a day of public fasting and humiliation.

Irish Mission.—The subject of the Irish mission was taken into consideration. A verbal report was given in by Mr. Simms, the convener of the committee that had been appointed for the conducting of this mission; and various interesting statements were made by the Rev. Robert Stewart, who had laboured for some time as a missionary in Connaught. An account of the schools that were in connexion with the mission was presented, and also an abstract of the treasurer's account. A discussion afterwards took place respecting the teachers to be employed in the schools that are to be supported by the funds. It was finally agreed that the report be published in the *Monitor*; that a committee of the Synod be now appointed, to meet in Ballymena on the second Tuesday of September, to prepare a constitution and regulations for the Irish mission, to be submitted to Synod at its next annual meeting; and that the Synod, feeling deeply its obligation to propagate the truth through the dark parts of this land, instruct the Irish

committee, which is now re-appointed, to carry forward the good work that has been begun, and, above all, to exercise a vigilant superintendence over the operations of the mission. The committee for the constitution that was appointed consisted of Dr. Stavely, Messrs. Dick, Sweeny, Simms, Chancellor, Ferguson, Russell, McCarroll, and Dr. Houston.

Education.—The report of the committee on elementary and collegiate education was read by Mr. Dick. It referred to a series of resolutions respecting national education, which were read by Mr. Russell, and were afterwards adopted by Synod, and ordered to be published with the minutes. After some discussion on that part of the report which referred to collegiate education, and which contained the committee's views of the Queen's Colleges, it was agreed to remit the matter of the course to be followed by the students of the Church for the present year to the committee on the constitution of the Irish mission.

Traffic in Liquors.—A motion was brought forward by Dr. Houston, to declare the traffic in ardent spirits immoral. After some discussion, the following judgment on the subject was adopted :

"Synod unanimously disapprove of the traffic in ardent spirits—declare that henceforth no member of this Church who opens a house for carrying on this trade shall be entitled to Church privileges—and instruct sessions, if there be any members under their inspection engaged in this trade, to deal with them, with a view of inducing them to discontinue it."

Common Fund.—Towards the close of the proceedings some discussion took place on the subject of a common fund for the support of the ministry; but, the evening being far advanced, it was judged inexpedient to do more than re-appoint the committee for this object. About ten o'clock on Friday evening, the proceedings were closed by prayer, by the Moderator.

All the ministers of Synod were present at this meeting; and the business was conducted throughout with good feeling, and a considerable measure of harmony and brotherly affection.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Sandwich Islands.—Thus far, the expense of the missions to these islands, has been borne by the Board at home. An attempt has lately been made, with partial success, to render them self-supporting. In accordance with the wishes of the Board, a convention of missionaries was held in May last, to consider the question. The convention was in session five weeks, but came to no definite conclusions. Still it appears that the Polynesian churches, generally, are either unable or unwilling to maintain themselves. However, some of the missionaries have resolved to relinquish their income from the Board, and to look to their churches and their own exertions for support. Another step has been taken in the same direction. The Mission Seminary at Lahainaluna has recently become, by grant, the property of the government, and is to be sustained hereafter by government funds, on essentially the same plan as heretofore. It has cost the mission, since it was founded in the year 1831, about \$77,000, and has sent forth 241 graduates, and 156 under graduates, to exert their influence upon the nation. It will be an important era in the history of missions when

China.—The following statement appears in the papers. If it be correct, we must modify our views of the state of things in the Celestial Empire, which we have been in the habit of associating with the idea of passive endurance on the part of the people, and complete independence on that of the government :

“There is a spirit of discontent, a love of change, a feeling of old partialities springing up in the Chinese empire, which will surprise us some fine morning in intelligence of the overthrow of the Tartar dynasty. China is on the verge of a political revolution—a disruption of its vast and distant provinces will be inevitable. Throughout the extent of the Chinese empire there is manifest a disposition and alacrity in forming clubs and associations, a combination of force and union of sentiment which will not be long without taking a more clear and decisive course of conduct. The province of Canton is ripe for rebellion ; is ready to throw off the yoke ; and the people would cheerfully avail themselves of any pretext to civil strife.”

The missionaries appear to have every facility of access to the people. There is a loud call for labourers. Mr. Johnson, writing from Fuh-chau, says :

“As I become better acquainted with its vast extent, my sense of its importance in a missionary aspect is augmented. In the great and fertile valley of the Min there are probably not less than two millions who speak the Fuh-chau dialect. Most of this multitude of perishing souls live within twenty miles of our homes. The numerous villages in which a considerable number reside, are so near, that if our force were adequate to the work, we might visit them almost daily. The people in general are friendly, and the fields are inviting. We need a great accession of labourers to gather in the perishing harvest.”

At Amoy, the usual Sabbath morning congregation, in their new house of worship, is from one hundred and fifty to two hundred ; the afternoon, about twice as large. A few females attend.

Turkey.—This empire is in danger of becoming involved in the great war raging on its northern boundary. It has forbidden the march of Austrian troops against Hungary through Servia, which lies to the south-east of Croatia ; and has given orders to its authorities in Wallachia to prevent the return of the Russians into that province, or to disarm those who do so. It is to be seen whether Austria and Russia will submit, having already enough upon their hands ; or whether they will insist upon a free passage for their troops.—The *missions* in Turkey are, for the most part, unmolested. In Syria, which is under Turkish rule, the opportunities are very favourable for missionary efforts ; but, so far, no great success has attended them. The missionaries of the Associate Reformed Church in Damascus, write rather discouragingly. In Trebizond, an important city in the north-east of Asia Minor, on the Black Sea, the missions are now free from molestation. The ordinary means of grace are regularly attended by the members of the congregations ; externally every thing is quiet, and the civil rights and immunities of the Protestants are respected by the Turkish officials. We hear little respecting the church in Constantinople.

Switzerland.—Our notices of the Swiss churches have been scanty of late. We have had few materials. The letter writers have been drawn away by the stirring events on a large scale in other countries. We offer some gleanings. The London Christian Times says :

“In no canton of German Switzerland, except Bale-ville perhaps, is there so much real and enlightened piety in the ministers of the Establishment as in that of Berne. Hence arises an increasing conviction of the necessity of a new life in the church, and of the creation of new channels of religious activity. Those ministers,

feeling the ancient bulwarks of official religion, and even of social order, giving way under their feet, deliberated seriously upon the establishment of a home mission, such as was proposed for the North of Germany by the Assembly at Witterberg, to be conducted by pious laymen as well as ministers, and to be wholly irrespective of state endowment and protection."

This is better news than we had expected to hear from any of the Established Churches. As to the effect of the oppressive edicts of the Canton de Vaud, which we have already laid before our readers, and the state of things, generally, the correspondent of the Presbyterian says:

"It has been granted our beloved brethren, to feel strengthened in proportion to the new violence of their enemies. They have been *unanimous* in deciding, that, with the help of the Lord, the only Head of the Church, the conflict shall be sustained, firmly and calmly, as in the past; that they will hold themselves in readiness to endure sacrifices of money, and other sufferings to which they may be called; finally, that all the members of the Free Church shall be requested to remember their present trial, before the Lord, every Saturday evening, between eight and nine o'clock. . . . The existing churches are maintained, and three new churches have been admitted. A work of evangelization has been extended over the canton, and the Grand Council is greatly excited against these evangelists, incessantly travelling all over the country, *as if it were a country of savages*. The Free Faculty of Theology has continued to prosper, and the number of their pupils exceeds that of the pupils of the National Faculty. The churches of Piedmont have recalled their students."

As to practical religion, Mr. Russell thus writes to the Evangelist:

"I have never seen, even in England, an *ensemble* so neat, so well ordered, as in the Canton of Berne. Every thing is in its place, in good condition, well washed and arranged; all breathes of quiet and prosperity. We passed the Sabbath in a village inn, whence I could observe what passed around the house. I heard no sound but the ringing of the bell which summoned the villagers to church, and saw no movements but those of the worshippers who were on their way thither."

He adds, however:

"During the remainder of the day, groups of three or four children were passing quietly here and there along the road; or some young girls, with white sleeves, were sitting upon a prostrate tree, on the edge of a meadow; no shouts, no boisterous games, and not a single person coming to drink in the cabaret."

Should there not be some attempt to establish more direct communication with some of these descendants of Zuinglius and Calvin?

Germany.—1. *Its Unity.*—The efforts of the republicans—for this the liberals are—to establish a confederated unity among all the German states, have failed. The Frankfort Parliament, of which so much was heard a year ago, has been broken up, and their constitution has become nearly a dead letter. At first Austria, then Prussia, and, finally, all the large states, refused to adopt it. A new constitution by the King of Prussia, was then promulgated. To this many gave in their adherence, but Austria refuses. Absolutism is in the ascendant. 2. *The Church.*—Since the dissolution, to a considerable extent, of the connexion between church and state in Prussia, efforts are making to establish a new church organization. This will be no easy matter. There are two parties—both influential—even among the evangelical clergy. We give a late and authentic account of the posture of affairs:

"The twelfth article of the Constitution granted by the King of Prussia, in December of last year, having made the separation of the Church from the State one of the fundamental principles of the new order of things, it became necessary to take measures for the re-organization of the church. Accordingly, the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs invited the consistories, and the theological faculties of the different universities, in January last, to report on the steps most advisable, in

their opinion, to be taken under existing circumstances. The veteran Uhlich, of Magdeburg, who has been reinstated in his parochial cure of St. Catherine's, convened a meeting in that city, on the 18th of April last, at which the best mode of bringing about a General Representative Assembly of the Church was debated; and steps were taken to organize a general movement on the principles agreed upon by the meeting. This body represents the democratic view of church matters, the Theological Faculty at Berlin representing the conservative, and (in the German sense of the word,) orthodox side, which has also been published. It was unanimously affirmed by the meeting at Magdeburg, that a General National Representative Assembly of Protestants should be convened with as little delay as possible. It was also determined that electors should be chosen, one from every congregation under five hundred souls, two from every congregation above five hundred and below one thousand, and one more for every additional thousand; the electors of each district or town, to meet together, and elect between them one clerical and two lay representatives for the General Assembly, which is to act as a constituent assembly, negotiating the terms of separation from the State on the one hand, and on the other hand, framing a new ecclesiastical constitution. The next question was as to the qualifications which should confer the power of voting, and render the party eligible as a church representative. The result of the debate on this point was, that any man who has the right of Prussian citizenship, and has completed his twenty-fourth year, be his creed or his moral character what it may, is qualified to give a vote in the choice of representatives, and to be elected as a representative. The reply of the Theological Faculty at Berlin, the sage doctors who teach under the special supervision of the King of Prussia, is a most servile apology for the supremacy of the King in the church. And proceeding from such men as Neander, Hengstenberg, Swesten, and Vitzsch, is unexpectedly conservative. It opposes the separation of Church and State, and resists all tendencies to improvement and change with a genuine Popish bigotry."

We will look, with interest, for the meeting of the expected General Assembly.

France.—The late elections have terminated in favour of the Conservatives. Out of nine hundred and fifty members, the Mountain, or Red Republican party, have a little more than two hundred—the high-toned Conservatives, or Monarchists, a large proportion—a third party, who may be reckoned as moderate republicans, holding the balance of power. The Monarchists are sanguine; and we will not be surprised, should an effort be made, and a successful one, to confer upon Louis Napoleon the consulate for life, or a large term of years, as a step to the restoration of one or other of the exiled Bourbon families. In its foreign relations, France is now to be ranked among the high conservative powers. She has beaten down republicanism in Rome. She looks coldly on the struggle of the Hungarians. She is in close diplomatic relations with Russia. At home, the government favours Popery, and even Jesuitism. The Minister of Public Instruction is a Jesuit. One of the writers says:

"In France, a great effort is going on to raise the Catholic Church to its former authority. To this the government gives its countenance. Since last December we have had innumerable religious ceremonies performed by Catholic priests. Even the anniversary of the proclamation of the Constitution was celebrated in Paris and the other departments by ceremonies in the Catholic churches. In February last, the same Church was charged to say masses all over France for the repose of the dead in the last revolution. The National Assembly has voted large salaries to bishops to enable them to exercise charity to the poor. Whether the money is appropriated in this way or not, cannot be known. One thing is certain, that the bishops and archbishops have contributed since last November large sums to assist the Pope in his campaign against the lives and liberties of the Roman people. The French government honours the priesthood in every way. In the late project of a law for popular education, presented by the Catholic, de Falloux, Minister of Public Instruction, an important part is given to the bishops, archbishops, and curates.

This week the government has offered to the Archbishop of Paris a rich palace, situated in the fashionable quarter of St. Germain, and recently occupied by the Austrian Ambassador. The offer is accompanied with the promise that, as soon as the government is in funds, a palace shall be built expressly for the use of his venerable highness."

That all this can last we cannot believe. There may be a temporary revival of both the great elements of the kingdom of darkness in France—a strong monarchical government and Popery; but it will be only temporary. France herself will throw off once more the former; and thus, at least, indirectly, the latter. The *great* earthquake is at hand.

Hungary.—1. *Its Religion.*—The following extract is rather long, but the intelligent reader will not wish it abridged. It is from the pen of a foreign correspondent of the *Evangelist*:

"Hungary contains sixteen millions of people, of whom four millions are Protestants; one half million Jews; one half million Gypsies; and the rest Papists. About one and a half million of the Protestants are Lutherans, the other two and a half million Reformed, holding nominally to the Confession of the Synod of Dort and the Heidelberg Catechism. Among these, however, there are perhaps a hundred and fifty thousand Socinians occupying a certain district in Transylvania. Nothing whatever is done for the Gypsies, although they are highly intelligent, and offer a fine field for missionary labour. The Reformed Church is organized much like the Presbyterian. Hungary is divided into four "Synods," which are subdivided into "Seniorats," answering to our Presbyteries; and these into "Presbyteries," answering to our Sessions. The General Congress is held annually at Pesth. The *Lutherans* hold their General Synod there at the same time, and the two bodies unite in counsel for any common Protestant interest. The last year the Socinians joined them for this end. At all of their ecclesiastical assemblies any member of the Church has a right to speak; but the delegates alone vote. The distinction of layman and minister is only faintly recognised. The pastors often hold office in the civil courts, and act as political leaders and representatives. *Rationalism* has made greater progress in Hungary than in any other country; but some districts are much less imbued with it than others. The higher and educated classes appear to have given themselves to it fully. This is the result of the efforts of the Roman clergy, who do not labour there "for a dish of lentils," but for a revenue of 35,000,000 of florins per annum (about \$17,000,000.) *Popery* in Hungary is of a very gross character, and is consequently rejected by the enlightened class, who reject at the same time the truth, and this infidelity acts powerfully upon the Protestants. The Austrian government has contributed greatly to the corruption of the faith and the demoralization of the people. Joseph II. introduced indifferentism and immorality, and forbid the exercise of discipline in the church. Nevertheless, the churches along the Theiss have preserved it in some degree. When a man has committed any scandalous crime, they make him do penance upon a large stone in the church, where they make him listen to a particular lecture, and demand pardon of the church, which is so far a good sign of the religious disposition of the people; there is perhaps no other in Europe who would submit to this. The people have, to a great extent, preserved a strong religious sentiment, which dates back to the Reformation. The simple Hungarian has learned to occupy himself with the salvation of his soul, and the purity of doctrine. *Family worship is a prevailing custom*: in passing through the Protestant villages of a morning one may hear from every house the song of praise. There is also worship in the temple every morning; the service lasts half an hour; the exercises are singing, reading of the Scriptures, exhortation, and prayer. The Session conduct the service, and any member may pray and exhort. In some districts there is an evening service also. Religious instruction and confirmation is general. *The Bible is read every where*; but the people do not see romances or journals: they do not occupy themselves at all with foreign missions. About thirty years ago there was found to be a great scarcity of Bibles, especially in the Bohemian language, so that it was remarked, while the estate of a family was usually settled among the heirs without any difficulty, there were frequent cases in court as to the possession of the family Bible.

. . . The Bible is now sold in Hungary for about half a dollar, and the New

Testament at twenty cents. . . . The knowledge of a little Latin was all that was required to be consecrated as a minister; and German rationalism was the prevailing theology. The Hungarian students were forbidden to enter the German Universities, in consequence of the revolutionary ideas existing there. But the greatest misfortune for the Church was the erection of a Faculty of Theology at Vienna in 1837. A vast number of students were gathered there, who became corrupted in this impure capital, and brought evil manners into their parishes. Mr. Wimmer believes that this was foreseen by the Government, and was the very thing intended; and all the preceding persecutions have done far less injury than this Theological School at Vienna. There was no other way but to establish a Normal School, and proceed from that to a School of Theology, whence evangelical doctrine should proceed. He (Mr. Wimmer) collected among the peasants \$14,500 to build the Normal School; and since then he has obtained a considerable sum for the Seminary, of which the King of Prussia gave 3000 thalers. The Normal School is working wonders, and the Seminary was opened in 1844 with twelve pupils. He obtained from Berlin and Saxe eight pious teachers; three of whom are sustained by his parishioners for the Normal School."

Facts like these increase our interest in the fearful conflicts of this people with Austrian and Russian despotism. 2. *The War*.—The late accounts—though later news may be different—are all in favour of Hungary. Bem, a Polish general, has beaten Jellachich; and cleared southwestern Hungary of her enemies. He has also beaten the Russians in the southeast and east, and thus, with some exceptions, relieved Transylvania from her Russian invaders. A great battle, fought near Waitzen, at the bend of the Danube, by Georgey, and Dembinski, another Pole, resulted in the defeat of Paskiewitch, the Russian commander, and has nearly freed central Hungary of hostile armies. The entire Hungarian population is fully roused. The feud between the Magyars (pronounced Modyars) and the other tribes, Slaves, Slovacks, Wallachs, &c., has been overborne by their mutual hatred of foreign domination and equal determination to be free. A lively interest exists on their behalf in England; and great meetings are held by some of her most influential politicians and business men, expressing the deepest sympathy, and urging upon the government the immediate adoption of measures for the recognition of her independencé.

Rome.—The French have conquered. They are in possession of Rome. The Triumvirate have fled. Garibaldi has taken to the mountains, with some thousands of followers. The Pope is still at Gaeta. He refuses to make any concessions, and the difficulties of the French seem to be only beginning. The population of Rome gave no welcome to the invaders. They are sullen. There was no reactionist party, as the French pretended, and even the friends of liberty feared. The result it is impossible to foretell. One of the signs of the times is the publication of a letter from Father Ventura, one of the most distinguished of the Italian priests. It was he who was called upon to pronounce O'Connell's funeral oration. From this letter, which has excited an intense interest, we take a few extracts. They embrace the most striking part of the letter:

"But that which troubles every Catholic is, that if this restoration takes place without establishing firmly the power of the *prince*, it will interfere with and perhaps destroy the authority of the *pontiff*; and that each discharge of cannon in damaging the walls of Rome will destroy, by degrees, the Catholic faith in the hearts of the Romans. I have told you of the horrible impression that the 'sugar-plums of Pius IX. sent to his children' (as the cannon balls were called) had produced upon the Roman people, and of the hatred they had excited against the priests. But all this is nothing in comparison with the anger which the sight of

the French bombs has excited against the Church, and even against the Catholic religion. These bombs, falling for the most part in the Trastevere, that portion of the Roman people, particularly, who formerly were such strong Catholics, are now cursing and blaspheming the Pope and the clergy. . . . The Roman people see that the Austrians, with a prelate of the Pope (Monsignor Benini) in their midst, are ravaging the country, bombarding the cities, burdening the most peaceable citizens with enormous taxes, banishing or shooting the most ardent patriots, and re-establishing, every where, an absolute clerical government. They see the French, in the name of the Pope, shedding Roman blood, and destroying the city of Rome; they see that it is the Pope who has sent four powerful nations, armed with all the implements of destruction, against the Roman States, like a pack of hounds let loose upon a wild beast; and from that time they hear nothing more, they raise themselves against the Pope and the Church, in the name and in the interest of which the Pope proclaims that it is his duty to re-conquer by force his temporal power. . . . I have just read the last address of the Pope to the Cardinals. What impudence! what folly to have put into the mouth of the Holy Father, pompous eulogies of Austria and the King of Naples; the greatest enemies of the independence of Italy, whose very name horrifies every Italian! What impudence to have made the Pope say that he himself appealed to the powers to reinstate him on the throne which he himself abandoned! It was to say, 'I intend to wage against my own people that war which the year before I declared I would not wage against Croats and Austrians, the oppressors of Italy.' Even the women raise this reproach against him; and now in witnessing the effects of this savage war of four powers against one little State, in seeing their husbands and children killed and wounded, you cannot conceive the rage of the women, the violent sentiments to which they give way, the cries of fury they vent upon the Pope, Cardinals and Priests *en masse*. . . . The people no longer wish to confess, nor to commune, nor to take part in the mass, nor to hear the Word of God. No one preaches in Rome for want of hearers. No one wishes any thing at the hands of a priest, or any thing priestly. . . . I have just learned that at Rome all the youth and men of any education are of opinion that the *Pope* wishes to reign over them by force; that he wishes for the Church or for the priests the sovereignty which belongs only to the people; and he believes that it is his duty to act thus, because they are Catholics, and because Rome is the centre of Catholicism. Ah, well: what prevents us from renouncing Catholicism, and becoming Protestants, if necessary? And then what political right could the Pope oppose to us? For is it not horrible to think, that because we are Catholics and sons of the Church, it is necessary to be overcome by the Church, to abjure all our rights, to expect from the liberality of the priests that which is due to us by justice, and to be condemned to the fate of the most miserable people? I have learned also, that these sentiments have become more general than one would believe; that they are held even by the women. Thus twenty years of labour that I have given for the purpose of uniting the Roman people more firmly to the Church are lost in a few days. Thus, that which I have foreseen and predicted in all my letters, is unfortunately accomplished, and even beyond my predictions. *Protestantism, indeed, finds itself implanted in a part of this good and religious Roman people*; and, sad to tell, this has happened by the conduct of some priests and by the bad administration into which the Pope has been led. Ah! my dear friend, the idea of a bishop who deals destruction among the people of his charge, of a shepherd who kills his sheep, of a father who sends death upon his children, of a Pope who wishes to reign, to impose himself upon three millions of Christians by force; who wishes to re-establish his throne upon ruins, dead bodies, and blood;—this idea, I say, is so strange, so absurd, so scandalous, so horrible, so contrary to the Gospel, that there is no people *that would not revolt at it, no faith that can hold fast to it, no heart that will not tremble at it, no tongue that could restrain itself from malediction or blasphemy*. Ah! it were a thousand times better to lose every temporal thing, even the entire world, *if necessary, than to give such an offence to his people*. . . . It is probable that Rome will yield to the attack of the French arms. How resist France? It is possible the Pope will re-enter Rome with the sword in his hand, instead of the cross, preceded by soldiers, and followed by the executioner, as if Rome were Mecca, and the Gospel the Koran. But he will never reign in the hearts of the Romans. Under this connexion his reign is destroyed, finished for ever; he will be Pope only of a pitiful number of faithful ones. The great majority will remain in fact Protestants, for they will no longer practise the old religion

whilst their hatred for *the priest is so great*. Our preaching can effect nothing. It will be impossible for us to make the Catholic Church loved, or even tolerated, by a people who will have learned to hate it, to scorn in it a chief imposed by force, and a clergy dependent on this chief. It will be impossible for us to persuade them that the Catholic religion is the mother, the guardian of the liberty of the people, and the security for their happiness."

At Rome, as in Tuscany, the restoration of the old order of things is followed by a large diminution of religious liberty.

England.—A bill has passed Parliament, called the Clergy Relief Bill, which permits, under certain conditions, such clergymen as abandon the Established Church to continue their ministrations as dissenters. Heretofore, no such clergymen could preach, after leaving the Establishment, unless under pain of fine and imprisonment. The bill legalizing the marriage of a deceased wife's sister, has been withdrawn. The Jewish Relief Bill, opening the way for Jews to sit in Parliament, was defeated in the House of Lords; and also the rate in aid, so unpopular in Ulster. The crops are very promising. Cholera has revisited some of the larger towns with renewed violence. The public mind is unusually quiet, so far as home affairs are concerned.

Ireland.—The only incident, out of the usual course, is a fatal conflict, which took place, July 12th, at Dolly's Brae—a hill in the south of county Down—between a large body of Orangemen and a multitude of Papists, who had assembled around, to oppose their passing this particular locality. Both parties used fire-arms. The Papists were beaten—some forty or fifty killed, and some of their hamlets burned. This conflict shows that the old feud, in its worst form, is still maintained—that popish malignity against Orangemen is not abated. Perhaps it has been imbibed by the open and ostentatious exhibition of loyalty last summer by the latter during the O'Brien trials in the south. The result of this encounter will probably be the re-enactment of the law forbidding both Papist and Orange processions. The region where this took place has more than once seen similar occurrences. The crops promise well; and there are hopes of some improvement, consequently, in the condition of the people. The cholera has not been so fatal in Ireland as was feared.

OBITUARY.

DIED, July 17th, at his residence, Muskingum county, Ohio, Rev. ROBERT WALLACE, aged 77 years. The deceased was for more than thirty years employed in labouring, and successfully, as a gospel minister and witness for a covenanted testimony. He departed as a "shock of corn, fully ripe." *

THE FOREIGN REVIEWS.—We would call the attention of our readers to the *five* Reviews advertised on the second page of our cover. No one should, if able to get them, be without them. In their pages he will find the best and most instructive accounts of all the great movements of the day, as they are regarded by eminent men of all political parties. He will also become acquainted with much that is valuable in literature and science. The late numbers are highly interesting.

* Will some one forward us a notice of his life? We have mislaid the paper containing it.

THE
COVENANTER.

OCTOBER, 1849.

MACAULAY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James II. By THOMAS BABINGTON
MACAULAY.

The age abounds with new histories, and especially with histories of great and critical periods. In these histories, moreover, there are peculiar features. We are not satisfied now, as former generations were, with a dry record of public events: we wish to see the actual condition of society at any given period, and, if possible, to have spread out before us the private life, and even the hearts, of the great actors in historical events. This craving for minute information is likely to be gratified. Every succeeding historian labours with renewed assiduity to present a complete picture of the period which he has selected as his theme: or if he has chosen to portray an individual, he brings him before us not only as he appears on the great stage of human action, but as he was in his family, in his private correspondence, in his hours of relaxation.*

We are glad that this is so; and, more especially, as we can plainly see that the public taste, both in this country and in England, seeks a more intimate acquaintance with that greatest of all historical periods since the incarnation of Christ, the Reformation. The ultimate results of such investigations we do not fear. Error alone shuns the light. The votaries of high churchism and absolutism may well be alarmed when so many are ransacking the archives of the past, and dragging out of their recesses, or stripping of their disguises, the hateful advocates of spiritual and political despotism, and showing them up in their true characters as enemies of religion and humanity. On the other hand, we are assured—we have seen enough already to assure us—that the more extensively and rigidly the history of the Reformation and the century following are examined, the brighter will shine the names of the faithful who have signalized themselves in defence of evangelical truth and civil liberty. We are no longer in danger of being misled by the cunning craftiness of Hume, so far as to imagine Queen Mary a greatly injured woman, or Charles I. a gracious and well-meaning monarch, resisted and murdered by a mass of untaught and vulgar clowns. Nor could even Scott,† with all his story-telling genius, per-

* Witness Carlyle's *Cromwell* and Walpole's *Recollections*. Much of the charm of D'Aubigné's *Reformation* consists in this, that he brings before us Luther, Melancthon, the Great Elector, Zuinglius, &c., as living, speaking, acting—quotes their words, and describes their doings.

† The Edinburgh Reviewers thus speak of the "Great Enchanter:—"

"Our recent history, in fact, has been obscured by the pen of Walter Scott, just

suade us—or the age—that “bloody Clavers” was any thing else than a fierce, reckless minion of arbitrary power. Puseyites and Tories may be alarmed at the inquisitive spirit of the age. They may sigh for those days when, in England, the king was the state, and, perhaps, we should add, the church, too,—when no prying eyes dare invade the sanctuary of official seclusion, and no winged newspapers were in existence to send to every hamlet the doings or the misdeeds of lords spiritual and temporal. Let the fountains of history be drained. We would wish to know all about the great periods of history and the men who moved in them. Rubbing, which mars and defaces the baser metals, only adds to gold new lustre.

The history before us has been received by the reading public—we can hardly use too strong an expression—with the utmost enthusiasm. Its author is a distinguished Scottish essayist and politician. In politics, Macaulay is a liberal; as to religion, though nominally an Episcopalian, he is, probably, infidel; at all events, he has a hearty hatred of evangelical truth and churches. As to his morals, we know nothing; but we cannot do otherwise than judge very unfavourably of the moral principles of any man who can speak as he does of breaches of the seventh commandment.* As a writer, no man stands higher. His style is clear, flowing, compact, lively, and picturesque. There are no gaps in his narrative,—events, with their actors and results, pass before you like a moving panorama, in which each character stands out distinctly, and yet not independent; for every one is seen in its various relations to the other figures on the canvass. Macaulay is learned,—he has been in parliament, where he occupied nearly the first place as a debater on the whig side;† and has long been about the head of the list of contributors to the *Edinburgh Review*.

There is but one object that Macaulay worships: that is civil liberty.

as the Wars of the Roses lie entombed under the dramatic fables of Shakspeare. In truth, with all his wonderful and enchanting endowments, Scott was a fervent worshipper of rank and power; nobility and ancient blood were to him the types of a superior order of humanity; Royalty was a sacro-sanct, mysterious idol. Considering his warm and kindly heart, and intimate acquaintance with the habits, wants, and virtues of the lower orders, it is wonderful how little is to be found in his pages of generous sympathy with the struggles of an oppressed people, or of pride in the liberty of that country, the manners and history of which he has illustrated in his immortal fictions. His predilections always lean to the monarch, however arbitrary—his antipathies rest with the people, however greatly wronged. ‘*Nos numerus sumus*’ is the feeling ever predominant in his mind when he speaks of the commonalty; and we believe he would have revered the chair which held the graceless Charles at the Tillietudlem breakfast, with devotion quite as genuine as that which he ascribes to Lady Margaret Bellenden. Thus, whether it be the misguided Mary, or the profligate Charles, or the bloody persecuting Claverhouse, there is always a glitter of romance thrown round them by his brilliant pen, quite sufficient to cast all their faults into the shade; while he cannot describe the persecutions of the Covenanters without smothering sympathy by ridicule.”

We need hardly add, that Scott’s misrepresentations became the *occasion*, to no small extent, of reviving the memory of the Covenanters. So it will always be.

* Speaking of the acts, wrong, fanatical, and ridiculous in his estimation, chargeable upon the Puritans in the time of the commonwealth, he says:

“The illicit intercourse of the sexes, even where neither violence nor seduction was imputed, where no public scandal was given, where no conjugal right was violated, was made a misdemeanor.”

† He was member for Edinburgh; but was thrown out at the last general election on account of his views in regard to the endowment of the Popish clergy of Ireland. His constituents were not prepared for this measure.

Religion is, with him, a matter of very inferior consequence. His soul delights to contemplate—his pen to canonize—the heroes who have held the van in great conflicts against despotism: the faithfulness, the fortitude, the integrity of those who have stood foremost in struggles for religious privilege, awaken, in his infidel mind, no enthusiasm. In the former, he sees greatness and high principle: in the latter, nothing but fanaticism. Even the opposition to James II. and his Jesuitical advisers, appears to him no more than a contest on behalf of the constitution and against the dispensing power. Evidently, he cannot realize such a thing as the dread of Popery as a false and damnable religion. He sees some of its evils, and paints them truly, but with no eye to any thing but what is merely earthly: of its spiritual evils—the spiritual darkness which follows in its train, with “death and hell?”—he has no conception.*

That such a man would do justice to the religious views and practices of the Puritans of England, or the Covenanters of Scotland, could not be expected. We might as well expect a blind man to admire and praise the cerulean canopy above us. “The natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit of God.” Still, we might have anticipated kind notices of the men who nobly stood in the breach against floods of spiritual and political despotism. We could hardly have looked for such a caricature of the Puritans as this:

“The persecution which the separatists had undergone had been severe enough to irritate, but not severe enough to destroy. They had not been tamed into submission, but baited into savageness and stubbornness. After the fashion of oppressed sects, they mistook their own vindictive feelings for emotions of piety; encouraged in themselves, by reading and meditation, a disposition to brood over their wrongs; and, when they had worked themselves up into hating their enemies, imagined they were only hating the enemies of Heaven. . . . They paid to the Hebrew language a respect which they refused to that tongue in which the discourses of

* The following is true, and deserves to be remembered:

“During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has every where been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation; the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic has the Roman Catholic Church, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France.”

Jesus and the epistles of Paul have come down to us. . . . Morals and manners were subjected to a code resembling that of the synagogue when the synagogue was in its worst state. . . . The learning and eloquence by which the great Reformers had been eminently distinguished, and to which they had been, in no small measure, indebted for their success, were regarded by the new school of Protestants with suspicion, if not with aversion."

This is mere abuse, and no little of it utterly false. That the Puritans had some peculiarities, we are not disposed to dispute; but, most assuredly, they were no "savages;" and how any historian who regarded his reputation for truth—the first attribute of his calling—could assert that the Puritans were "averse to learning," we cannot conjecture. In making these unfounded statements, Mr. Macaulay must have forgotten that Owen, the distinguished vice-chancellor of Oxford, and Howe, one of the most eloquent and polished writers and speakers of his age, the chaplain of Cromwell,—and Baxter, who was offered a bishopric after the restoration,—and Reynolds, who accepted one, were among the Puritans. Did he forget Bates, Calamy, and, lastly, Milton? We might add, did he forget the Assembly of Divines, composed of men eminent as scholars, as preachers, as theologians? But how, if they were savages, has it come to pass that the era of Puritan ascendancy is the era of English greatness—we might almost say, civilization? Macaulay has taken up the vulgar notions of the age, and has recklessly, and *con amore* slandered the Puritans.

True, in their estimation,

"The solemn peal of the organ was superstitious. The light music of Ben Jonson's masks was dissolute. Half the fine paintings in England were idolatrous, and the other half indecent."

And they had no love for May-poles, huntings, dancings, and idle amusements, generally. They thought life had other aims than to be played and sung, and romped and whistled away. Perhaps, in some things, they carried their rules to extremes; but even this the pious historian would have regarded as no more than the natural consequence of the *extreme* and acknowledged licentiousness of the Tory party in church and in state.*

But let us look at the Puritan as he appears when contrasted with even the *gentleman* of England. The former was strict in his morals, faithful in his domestic relations, intelligent in religion, grave in his deportment. Thus was every Puritan. What was the English squire? Let Macaulay testify.

* A sentence in his notice of Clarendon, the eminent politician in the time of Charles II. and his Popish brother, furnishes an excellent specimen of the way in which this writer judges of the same things in different connexions. Clarendon is a favourite character, and among no little panegyric occurs the following:

"His morals as well as his politics were those of an earlier generation. Even when he was a young law student, living much with men of wit and pleasure, his natural gravity and his religious principles had to a great extent preserved him from the contagion of fashionable debauchery; and he was by no means likely, in advanced years and in declining health, to turn libertine. On the vices of the young and gay he looked with an aversion almost as bitter and contemptuous as that which he felt for the theological errors of the sectaries. He missed no opportunity of showing his scorn of the mimics, revellers, and courtesans who crowded the palace; and the admonitions which he addressed to the king himself were very sharp, and, what Charles disliked still more, very long."

Had Clarendon been a Puritan, all this would have been ridiculous—as he was an Episcopalian, it was an evidence of good sense, especially as he was not evangelical.

“His chief pleasures were commonly derived from field-sports and from an unrefined *sensuality*. His language and pronunciation were such as we should now expect to hear only from the most ignorant clowns. His *oaths*, *coarse jests*, and scurrilous terms of abuse were uttered with the broadest accent of his province. . . . The habit of drinking to excess was general in the class to which he belonged. . . . The coarse jollity of the afternoon was often prolonged till the revellers were laid under the table. . . . His opinions respecting religion, government, foreign countries, and former times, having been derived, not from study, from observation, or from conversation with enlightened companions, but from such traditions as were current in his own small circle, were the opinions of a child. He adhered to them, however, with the obstinacy which is generally found in ignorant men accustomed to be fed with flattery. . . . His wife and daughter were in tastes and acquirements below a housekeeper or a still-room maid of the present day. . . . His ignorance and *uncouthness*, his *low tastes* and *gross phrases*, would, in our time, be considered as indicating a nature and a breeding thoroughly plebeian.”

We have italicized a few phrases. And, remember, this is the “country gentleman!” And, we ask, which is the clown—the ungainly Puritan, if you please—or the uncouth, ignorant, gross Tory gentleman? To say nothing of such men as Owen and Howe, it would be no little disparagement to the Puritan *peasant* to compare him with such characters as English Tory squires of the seventeenth century. But we have more testimony from the same pen to the same effect. If any where the characteristic traits of the Puritans would show themselves, it would be in the army: if they had any hidden leanings to degrading vices, they would make their appearance amid the license of war. Now, what sort of men were Cromwell’s soldiers?

“But that which chiefly distinguished the army of Cromwell from other armies was the austere morality and the fear of God which pervaded all ranks. It is acknowledged by the most zealous Royalists that, in that singular camp, no oath was heard, no drunkenness or gambling was seen, and that, during the long dominion of the soldiery, the property of the peaceable citizen and the honour of woman were held sacred. If outrages were committed, they were outrages of a very different kind from those of which a victorious army is generally guilty. No servant-girl complained of the rough gallantry of the red-coats; not an ounce of plate was taken from the shops of the goldsmiths; but a Pelagian sermon, or a window on which the *Virgin and Child* were painted, produced in the Puritan ranks an excitement which it required the utmost exertions of the officers to quell. One of Cromwell’s chief difficulties was to restrain his pikemen and dragoons from invading by main force the pulpits of ministers whose discourses, to use the language of that time, were not savoury; and too many of our cathedrals still bear the marks of the hatred with which those stern spirits regarded every vestige of popery.” *

And, finally, who were the savages—the Puritans, who accomplished a great revolution without doing any violence to property or life, except in the case of those who died in battle, or of the *three* chief offenders, Strafford, Laud, and Charles, who died on the scaffold,—or the

* Of these troops we find, on page 45, the following interesting statement. It refers to the period after the Restoration:—“The troops were now to be disbanded. Fifty thousand men, accustomed to the profession of arms, were at once thrown on the world; and experience seemed to warrant the belief that this change would produce much misery and crime—that the discharged veterans would be seen begging in every street, or would be driven by hunger to pillage. But no such result followed. In a few months there remained not a trace indicating that the most formidable army in the world had just been absorbed into the mass of the community. The Royalists themselves confessed that, in every department of honest industry, the discarded warriors prospered beyond other men; that none was charged with any theft or robbery; that none was heard to ask an alms; and that, if a baker, a mason, or a wagoner attracted notice by his diligence and sobriety, he was, in all probability, one of Oliver’s old soldiers.”

Cavaliers, whose restoration to power was the signal for wrong, and rapine, and bloodshed, more or less, throughout the island? No. The Puritans were not faultless; but in every attribute that makes the man, and even in manners, they will compare most favourably with any men of their class in their day: and if we have in any thing the advantage of them, it is owing, under God, to their manly virtues, and Christian integrity, and those of the Covenanters in the North.

These last Mr. Macaulay likes still less than he does the Puritans, and makes a still more offensive effort to hold them up to loathing. Against the morals or the manners of the Covenanters he has nothing to say: he attacks their principles and their public proceedings: and these are pursued in a more hideous caricature than even the manners of their southern neighbours:

“They wanted not only freedom of conscience for themselves, but absolute dominion over the consciences of others; not only the Presbyterian doctrine, polity, and worship, but the Covenant in its utmost rigour. Nothing would content them but that every end for which civil society exists should be sacrificed to the ascendancy of a theological system. One who believed no form of church government to be worth a breach of Christian charity, and who recommended comprehension and toleration, was, in their phrase, halting between Jehovah and Baal. One who condemned such acts as the murder of Cardinal Beaton and Archbishop Sharpe, fell into the same sin for which Saul had been rejected from being king over Israel. All the rules by which, among civilized and Christian men, the horrors of war are mitigated, were abominations in the sight of the Lord. Quarter was to be neither taken nor given. A Malay running a muck, a mad dog pursued by a crowd, were the models to be imitated by Christian men fighting in just self-defence. To reasons such as guide the conduct of statesmen and generals the minds of these zealots were absolutely impervious. That a man should venture to urge such reasons was sufficient evidence that he was not one of the faithful. If the Divine blessing were withheld, little would be effected by crafty politicians, by veteran captains, by cases of arms from Holland, or by regiments of unregenerate Celts from the mountains of Lorn. If, on the other hand, the Lord’s time were indeed come, he would still, as of old, cause the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and could save alike by many and by few.”

As we said before, this is mostly abuse and falsehood. True, the Covenanters did hold that systems of gross error, and Popery in particular, should be restrained by the civil authorities; but that they asked *any* dominion, much less “absolute,” over the consciences of others, is directly false. An explicit and cherished doctrine of their Confession was, that “God only is Lord of the conscience, and has made it free from the commandments of men.” It is equally false that they would sacrifice *any* end, much less “every” end of civil society for any purpose whatever. They understood the nature of civil government far better than any other people of their times—unless the Protestant Swiss—and, great as Mr. Macaulay is as a politician, better than he does even now. Among these ends, they put first, as the ultimate end of all, the glory of God,—then, moral and religious interests,—then, civil liberty and good order,—the former as the means, and the *only* effectual means of preserving the latter. And that they were right, the history of the past two centuries abundantly demonstrates: the ineffectual struggles of irreligious nations for the permanent possession of civil liberty now demonstrate. As to their views of the importance of church government, it is not necessary to attempt their vindication in the abstract; we have only to remember that the controversy then was, whether the king was head of the church, having power to model her forms according to his sovereign pleasure, or whether the Bible con-

tains the entire faith of the Christian—or, in other words, whether Christ be supreme and sole head of the church. It was a controversy between Jehovah and Baal. And, moreover, the interests of civil liberty, as Mr. Macaulay himself would have seen, had he not been blinded by his hatred of evangelical religion, were intimately connected with the points at issue. The next clauses are directly false. The most of them believed that Cardinal Beaton and James Sharpe were righteously put to death, as to the substance of the act—as to the form, they were not so entirely agreed. Even Aikman, as nearly as possible, justifies the latter—he dare not condemn it. But, to represent the Covenanters as waging unnatural war, is a most malignant slander. Considered as outlaws, hunted like wild beasts, they rarely retorted—not half as often as they might have done. And, as a specimen of their spirit, even when Sir James Turner, who had raged against them with the most frightful cruelty, and had put many to death by his dragoons, in cold blood, fell into their power, they spared his life, and dismissed him unharmed. That they were irrational in having a principal regard to the favour and blessing of God in all their enterprises, no pious man will believe: that they believed in the miraculous interposition of the Most High, without the use of appropriate means, none but the ignorant will credit—none but the malicious affirm. In a word, the conduct of the Covenanters, during the days of their ascendancy, sufficiently vindicates them from all such aspersions as these: contrasting that period with that of Episcopal power which immediately followed, their character becomes bright by the contrast. Finally, had they succumbed, liberty would have taken her flight from the whole island. It was their banner, “descried by the vigilant eye of William,” that encouraged him in his attempt to rescue the whole empire from popish tyranny.

Still, let us do Macaulay justice. He does not imitate Scott in his descriptions of the persecutions of the Scottish Covenanters. Speaking of the year in which James II. ascended the throne, he says:

“The fiery persecution which had raged when he ruled Scotland as vicegerent, waxed hotter than ever from the day on which he became sovereign. Those shires in which the Covenanters were most numerous were given up to the license of the army. With the army was mingled a militia, composed of the most violent and profligate of those who called themselves Episcopalians. Pre-eminent among the bands which oppressed and wasted these unhappy districts were the dragoons commanded by James Graham of Claverhouse. The story ran that these wicked men used in their revels to play at the torments of hell, and to call each other by the names of devils and damned souls. The chief of this Tophet on earth, a soldier of distinguished courage and professional skill, but rapacious and profane, of violent temper and of obdurate heart, has left a name which, wherever the Scottish race is settled on the face of the globe, is mentioned with a peculiar energy of hatred. To recapitulate all the crimes by which this man, and men like him, goaded the peasantry of the western lowlands into madness, would be an endless task.”

With verbal exceptions, the following is a just account of the condition of the Covenanters during the reign of the last of the Stuarts:

“But there were, particularly in the western lowlands, many fierce and resolute men, who held that the obligation to observe the Covenant was paramount to the obligation to obey the magistrate. These people, in defiance of the law, persisted in meeting to worship God after their own fashion. The Indulgence they regarded, not as a partial reparation of the wrongs inflicted by the magistrate on the Church, but as a new wrong, the more odious because it was disguised under the appearance of a benefit. Persecution, they said, could only kill the body, but the black Indulgence was deadly to the soul. Driven from the towns, they assembled on heaths and moun-

tains. Attacked by the civil power, they without scruple repelled force by force. At every conventicle they mustered in arms. They repeatedly broke out into open rebellion. They were easily defeated, and mercilessly punished; but neither defeat nor punishment could subdue their spirit. Hunted down like wild beasts, tortured till their bones were beaten flat, imprisoned by hundreds, hanged by scores, exposed at one time to the license of soldiers from England, abandoned at another time to the mercy of bands of marauders from the Highlands, they still stood at bay in a mood so savage that the boldest and mightiest oppressor could not but dread the audacity of their despair."

If Macaulay caricatures the evangelical party, he does not hesitate, on the other hand, to speak very freely of the English Establishment. Witness the following:

"To this day, the constitution, the doctrines, and the services of the Church retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies a middle position between the churches of Rome and Geneva. Her doctrinal confessions and discourses, composed by Protestants, set forth principles of theology in which Calvin or Knox would have found scarcely a word to disapprove. Her prayers and thanksgivings, derived from the ancient Liturgies, are very generally such that Bishop Fisher or Cardinal Pole might have heartily joined in them. A controversialist who puts an Arminian sense on her articles and homilies will be pronounced by candid men to be as unreasonable as a controversialist who denies that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration can be discovered in her Liturgy."

And this:

"The thirty-seventh article of religion, framed under Elizabeth, declares in terms as emphatic, that the ministering of God's word does not belong to princes. The queen, however, still had over the Church a visitatorial power of vast and undefined extent. She was intrusted by Parliament with the office of restraining and punishing heresy and every sort of ecclesiastical abuse, and was permitted to delegate her authority to commissioners. The bishops were little more than her ministers. Rather than grant to the civil magistrate the absolute power of nominating spiritual pastors, the Church of Rome, in the eleventh century, set all Europe on fire. Rather than grant to the civil magistrate the absolute power of nominating spiritual pastors, the ministers of the Church of Scotland, in our own time, resigned their livings by hundreds. The Church of England had no such scruples. By the royal authority alone her prelates were appointed. By the royal authority alone her convocations were summoned, regulated, prorogued, and dissolved. Without the royal sanction her canons had no force. One of the articles of her faith was, that without the royal consent no ecclesiastical council could lawfully assemble. From all her judicatures an appeal lay, in the last resort, to the sovereign, even when the question was whether an opinion ought to be accounted heretical, or whether the administration of a sacrament had been valid. Nor did the Church grudge this extensive power to our princes. By them she had been called into existence, nursed through a feeble infancy, guarded from papists on one side, and from Puritans on the other, protected from Parliaments which bore her no good will, and avenged on literary assailants whom she found it hard to answer. Thus gratitude, hope, fear, common attachments, common enmities, bound her to the throne. All her traditions, all her tastes, were monarchical. Loyalty became a point of professional honour among her clergy, the peculiar badge which distinguished them at once from Calvinists and from papists."

The above extracts refer to the constitution of the church: we give one that exhibits very correctly the state of moral principle in the establishment after the commonwealth had passed away. Episcopalians should read it; many, no doubt, have read it with shame.

"The restored Church contended indeed against the prevailing immorality, but contended feebly, and with half a heart. It was necessary to the decorum of her character that she should admonish her erring children; but her admonitions were given in a somewhat perfunctory manner. Her attention was elsewhere engaged. Her whole soul was in the work of crushing the Puritans, and of teaching her disciples to give unto Cæsar the things which were Cæsar's. She had been pillaged and oppressed by the party which preached an austere morality. She had been restored to *opulence and honour by libertines*. Little as the men of mirth and fashion were disposed to shape their lives according to her precepts, they were yet ready to fight knee-deep in

blood for her cathedrals and palaces, for every line of her rubric and every thread of her vestments. If the debauched Cavalier haunted brothels and gambling-houses, he at least avoided conventicles. If he never spoke without uttering ribaldry and blasphemy, he made some amends by his eagerness to send Baxter and Howe to jail for preaching and praying. Thus the clergy, for a time, made war on schism with so much vigour that they had little leisure to make war on vice. The ribaldry of Etherege and Wycherly was, in the presence and under the special sanction of the head of the Church, publicly recited by female lips in female ears, while the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress* languished in a dungeon for the crime of proclaiming the Gospel to the poor. It is an unquestionable and a most instructive fact, that the years during which the political power of the Anglican hierarchy was in the zenith were precisely the years during which national virtue was at the lowest point."

And now what were her clergy? and what was their social position? Some of them were eminent—held high places—had great influence. But what were the working clergy—the rectors in small parishes, her curates, her chaplains? In Scotland the ministry were, from the Reformation, an honoured class—even the teachers of her schools occupied a very eligible social position. It must be so in a Presbyterian country. What was it in the seventeenth century in Episcopal England, where the prevailing religion was the religion for a gentleman? Macaulay's illustrations are somewhat coarse, but the coarser probably the nearer the truth:

"Perhaps after some years of service he was presented to a living sufficient to support him; but he often found it necessary to purchase his preferment by a species of simony, which furnished an inexhaustible subject of pleasantry to three or four generations of scoffers. With his cure he was expected to take a wife. The wife had ordinarily been in the patron's service; and it was well if she was not suspected of standing too high in the patron's favour. Indeed, the nature of the matrimonial connexions which the clergymen of that age were in the habit of forming is the most certain indication of the place which the order held in the social system. An Oxonian, writing a few months after the death of Charles the Second, complained bitterly, not only that the country attorney and the country apothecary looked down with disdain on the country clergyman, but that one of the lessons most earnestly inculcated on every girl of honourable family was to give no encouragement to a lover in orders, and that, if any young lady forgot this precept, she was almost as much disgraced as by an illicit amour. Clarendon, who assuredly bore no ill-will to the Church, mentions it as a sign of the confusion of ranks which the Great Rebellion had produced, that some damsels of noble families had bestowed themselves on divines. A waiting-woman was generally considered as the most suitable helpmate for a parson. Queen Elizabeth, as head of the Church, had given what seemed to be a formal sanction to this prejudice, by issuing special orders that no clergyman should presume to marry a servant-girl without the consent of her master or mistress. During several generations, accordingly, the relation between priests and handmaidens was a theme for endless jest; nor would it be easy to find, in the comedy of the seventeenth century, a single instance of a clergyman who wins a spouse above the rank of a cook. Even so late as the time of George the Second, the keenest of all observers of life and manners, himself a priest, remarked that, in a great household, the chaplain was the resource of a lady's maid whose character had been blown upon, and who was therefore forced to give up hopes of catching the steward."

No one can read these volumes without *feeling* that the Church of England has never been more than half-reformed. This appears on every page. And that what reformation she has had, moreover, has been largely in spite of the heads of her church—clerical and lay—will become equally manifest. It will become equally plain that the liberties of England have been secured—such as they are—not by the church, but in opposition to the doctrines which in the height of her power she was at most pains to inculcate upon her people—doctrines of the most slavish passive obedience. Macaulay describes them well,—and as well, the readiness with which a large proportion of their advocates cast them

aside for the time, when by the encroachments of James, their *places* and *emoluments* were endangered:

“The greatest Anglican doctors of that age had maintained that no breach of law or contract, no excess of cruelty, rapacity, or licentiousness, on the part of a rightful king, could justify his people in withstanding him by force. Some of them had delighted to exhibit the doctrine of non-resistance in a form so exaggerated as to shock common sense and humanity. They frequently and emphatically remarked, that Nero was at the head of the Roman government when St. Paul inculcated the duty of obeying magistrates.”

This was repeated so often by these zealous advocates of prerogative, that James took them at their word. What then? Did they practise what they professed? No.

“That logic which, while it was used to prove that Presbyterians and Independents ought to bear imprisonment and confiscation with meekness, had been pronounced unanswerable, seemed to be of very little force when the question was whether Anglican bishops should be imprisoned and the revenues of Anglican colleges confiscated. It had often been repeated from the pulpits of all the cathedrals in the land, that the apostolical injunction to obey the civil magistrate was absolute and universal, and that it was impious presumption in man to limit a precept which had been promulgated without any limitation in the word of God. Now, however, divines whose sagacity had been sharpened by the imminent danger in which they stood of being turned out of their livings and prebends to make room for Papists, discovered flaws in the reasoning which had formerly carried conviction to their minds.”

In a word, in spite of their doctrines, they rebelled, and joined—many of them—the standard of William.

We are obliged to pause. This history is one of the most attractive we have ever read. The narrative is most impressively given. The arrival of William, the flight of James, and the subsequent events until the crown was settled upon William and Mary, are most dramatic. And with all their faults, no one can rise from the perusal of these volumes without a keener sense of the evils of tyranny and popery, and a more lively gratitude to Him who raised up and endowed with “power” to stand in evil times, so many faithful and honoured witnesses.

[For the Covenanter.]

THE DOOM OF SLAVERY.

What! know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Wo unto you, ye rich men; weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you! What is wrong? Behold the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, crieth, and their cry cometh unto the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. James v. Slave-dealers are ranked and classed with murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers. 1 Tim. i.; and John, in his vision, saw in the wreck of Babylon, slavery. The foundations of this horrid system are giving way,—not only is all the North, all the inhabitants of the States called free, awakening to a just sense of the iniquity and atrocity of the system, but western Virginia, Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee, are quaking—expecting, even now, to become frontier slave states. Both the Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church are shaking and bending under the weight, the pressure of the agitation of this system. God himself is speaking by fire and flood in language that cannot be misunderstood. He is saying in thunder tones, “Let the oppressed go free.” Churches should echo the voice of Jehovah. We have great reason to thank God and take courage. For about half a century

we stood *alone*, testifying against the sin of slavery and of the compromises of the constitution on this sum of all villainies: now all the churches, all the nations, all the world, are fast coming into our views. The anti-slavery spirit is roused, and hell and earth cannot put it down. It speaks in every company, court, and congress. The desperate efforts of politicians and ecclesiastics to suppress and gag it, only tend to make more manifest its mighty strength. Like steam, it cannot be confined. Like gaseous exhalations and subterraneous fires, it will rend the earth and split and melt the primitive rock, rather than be confined. The lightnings are flashing in the two great councils of the Presbyterian Church. Their strong bonds of interest and compromise are yielding to anti-slavery and Christian principle.

So powerful is truth, that little men in anti-slavery associations have vanquished the great and mighty in the state; and students, mere boys, have exposed the sophisms of great doctors of theology. It has been plainly demonstrated that though the Bible gives countenance to slavery as a punishment of crime, its principles and its laws reprobate, in no measured language, the cruelty of inflicting this penalty on the innocent. Discussion has dissipated the darkness that ignorance had spread over this subject; and moral principle begins to burst the cobweb and gossamer toils that the base and the interested had fastened on the minds of community.

The Lord is evidently manifesting his compassion for the oppressed, and rising in his majesty to set the suffering slave on his feet; notwithstanding the terrible combination of state policy and the spirit of the world, soon will the trumpet, the silver trumpet of a general jubilee, sound its mellifluent notes of liberty to all the inhabitants of this and of every land. When the Lord works, none can hinder. He does all his pleasure.

The ministry should drink into the spirit, imitate the example, and obey the commands of the Divine Master. How amazingly compassionate was our blessed Lord in thinking of and engaging for the poor enslaved sons of men! He thought of man in his lost estate. He took upon him our nature, and appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh. He carried our sorrows, healed us by his stripes, took upon him the form of a servant, and humbled himself, and became obedient unto the death, even the death of the cross,—a death which could be inflicted on no Roman citizen; it was the death of a criminal slave. What condescension! What a spirit of pity! What an example of compassion! The Divine Master commands his servants to “open the mouth for the dumb in the cause of all that are appointed to destruction.” He orders them to “cry aloud and spare not, to show his people their transgression and the house of Jacob their sin.” In relation to what? In relation to the sin of slavery. “Break every yoke. Let the oppressed go free.” And if they do not, then what? Why, “Behold, I proclaim a liberty to you to the sword and to the pestilence!”

J. M.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

Mauchline—Airdsmoss—Muirkirk—Priesthill, and Kilmarnock.

The next day after my visit to Lochgoin, September 26th, I set out from Kilmarnock, in company with Dr. McIndoe, for Airdsmoss, where

is the grave of Cameron, and for Priesthill, the scene of the martyrdom of John Brown, the "godly carrier." Our route lay south-east twenty-four miles to Muirkirk, through Mauchline, Auchenleck, (pronounced Afleck,) Cumnock, and Airdsmoss. This part of our journey we performed very rapidly by the railway, which has lately been completed to Muirkirk; passing a little beyond Kilmarnock the little village of Crookedholm, where the church once occupied by the Reformed Presbyterian congregation of that place still stands—a small, neat, little building, but now altogether unoccupied—and some miles farther on, through the centre of the farm where Burns, the peasant poet, first saw the light. As far as Cumnock, the country presents the usual highly cultivated aspect of the lowlands of Scotland, and we still saw not a few herds of the justly celebrated kine of Ayrshire grazing, in contented abundance, on the rich autumnal pastures.

We were again on the classic ground of the martyrs. Every hill, every valley, every village, has its story. As far back as the Lollards of Kyle, Ayrshire has held no second place among the localities enriched by the virtues, piety, and sufferings of Christ's faithful witnesses. At Mauchline is a "martyr's stone" covering the remains of five martyrs—Peter Gillies, John Bryce, Thomas Young, William Fiddison, and John Bruning—executed there in 1685.* A few miles from Cumnock is the burying-place of Alexander Peden. These places, for want of time, I was compelled to leave unvisited.

At Cumnock the railway turns towards the north-east—its course, previously, had been but little east of south—and passing up between the elevated ridges shooting out from the central highlands, enters Airdsmoss—rolling, dark, and, of course, barren—extending four or five miles towards Muirkirk; its greatest breadth is about two miles, or a little more. Not far from the centre of this moss, three miles west of Muirkirk, are the battle-field and Cameron's monument. They are in a depression, or basin, of a few acres in extent, surrounded on all sides by gentle elevations. Here, on July 20th, 1680, about the middle of the afternoon, Richard Cameron, his brother Michael, and at least seven others, died defending themselves—as even their enemies acknowledged—with unshrinking courage. These martyrs, with others, had issued on the 22d of June, the Sanquhar Declaration, publicly and explicitly disowning the king's authority. The enraged council proclaimed them outlaws, following up their proclamation with the most active efforts to apprehend or kill them. A swarm of soldiers scoured the country, penetrating every nook and crevice. On the day of the battle a small company of Covenanters found themselves together near Airdsmoss. There were, in all, twenty-five horsemen, and about forty foot, commanded by Hackston of Rathillet. Their scouts were not sufficiently vigilant; and about three in the afternoon over a hundred horsemen, headed by Gordon of Earlshall, were upon them. They retreated to a favourable spot in the moss; but, just as they reached it,

* On a stone which covers their grave, are the following lines:

"Bloody Dumbarton, Douglas, and Dundee,
 Mov'd by the devil, and the Laird of Lee,
 Dragg'd these five men to death with blood and sword,
 Not suffering them to pray, nor read God's word;
 Owing the work of God was all their crime.
 The eighty-five was a saint-killing time."

leaving them but a moment to arrange their little band, the enemy overtook them. The horse were on the wings—the foot in the centre; and while Cameron was uttering the prayer, “Lord, spare the green, and take the ripe,” the onset was made. It was soon over. The horse broke. The infantry were badly armed, and could make little opposition to the disciplined cavalry coming upon them in overwhelming numbers. Some escaped, fleeing by ways impracticable for horse. Some were taken, and among them the brave and accomplished Rathillet, afterwards executed at Edinburgh. The rest, from nine to twelve, were killed upon the spot; and—with the exception of Cameron’s head and hands, taken to Edinburgh, and barbarously affixed upon the gates of the city—lie buried where they fell. For a long time but a simple stone covered their remains. It bears the following inscription:

“Halt, curious passenger; come here, and read;
Our souls triumph with Christ, our glorious head.
In self-defence, we murder’d here do lie,
To witness ’gainst this nation’s perjury.”

A few years ago a monument was erected upon the grave, with funds raised at a collection after a sermon preached on the ground by Dr. Wm. Symington, of Glasgow. It is a striking feature, rising amid the bare, bleak moss, and distinctly visible from the railway, from which it is distant some two or three hundred yards to the north.

Passing on to Muirkirk, the scenery becomes, in no small degree, striking and romantic. On the south is Wardlaw, a bare, elevated ridge, lifting its head above the “dark valley” of Welwood. A little further east, directly south of Muirkirk, is seen the lofty summit of Cairntable—well named; for at five miles distance we could distinctly see the huge ancient castle on its highest peak. On the north the hills are less elevated, but all present alike the smooth and bare aspect which characterizes this region of moss and heather.* Muirkirk lies in a narrow valley—a long, straggling village; not badly built, considering its location. This place, also, had its martyrs; one of whom, James Smith—shot by Col. Buchan, of Ayr—lies interred in the grave-yard of the parish church. At the head of his grave stands a plain, low head-stone, on which may be read with ease the following lines:

“When proud apostates did abjure
Scotland’s reformation pure,
And fill’d this land with perjury,
And all sorts of iniquity;
Such as would not with them comply,
They persecute with hue and cry.

* We were now among the scenery so poetically described in the “Cameronian’s Dream.”

“In a dream of the night I was wafted away,
To the moorland of mist where the martyrs lay;
Where Cameron’s sword and his Bible are seen,
Engraved on the stone where the heather grows green.

“’Twas a dream of those ages of darkness and blood,
When the Ministers’ home was the mountain and wood;
When in Welwood’s dark moorlands the standard of Zion,
All bloody and torn ’mong the heather was lying.

“It was morning, and summer’s young sun, from the east,
Lay in loving repose on the green mountain’s breast;
On Wardlaw and Cairn-Table, the clear shining dew
Glistened sheen ’mong the heath-bells, and mountain flowers blue.”

I in the chase was overta'en,
And for the truth by them was slain."*

From this place we took a car to Priesthill, which lies about four miles to the north—or rather, somewhat east of north. The road lies, for a short distance, through fields tolerably well cultivated. At no great distance, however, from the village, you take to the fields, and follow, with many windings, and not a few ups and downs, but mostly “ups,” a cart road to the herd’s cottage on the farm of Priesthill. Long before this the cultivation has become imperfect. The land has assumed a wild appearance. In fact, you are getting into a moorland, mountainous region, where not a tree is to be seen, unless an occasional fruit tree, nor even a bush. The cottage of Priesthill is situated upon the face of, and near the western extremity, of a long and gently sloping ridge, not far from its summit. Towards the east this ridge declines for a short distance, when it again swells up more abruptly, effectually shutting in the view in that direction. On the north and west, also, the view is limited, with the exception of a gap on the north-east, through which lay John Brown’s road from Ayr to Glasgow. On the south you get a view of Cairntable and Wardlaw. Muirkirk, and the cultivated regions, lie hid behind intervening hills of moss. Nor is there any thing, with the exception of two herds’ cottages, and a few trees and patches about them, and these a mile apart, to relieve the view in this limited range. All is heather and bent. Of all lonely, desolate places my eye ever rested upon, not even excepting Lochgoin, Priesthill is the most lonely and desolate.†

The martyr’s dwelling was about three quarters of a mile to the north of the present cottage. This we went on foot, over the wet surface of the mossy soil; ascending gently along the summit, or slightly inclined face of the ridge, until we came within about two hundred yards of the monument, when we descended into the ravine, near which, or rather, in which, it stands. The walls of the house have long since fallen down, but are still plainly discoverable. It stood facing the ravine, having in front a small level plot, which stretches off towards the north, where once there has evidently been a cultivated and level field of a few acres extent. To the south, a few paces distant, was the stable, still plainly marked. Along the ravine trickles a small stream, rising among the moss, and passing off to join itself with the waters which pass Muirkirk. The road seems to have followed originally the same course, passing off through the gap, beyond which we could descry in the distance the hills, as I judged, about Lesmahagow.

Just in front of the house the martyr is buried, on the spot where he was murdered. The circumstances of his death are too well defined to be forgotten. It was the 1st of May, 1685. Brown was at home, preparing peats. Claverhouse, on his way westward from Lesmahagow, found him at his work, apprehended him, and led him to this spot. His wife was within. He had time given him to pray; when, his troopers refusing, the “bloody Clavers” shot him with his own

* See, for Muirkirk and its neighbourhood, Traditions of Covenanters, 1st series, chap. viii.

† These farms are very large; and, like Priesthill, are frequently owned by persons living in the towns, or by landlord farmers, who employ hands to take care of the flocks which feed upon them.

hand, scattering his brains on the heath; adding, in reply to a challenge of the bereaved widow, that he would have "an account to give of what he had done," "To man I can be accountable; and as for God, I'll take him in mine own hand." He then passed on, not altogether recklessly, however; for he afterwards acknowledged that he found it impossible to get completely rid of the impression made by the martyr's dying prayer. He passed on, leaving the widow with her infant child in her arms, and the shattered and bloody head of her husband on her knee, to find, as she could in that solitude, the necessary assistance for his decent burial. Is it any wonder that the memory of such deeds of blood is ineffaceable? And can we err in anticipating a fearful recompense for such transactions to be visited upon the nation under whose sanction they were perpetrated, and which has never yet expressed, whatever it may have felt, any compunction on account of these atrocities?

The martyr lies under a plain, flat stone, with the following inscription completely covering it, and now not very legible:

"In death's cold bed, the dusty part here lies
Of one who did the earth, as dust, despise.
Here, in this place, from earth he took departure:
Now he has got the garland of the martyr.

"Butcher'd by Clavers and his bloody band,
Raging most rav'nously o'er all the land.
Only for owing Christ's supremacy,
Wickedly wrong'd by encroaching tyranny.
Nothing, how near soever, he too good
Esteem'd; nor dear, for precious truth, his blood."

Until 1825, this alone marked the last resting-place of the "godly carrier." Now, however, a neat monument some seven or eight feet in height, stands at the head of the grave, with this inscription:

"This monument was erected, and the adjoining grave of John Brown enclosed, by money collected at a sermon preached by Rev. John Milwain, August 28th, 1825, in commemoration of the martyrs."

The sermon was preached on the spot; and this simple monument, in its loneliness, well befits the scene, and, especially, viewed from the summit of the ridge, commends itself as an appropriate token of regard for one who, in his life, bore himself unimpeached, and who was erect and faithful even in death.

Kilmarnock, to which we returned the same evening, is not without interesting memorials of the sufferings of the witnesses. In the old grave-yard are the remains of some of the faithful. The most eminent of these was John Nisbet, who was hanged April 16th, 1683. At the cross of Kilmarnock a stone still marks the spot where his body was at first interred; and, what is rather singular, to this day the spot on which the gallows was erected is marked by rows of white stones in

* Upon it are the following lines:

"Come, reader, see, here pleasant Nisbet lies,
His blood doth pierce the high and lofty skies;
Kilmarnock did his latter hour perceive,
And Christ his soul to heaven did receive.
Yet bloody Torrence did his body raise,
And buried it in another place;
Saying, *Shall rebels lye in graves with me?*
We'll bury him where evil doers be."

the pavement of the street, forming the initials of his name. When this originated I could not learn, but so it is; whenever the pavement is renewed, the white stones are set in their places, and, with a little care, can at any time be readily discerned.*

It was with regret I left this neighbourhood, particularly as it was out of my power to visit Ayr and its many localities of note and interest. However, that I might be in season to attend the examination next day in the Theological Hall, Paisley, I was compelled to forego any farther researches, and take my departure for Glasgow on the evening of Wednesday, September 27th. I had spent three days of unusual interest among scenes hallowed by most interesting and cherished recollections, and could not complain. J. M. W.

EXTRACTS.

THE CHILDREN OF GOD.—"The children of God themselves, the people who are born again, are called the dew; because they are born from above; born of God; because a beam of Divine light shines through them, and the image of the eternal Sun of Righteousness is reflected in them: because they are jewels of the earth's attire, like the drops of dew; a graceful decoration and refreshment spread over the green field of human nature; also because the day will arrive, when, like the dew-drops, they shall be found a great multitude that no man can number: and, lastly, because, imperceptibly and mysteriously, they are begotten and brought forth, as in the night, unnoticed and unobserved by the world."—*F. W. Krummacher.*

CHRIST THE ONLY FOUNTAIN.—"We may search and look long enough for any verdure in the soul that is a stranger to Jesus, who alone is the Source from which it springs. Alas! every thing therein is not only withered, but burnt up by the heat of temptation and sin. Oh! how is that beautiful Eden, which God planted within us, become a wild, a desolation! A fire has been kindled beneath it—a spirit of rebellion against God, and has consumed or withered every green thing. The soul of man is a wilderness—a barren heath—the place of dragons and vipers—the seat of unholy imaginations and fleshly lusts. Search and seek in it for the noble plant of love to God; lo, it has all withered and died away. Look in it for any bud of child-like confidence, heart-felt devotion, or secret delight in prayer. Trace in it, if you can, the grace of true humility, that sweet lily of the valley. Inquire in it for the herb patience, if there be a flower of it left. Look for the twining evergreen of communion with God, whether a blossom of it appears; in a word, whether the soul of man retains any strength, or disposition, or desire to do the will of our Father which is in heaven; whether there be any heavenly-mindedness, or any affection for things above. Ah! how is there nothing of all this to be found in it! What a dry desert! In the most awful sense does that saying of the prophet apply to us, 'Thou, daughter, that dost inhabit Dibon, come down from thy glory, and sit in thirst,' Jer. xlviii. 18. Our strength is dried up; it is become as the drought of summer. There is neither verdure nor life in us; nor does our fallen nature of itself possess any power to restore us. Our best efforts to this purpose are

* For an account of his trial—it is very interesting—see *Cloud of Witnesses.*

no better than water spilt upon the burning sands, unless accompanied with the marvellous dew of Divine grace. Though we make ever so many good resolutions, or hear ever so many sermons and instructions; though we read ever so deeply in the Scriptures, or outwardly join in the prayers and praises of the church; though we retire into monastic seclusion, or frequent the company of the pious; still nothing to the purpose is effected, nor is any spiritual life brought forth, till the Lord himself be really resorted to. For the life of the soul is revived only by his Spirit. Without this Divine vouchsafement, which we must seek, if we would receive it, our human devices, with even the means of grace themselves, prove as inefficient as the dew or rain upon the stones of the street, whose nature still remains unchanged. But the Lord can, out of these stones, form a people for himself, and raise up children unto Abraham. He can make the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose."—*Ib.*

TEMPTATION—CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.—“Take another example. Satan wishes, we will suppose, to bring you back into the world; and how would he do it? He gently insinuates that true religion does not require you to stand aloof from your former companions, or to be so shy of the society of those whose opinions may differ a little from your own: that Christian charity teaches quite another lesson; that it is your duty now and then to go into the world, that you may let your light shine before men, to prevent religion from being slandered as belonging exclusively to monks and misanthropes, and to show that piety is sociable and cheerful, than which nothing is more necessary for gaining the hearts of others to its cause. Yea, that even for your own exercise and confirmation in holiness, it is your duty not to withdraw from the world; for what is there in being holy, where there are no temptations or allurements to the contrary? whereas, to meet evil in the face, and to be able to resist it wherever we see it, is to play the man and the Christian. Such are the reasonings of our great adversary, and they are very congenial with the disposition of our fallen nature. Now if you attempt to dispute such a matter with him with your own wisdom, you will certainly be perplexed and overcome; for no shrewd sophist is so subtle in reasoning as he is. He knows how to make the most foolish thing appear most plausible and rational. But if you have faith in the word of God, and trusting in it, you can reply, It is written, ‘Be not conformed to this world,’ he is then defeated, for you have struck the dagger out of his hand. Thus the word of God, when grasped with a firm hold of faith, is found to be a strong ‘sword of the Spirit,’ wherewith we ‘wound the dragon.’ Even the ten commandments, when written in the heart and uttered against him, are sufficient to repel the enemy. Against this roaring lion they are like ten weapons such as Samson’s, or ten swords such as Michael’s.”—*Ib.*

MR. NEIL'S DECLINATURE.

A document, with this title, appears in the September No. of the Evangelical Repository, with two introductions: one by a Minister of the Secession Church, in which he styles Mr. N. “an original thinker,” and commends him as “pushing forward his researches to an independent and truthful conclusion,” “untrammelled by denominational

influences," from which his position "cuts him off;" the other by the Editor, in which, while withholding his assent from some of the views expressed in the declinature, he speaks of the document as "embodying a vast amount of documentary evidence, showing that the power *circa sacra* given to the civil magistrate by our reforming ancestors was a power inconsistent with the rights of conscience and the independence of the church."

This essay is the same that was lately addressed by Mr. Neil to the Reformed Presbyterian Synod; and, by them, without reading, referred, with its author, to the Pittsburgh Presbytery for them to take the appropriate action.* As to Mr. N., our readers are probably aware that he acceded to this church in the year 1840, having been, previously, a minister among the Reformed Dissenters. For some time after he came among us, he was sent to supply vacancies, chiefly in the bounds of the Pittsburgh Presbytery, which had been mainly instrumental in his reception; occasionally branching out into other Presbyteries. This continued for some years, when the result was that, for very sufficient reasons, arising out of his entire unacceptableness to the people, he was left, to use his own phrase, "without ministerial employment." His visit to the eastern section of the church will not soon be forgotten. Another would have been among the impossible things.

Under these circumstances, Mr. N. turned his face, as it seems, outwards. He ceased to attend the church courts, and *began* to do what he *professed* to have done when he united himself with us—to examine the principles of the church. The result is before us. And here we would say to his Secession endorser, that, instead of prosecuting these researches when "cut loose from denominational influences," the whole work was done while professedly a minister of this church. The fact is, the parties became mutually tired of the connexion, and then he set about finding out reasons for abandoning the church.†

As to the essay, finding him endorsed as "an original thinker," we expected to see—however unexpected otherwise from such a source—some new batteries opened upon our position. Instead, there is not a sentence in it new, except some falsifications of history—nothing that has not been far better said by other writers, on the same side, before him. He begins by saying, that

"It is upon the Old Testament Scriptures we are to depend, for the support of the civil magistrate's control over ecclesiastical matters;"

and then goes on with a string of assertions, totally false, the most of them, respecting the organization and operations of the church during that economy—as that "the distribution, appointment, continuance in place, and maintenance of the priests and Levites, depended on the civil magistrate—that the discipline of the church depended in a great measure for execution on the king;"—"that the church had been organized by the king, and administered principally by his authority."

* His name was not "stricken from the roll," as the Editor of the Repository states. We do not so dismiss members or ministers.

† Mr. N. was, while with us, one of the most ultra in his opposition to *all* voluntary associations in which there were members of other churches; and yet now some of his chief difficulties are *said* to have arisen out of Synod's "disapproving of attempts to unite other churches." Ultraism was then popular in the Pittsburgh Presbytery. Extremes meet.

Mr. N. evidently does not know that the Old Testament church was organized long before there was a king; and is more profoundly ignorant of the fact that, even after the appointment of kings, they had nothing to do with any of those things he mentions, except to see that the laws of Christ had their free course—that royal authority could not alter one particle of the Mosaic institutions. We wonder how one so ignorant could ever have found a place among Reformed Presbyterians. Surely the Secession ministry will not endorse such statements?

His second statement is, that

“The New Testament does not teach or prescribe any such civil headship over the Christian church.”

This old and hackneyed objection—not “original”—he follows up by such statements as the following:—“We find no mention made of a civil magistrate either supreme or subordinate, in the list of officers given to the church by her Head; nor of any application made for a civil ratification of any ecclesiastical proceedings; nor of any complaint made for the want of such enforcement. The accessions made to the church were voluntary, and not by the power of civil coercions; and the disorderly conduct of members was treated with appropriate ecclesiastical censures, without any farther prosecution of a civil nature. The members had a right to the election of their ecclesiastical officers, without being compelled to submit to the arbitrary intrusions of civil patronage.” But, what has all this to do with the Reformed Presbyterian Church? Do we hold the magistrate to be a church officer? Do we hold “civil patronage?” Do we teach that accessions should be made to the church “by civil coercion?” We confess our surprise that such folly has found the light in a Secession periodical. We still indulged the notion that Seceders held it to be the duty of the Christian magistrate to recognise and foster the church. Mr. N. being judge, all that must be wrong, because Jewish and pagan governments did not do it, or, at least, because the church did not complain that she was not taken into their embrace!

Mr. N.'s third and fourth statements relate to the establishment of religion under Constantine and his successors, and by the reformed nations at the Reformation. Of the former he says, that “the history of the Arian, Nestorian, Pelagian, and other controversies are (?) sufficient to show that the extent of the Roman emperor's power over church officers, was about as great as that of the kings of Israel and Judah over the priests and Levites.” A grand misstatement: but, passing that, even if Mr. N.'s statement were true, which would be the legitimate consequence—both right, or both wrong? The declinature prefers the latter view,—but does not say how David can be regarded in any other light than as an Erastian, provided Constantine was. We deny the premises. There was hardly the slightest resemblance between the authority of the Roman emperors and David's.

But, after all, we were surprised to find the following, under Mr. N.'s fourth particular. We scarcely thought he was so far gone as to repeat the nauseous slanders of infidels and papists. “Yet they (Calvin and the reformers) had to yield to the operation of that prevailing principle, to some extent, as may sufficiently appear from the trial and execution of Servetus at Geneva, for heresy, though only a passenger

through the place, in virtue of a statute of the Popish Emperor Frederic II., of more than three hundred years' standing." To put to death an open blasphemer of the Most High, was to assume an Erastian Headship over the church!

In his *fifth* paragraph he takes up the Scottish Reformation—finds no little fault with the manner in which Scotland became a Protestant from a popish country—in direct defiance of all history, insinuates that in the convention (he calls it a parliament) that met in 1560, the papists had no opportunity to defend their system—and, finally, with equal contempt of the record, asserts that the reformers “did not think the decisions of the church courts final, until ratified by the civil authority!” He reiterates the old slanders—for they are no better—that the church, *even* in the first and second Reformations, did not hold to the right of church courts to meet on their own adjournments, which every tyro in church history knows they did*—that they compelled all alike, even the “graceless and reprobate,” to take the covenants†—and sums up by calling the second Reformation “a contradictory and persecuting period.” He then proceeds to criticise the Westminster Assembly, evidently under the notion that it was a church court, finding great fault with it as “the creature of parliament,” forgetting, or, rather, not knowing, that it was merely a consultative body—and just

* As to the leaders in the first Reformation, read the following. It is from a remonstrance addressed to the King, James VI., at Linlithgow, 1585, by the Commissioners of the Kirk:

“Always we offer to prove, by good warrant, of the Word of God, that it is lawful to the ecclesiastical estate to convocate assemblies, and to hold the same, and to appoint an order, place, and time for convening of the same: to treat upon such matters as concern the kirk affairs, which no wise impairth your majesty's civil and royal jurisdiction, but rather fortifieth and decoreth the same; not denying, in the mean time, but it is lawful to your majesty's estates, when any extraordinary necessity shall require, to call the members and office-bearers within the kirk, in few or greater number, and cause them to be convened, to resolve upon such things as concern their estate and necessity of the time.” (*Calderwood*, vol. iii., p. 453; Ed. 1843.)

As to the second Reformation, we have its doctrine on this subject, accessible to all, in the last paragraph of the act adopting the Confession of Faith.

† So far is this from being true, that the very contrary is the fact. Some were restrained from taking the covenant, because they did not seem to have the requisite qualifications. The Protestors were opposed, on this very ground, to the admission of Charles II. to take the covenants. And, on this same principle, the celebrated act of classes was passed. If in some instances violence was used, it was disapproved of. The Covenanters reasoned with the Aberdeen doctors, and endeavoured to persuade them to take the covenants. True, the taking or not taking the covenants was justly made a criterion of the right to hold office, and this was the extent to which the penalties went for *this* offence: for other offences, severer penalties were prescribed. The fact is, those who refused to take the covenants were well understood to be hostile to the existing state of things—plotters for Popery and arbitrary power, and, *as such*, they were dealt with.

Whether these Reformers allowed a civil jurisdiction within the church, will appear from the following extract from the doings of the Assembly, 1640:

“An act (was passed) declaring that the *sole* power of jurisdiction, within this church, stands in the church of God as it is now reformed, and in the general, provincial, and presbyterial assemblies and kirk sessions,” &c. (*Stevenson*, vol. iii., p. 868; Ed. 1757.)

as if parliament, having called them together for advice, should have left them uninformed on what points they wished advice! We ought to have said that Mr. N. is equally put out by the act of the Scottish Convention of 1560, abolishing popery in that realm.

We have not space to follow this essayist through all his misstatements, misapprehensions, illogical reasonings, and false conclusions. Our chief object has been to show how complete is his apostacy. That he hates the covenants, is evident; and not less so, that he regards the whole civil part of the Reformation, on the Continent, and particularly in Scotland, with hearty dislike. His essay will do no harm. We repeat, it contains "nothing new that is true, and nothing true that is new;" and we conclude, first, by expressing a sense of shame that the writer was ever called by our name—and second, by asking, what is Mr. Neil? Is one who speaks in language so envenomed against some of the leading principles of the Reformers and of the Reformation, to be regarded as a Protestant at all? Sure we are, that sentiments like these are most grateful to Papists. And, thirdly, is all this to be regarded as in any way a fruit of Mr. N.'s inveterate anti-deaconism?

PRESBYTERY OF THE LAKES.

The Presbytery of the Lakes met at Brushcreek, September 3, and transacted their business with usual harmony. All the ministerial members were present, except Dr. Willson and James Neill. The business was chiefly of a local character. Presbyterial visitation of Brushcreek congregation was attended to. Mr. JOHN FRENCH delivered his remaining pieces of trial; and, after the usual course of examination, was licensed to preach the everlasting gospel. Mr. James M'Donald, student of theology, under the care of Illinois Presbytery, at his own request and by permission of his Presbytery, delivered an exercise and additions; and had a subject of lecture assigned, Isa. xlii. 1—6; and popular sermon—subject, the covenant of works.

Messrs. John M. Armour and David J. Shaw were received under the care of Presbytery as literary and theological students. A report was received from the fiscal board of Geneva Hall, showing a prosperous and encouraging state of the institution; nearly the whole debt incurred in the erection and completion of the building has been liquidated, and a sufficient amount is on subscription to cover the remainder. A very encouraging number of students are reported in attendance the present session.

The following scale of appointments was made:

Mr. J. FRENCH, 4th Sab. Sept., *Macedon*; 5th Sab. Sept., and 1st Sab. Oct., *Cedar Lake*; 2d, 3d, and 4th Sabbaths, Oct., *Lake Elizabeth*; 1st and 2d Sabbaths, Nov., *Cedar Lake*.

Mr. R. J. DODDS, *Cincinnati* and *Xenia*, till the last Sabbath of Oct.; 1st Sab. Nov., *Macedon*; 2d, 3d, and 4th Sabbaths, Nov., *Lake Elizabeth*; 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th Sabbaths, Dec., *Cedar Lake*. Then discretionary till the 1st of Feb. February and March at *Cincinnati* and *Xenia*.

Messrs. J. DODDS and R. J. DODDS to dispense the sacrament of the supper at *Cincinnati* some time in February.

Mr. J. NEILL to dispense the sacrament of the supper at *Cedar*

Lake some time in the spring, and moderate a call if the congregation be prepared.

Messrs. J. NEILL and R. J. DODDS, with an elder or elders from Cedar Lake, or Southfield, to constitute a session at *Lake Elizabeth*, when convenient, to regulate affairs there.

Mr. J. C. BOYD, *Iberia* 5 days, and *Coshocton* 7 days, during the ensuing year.

The committee on supplies, Rev. A. M'Farland, J. B. Johnston, John M'Daniel, and Wm. Rambo, ruling elders, was continued. Presbytery holds its next meeting at Miami, 4th Monday of April, 1850.

JOHN C. BOYD, Clerk of Presbytery.

THE BANNER OF THE COVENANT.

This New Light periodical comments upon the doings of our late Synod. It says that "we may anticipate that a few years will witness its disruption." Commenting upon the letter to Scotland, it says: "We would still hope that these erring brethren may return, and the division be healed, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church again united on the ground occupied prior to the separation of 1833, which we still maintain, and which we think many of our former brethren now begin to feel, is true and sufficient."

In regard to the "disruption," we have only to say that some of the anti-deacon brethren appear to be in some danger of putting themselves into a position similar to that of our quondam brethren in 1833, of leaping out of the traces rather than carry out faithfully the standards of the church. Still, we hope better things. They will hardly be so given up as to abandon the church rather than ordain deacons in their congregations. We think these friendly anticipations are doomed to disappointment. At all events, it hardly becomes the Banner—two of whose congregations in this city have lately suffered unfriendly "disruptions"—to say much upon this subject.

As to our second quotation, it gives rise to some grave remark. Does the Banner mean to say that it maintains "the ground occupied" by the Reformed Presbyterian Church "prior to the separation in 1833?" or only "the ground occupied" for some time before, by Dr. Wylie and others, and to which they were doing their best, covertly, to bring the church? If the latter, then it is guilty of a dishonest *double entendre*. If the former, then we ask, does the Banner believe this? Does it believe that the Reformed Presbyterian Church, when she declared in the first edition of her Testimony, that "it was necessary to refuse allegiance to the whole system" of government in this country, occupied the same ground with them? The Banner believes no such thing. It *knows* better. And it is not for us to reconcile such statements as the above with the commonest rules of truth and honourable dealing. What it says about "erring brethren—returning," &c., is merely a good joke. The Banner means to be a little merry.

Again, does the Banner *believe* that "many" of our members are thinking about adopting the New Light doctrines? What testimony has it? What has been said? What done? That some member, or members even, of a church scattered over so wide a country, may have privately given some reason to doubt their attachment to covenanting

principles, is not impossible. But, that “many”—that *any* considerable number have done so, that *any* have publicly, or, notwithstanding what we have just said, even privately, we call upon the Banner to prove. If it knows—or has reason to believe—that treachery is at work in our camp, let it be honourable, and tell us where. If it has no such knowledge, it must stand chargeable with the sin of bearing false witness.

The Banner is wrong in another matter of fact. Mr. Morton has not “joined the Seventh Day Baptists.” This is a fiction of this writer. Mr. M. has adopted their views respecting the Sabbath, but has no more joined them than has the Editor of the Banner.

We have dealt a little sharply with this periodical. We do so because of the *moral* delinquencies in such an article as the one from which we have quoted. Differences of opinion we would handle respectfully: departures from truth, and hurtful insinuations, require a different kind of treatment. Let the Banner come out and candidly acknowledge that the body to which it belongs has changed its views respecting the application of covenanting doctrines, and these *doctrines themselves*, particularly on the magistrate’s power and covenanting, and we will give it credit for honesty, at least. Occupying its present position,—pretending to occupy, what it *knows* it does not, the early ground of the church in this country, this body can only be regarded as an attempted imposture, and be treated accordingly.

THE MANCHESTER CONGREGATION.

The contributors to that congregation among our readers, will be glad to hear from them. The following is from an article in the May No. of the Belfast Missionary Chronicle. It is from the pen of Dr. Houston, the Editor:

“It is gratifying to state, that the number of members has suffered little diminution—and that the people continue to evince the most earnest concern to hold fast the testimony of our fathers, to edify one another in fellowship-meetings, and to transmit the cause which they maintain to future generations. Since the pastoral relation between them and Mr. Johnson has been dissolved, and they have been deprived of public ordinances, they have met regularly in a social capacity, on the Sabbath, and have been diligent in attending fellowship-meetings at other times.

“Still, the pressure of the debt on the house of worship is severely felt by the congregation, in its destitute condition; and without an effort made by the friends of a Covenanted cause to aid and relieve them, there is reason to fear that this burden may overpower them. If such a sum as between 300*l.* and 400*l.* could be raised, in a short time, throughout the church, to assist the congregation in Manchester, the members would not only be enabled to retain the property without risk of losing it, but the interest also would be so reduced that they could meet the annual payments, and enjoy the public administration of the gospel. As exhibiting their claims upon the sympathy and aid of brethren in the church, it may be mentioned that, during the few weeks that have elapsed since they were left vacant, they have, by vigorous exertions, raised and paid 50*l.* for arrears of rent, interest, &c., and have, besides, pledged themselves to contribute, in the space of three or four months to come, about 80*l.* to reduce the debt against the

house of worship. We regard these as great efforts for a people circumstanced as the Manchester congregation is—very few of the members having any thing beyond bare means of support, for themselves and their families.”

THE RELIGION OF THE TIMES.

Religion rightly presides over morals, and should prescribe rules for all the relations of men; but our political and ecclesiastical Protestantism, to make sure of the divorce of church and state, forbids our sacred books to obtrude the thought of God into the theory of politics; and the ministry is as scrupulous to observe the prohibition as if it really believed theocracy to be the worst sort of despotism. The church gives us no system of society—social, industrial, or political. It prescribes particular virtues and proscribes particular vices in the direction of individual conduct; but it declares that the New Testament does not teach politics, and it even accepts its own polity from the civil government. It is as democratic in its prolonged protest against popes, as the republic is in its resistance to kings. The church takes care of worship, and allows the state to prescribe morals, and we have no help from that quarter.—*National Era*.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Sandwich Islands.—Recent epidemics have carried off one-seventh of the native inhabitants of these islands. Of church members two thousand three hundred have died. There have been sixteen hundred added during the year. Some of these converted islanders have found their way to California, and seem to conduct themselves well—keeping up religious exercises among themselves in their own tongue.

Turkey.—The missionaries in Turkey are generally allowed to pursue their labours undisturbed. During the last eighteen months twenty-two converts have been added to the church in Constantinople, twenty in Nicomedia, eight in Ada Bazar. The church in Broosa consists of thirteen members, who have increasing access to their former brethren. At Erzeroom and neighbourhood the spirit of persecution has so far been quite active. At present the authorities appear to be better disposed to carry out the late decrees in favour of the Protestants. Should this continue, they, with the church in Nicomedia, consisting of more than forty members, and a population of about two hundred, with their schools and other means of improvement, will have peace.

Ionian Islands.—Zante, one of these islands, inhabited, like the rest, chiefly by Greeks of the Greek Church, has recently been the scene of a singular movement. A number of persons, including some priests, have been led, by the reading of the Scriptures, to abandon their errors; and, separating from the Greek Church, they have asked the Free Church of Scotland to send out a minister, that they may be organized into a congregation. Of course, they will be Presbyterians. These islands, which lie on the western coast of Greece, are under British protection, which partly accounts for the movement itself, and the direction it has taken. What encouragement to circulate the Scriptures, even where the living ministry cannot be sent with them!

Russia and Circassia.—Peace has been, or is about to be concluded between the Czar and the brave mountaineers of the Caucasus. They have been at war, with various success, for about twenty years; Russia pushing forward along this rugged isthmus between the Black and the Caspian Seas, towards the eastern territories of Turkey, and to the Persian empire. Propositions for peace originated with Russia, who withdraws her troops—70,000—and leaves all her conquests to be repossessed by the Circassians. Perhaps she wanted her troops nearer—perhaps she has found on her western border a readier way to the great object of her ambition—the acquisition of Constantinople. At all events, the fact is important, as indicating a most decided tendency westward—to employ all her resources, as she finds opportunity, in driving her hordes still further into Europe. It is a part of the work of concentrating the “hail-storm.”

Hungary.—The late accounts from Hungary are astounding. Notwithstanding the unfavourable issue of some late battles, all supposed that the ardent Hungarians might still sustain themselves, even against two great empires combined for their national annihilation. Far otherwise. Divisions were secretly doing their work among the leaders, while the sword was thinning the ranks of the soldiers. Kossuth transferred his dictatorial powers to Georgey; and the latter, almost at once, surrendered, unconditionally, to Paskiewitch, the Russian commander-in-chief. How this was brought about is still uncertain. Some ascribe it to treachery. Others say that England has had a hand in it; and that the conditions will not, ultimately, be altogether unfavourable to Hungary—that she is still to have, at least, a measure of independence. In the mean time, however, she is prostrate, so far as she is concerned, at the feet of her great antagonists, and must submit to whatever terms they choose to impose. Kossuth, Bem, and Dembinski, are fugitives. Thus ends another chapter in the drama of European revolution. One after another, the revolutionary efforts of the oppressed have failed. Despotism is in the ascendant. New Holy Alliances are forming, to crush the friends of liberty in every quarter of Europe. As to the *immediate* issues of these events, it is useless to speculate. One thing, however, is certain. The power of Austria, backed by Russia, will now be brought to bear, with overwhelming weight, in Italy, for the re-establishment of the old order of things—at least so far as England and France will permit them to carry out their designs. Russia, moreover, has acquired new importance. The iron-heeled aristocracy in every kingdom of Europe, not excepting England, look to her as the conservator of their prerogatives; and, much as they dread her ascendancy, will not hesitate to invoke her aid in defending themselves against the people.

Italy.—1. *Venice.*—This city, which had taken part with the rest of northern Italy, has surrendered, after a protracted siege, to the Austrian armies, under Radetski. This extinguishes the last vestige of revolution in the Italian dominions of Austria, and disengages another army and renowned commander. 2. *Rome.*—The Roman affairs are not yet settled. The Pope is obstinate. He will give no guarantees against the restoration of old abuses. The Roman armies have all been disbanded, leaving none but French troops, of which there are 20,000, under Gen. Rostolan, in Rome. The government is in the hands of a

Papal commission, consisting of three cardinals, who are set upon reviving the entire system of priestly rule. The inquisition, with the other ecclesiastical tribunals, has been restored. The latter have already arrested and imprisoned a large number of priests and laymen, charged with having taken part in late events. The former has seized and consigned to its dungeons, Dr. Achilli, a distinguished and devoted convert from Popery. However, all does not go on smoothly. The French cabinet, traitors as they are to liberty, are not, at least yet, prepared to force an abhorred government upon the Romans. Some of the decrees of the Pope they have refused to publish or sanction,—they still urge concession, and have even employed threats. They fear the people. What they have already done is exceedingly unpopular. And besides, they are hardly willing to disgrace themselves by disregarding the fair professions with which they set out, or by breaking their explicit promises.

In the mean time, Italians, at home and abroad, are expressing, in the plainest terms, their detestation of papal domination. A great meeting of refugees and residents of this nation was lately held in London. We quote from some of their speeches, premising that the speakers were all eminent men—some of them active agents in the late movements:

“*Dr. Mapei*, at great length, set forth the evils of Popery, and the absurdity of credence in the infallibility of the Papacy, of which the instance of Galileo’s persecution by the Pope of his day would be sufficient to prove the fallacy. . . . He asserted that Italians had at length recognised the incompatibility of their liberties with the system of Popery.

“He urged on all true patriots to renounce Popery, disclaiming, at the same time, any connexion with any system commonly designated Protestantism. He equally denounced the evils that are gathered under that name, and called on his countrymen to embrace *pure Christianity*, which embodies, he said, a religion of peace and love, and uttered his prayer that the *intolerance* and *bigotry* which have erected so many banners of sectarianism amongst Protestants might be repudiated for ever amongst Italian Christians. He trusted that one God, one faith in the atoning blood of the Divine Redeemer, would become the standard of love and union among believers, whatever might be their diversities of opinion on minor points. He, *Dr. Mapei*, invited Italians to declare themselves, and with the grace of God to be neither Papists nor (so-called) Protestants, but Christians. He urged them to study the Divine Scriptures of truth, and to learn the true religion of Jesus Christ. He denounced priestcraft, which, whilst it acknowledges the Scriptures to be from God, yet prohibits the reading of them by the people, and pointed out the diplomacy which kept from the people the knowledge which would open their eyes to the practices of their spiritual guides.

“*Signor Rbsetti* followed, and powerfully affected the audience. He said, that although suffering in bodily health, he could not but be present at the meeting; he denounced Roman Catholicism as a snare and a conspiracy against the liberties of nations. . . . He denounced Popery as the *curse of national prosperity*; compared the histories of Spain and England—the former great, rich, and powerful, the latter less so till the time of the Reformation. Spain remaining Papist, declined from her high position; while England, casting off Popery, rose from that time to be pre-eminent in national greatness, wealth, and power. He, too, urged upon his countrymen to rid themselves of the yoke of Popery, and adhere to the religion of the Gospel—insisting that Popery was to national progress as a weight of lead, sinking it to the depths of hell; while the pure religion of the Gospel would act as the breath of heaven, elevating it higher and higher, till it reached into Paradise. He said, the Pope assumed to be the vicar of Christ; but he had sold Christ, and was *Anti-Christ*.

“*The Chairman* then read aloud the proposed resolution:—‘That this meeting, whilst condemning the conduct of Pius IX. as tyrannical, infamous, anti-evangelical, and impious, invite all Italians to follow the true religion of Jesus Christ, which was

the religion of their ancestors, throwing off utterly the Papal Church, which is a snare and conspiracy against the liberties of nations.”

This resolution was put and carried by an immense majority. On those who might wish to oppose it being requested to hold up their hands, not a hand was raised!

In another paper we find the following interesting account of the Italian refugees in the island of Malta:

“They have found them all without exception disgusted with Popery and unbelievers. They have offered the Bible to them; they read it with interest and surprise. We have an Italian meeting for them every Friday evening. They come to it in great numbers. There we discuss religious subjects; they propose their doubts and their objections. Some of them begin to receive the Bible as the Word of God. These meetings are at the house of Mr. De Sanctis, who was formerly a Roman Priest, a man of great talent, who abandoned Popery with great disinterestedness. He is a good patriot, and believes that his dear Italy can never be regenerated except by the knowledge and the love of the Gospel. He publishes twice a month a newspaper called *Il Catolico Cristiano*, which contains some excellent articles.”

But the most interesting and instructive of all the documents we have yet seen, as illustrative of the spread of sound religious opinions in Rome, is a circular issued by the *Circolo Popolare*, the popular club of Rome. It says, among other things:

“We hold the religion of Christ dear, because we believe it to be true, saving, and holy. But this religion, which is none other than *faith in Christ, by which we are justified before God and forgiven all our sins*, can well exist without Bishops and priests. This religion of faith, professed by many persons in all parts of the world, constitutes that invisible Church of believers which is universal, whose Head and Pontiff, and Priest is and can only be Jesus Christ. To every man who belongs to this Church appertain all the great promises which we read in the gospel. In this Church there is neither hierarchy nor aristocracy, but only God and people, and Christ, the mediator and intercessor. This invisible and spiritual Church does not prevent the existence of another Church, visible and material, which is divided into as many fractions as there are nations and languages; and these again are subdivided into smaller fractions; and it is possible for one country to contain many Churches, in the liberty which every man has to choose that which best suits him. To the first class belong the Greek, Syriac, Armenian, and Latin Churches, and the Anglican, and Swiss, and German, who three centuries ago separated themselves, or rather recognised their liberty and their independence of the Latin Church. To the second class belong the Roman and Milanese Churches and those of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, &c. These are all parts of one whole, not because they have the same bishop and the same priests, but, as says St. Paul, “*One Lord, one faith, one baptism.*” Some, indeed, of these churches have no bishops, as the German, Scotch, and Swiss, and the Evangelical Churches of France and Italy. Who is the Bishop of the Church of the Waldenses, in the kingdom of Piedmont? No one. Yet it is a Christian Church, full of fervour, established there at the end of the eleventh century, and which, after most cruel persecutions, and slaughter and massacre, presents to us at this moment a body of twenty-four thousand believers. Then it is possible to be good Christians, and to form a visible national Church on such a model, without having any bishop to interfere with it. At all events, you cannot deny, that a church may, for just reasons, change her bishop.” . . . Observe, that those who were formerly asleep are now awake; and those on whom you formerly imposed, no longer believe what you say. When you quitted Rome, the Bible entered it. The Bible, so long persecuted by Popes, both the gospel of Christ and the holy letters of the apostles, faithfully translated into Italian, are now in the hands of the people, who read them, and there they find neither Popery nor Pope.”

With every opinion expressed in this circular, and even in this extract, we do not agree; but, certainly, it is in no small degree remarkable, that such a document should have issued from the very seat of Anti-Christ,

The above quotations—particularly the first and the last—demonstrate that the Roman revolution is not altogether political: that it has not been, on the part of all concerned, a mere selfish and blind struggle for personal rights. It has had, with many, a higher object—the resuscitation of pure religion.

France.—1. *Jesuit Reaction.*—We have already referred, in former numbers, to the fact, that not only Popery, but Jesuitism, is reviving in France. A correspondent of the *Evangelist* confirms this. They are getting, what they could not do under the late government, the education of the country in their hands. He says:

“There is one subject to which I alluded in my last letter, which is rapidly becoming the great question of the day. I refer to the progress of Jesuitical Catholicism, which threatens to be as tyrannical in our day as it was at the restoration of the Bourbons in 1815. This is its most threatening aspect, its most alarming phase for the friends of truth. The horror of Socialism felt by our bourgeoisie, has led them to seek for support and defence in Catholicism, and they have cast themselves headlong into its arms. This Jesuitical reaction is frightful, as is evident from this infamous Roman Affair, which is the first triumph of this sentiment. Perhaps a still graver view of this Jesuitical scheming, is the draft of a law for public instruction, as proposed by M. De Falloux. The importance of the organization of public instruction is well understood by them. Heretofore it has been almost exclusively under the direction of the State; *the University*, a vast educational corporation, proceeded directly from the Government, and those establishments which did not fall directly within its jurisdiction, were yet under its surveillance. For a long time, the clergy were the sworn enemy of the University, because the latter prevented them from exercising their spiritual influence over pupils during their minority. There are no libels so gross as those they have promulgated against Governmental education.—Doubtless, great reforms were needed; the University monopoly was too oppressive; but it is not with such reforms that M. De Falloux has busied himself. He has only been anxious to secure a preponderance of power for the clergy; and in accordance with his plan, there are five bishops in the Superior Council of Public Instruction.—In each department of the Council the Catholic clergy have many representatives, while the Protestants have but one. Further, every teacher is in a great measure dependent on the curate, who is the judge of his moral fitness. Consequently, if he at any time is lacking in devotion, the curate can oblige him to give up his place. The curate, therefore, will be all-powerful in the school. At the same time, a law is under discussion, which will almost completely destroy the freedom of the press, by reason of the conditions with which it is burdened. Still another suggestion of the Catholic party. M. De Montalembert, who is its leader, has declared that it was his design to suppress, as speedily as possible, the freedom of discussion, and that he hoped this law was only the first chapter of a series of laws in the same direction.—Judge how long we shall preserve our religious liberty with such dispositions!”

2. *Its Socialism.*—The following presents a dark—perhaps too dark—a picture. Still, in the main, it is true:

“I am told by a person very well informed in the matter, that notwithstanding the severe check received by the Socialists on the 13th of June, in spite of the punishment or flight of most of its leaders, that there is not much discouragement in the party; a new element of strength has, indeed, been imparted to it by the indignation it feels at this Catholic re-action. The re-action will inevitably end in crushing the country, and then Socialism, which has thousands, almost millions of adherents, will have a period of terrible triumph over us all, but which will have been brought about by the madmen who govern us. This is the feeling of all reflecting men, who know that we cannot put off a revolution by our jugglers' tricks.”

These Socialists are at work throughout Europe, and are exerting no little influence. To them the *North British Review* ascribes the unhappy issue of most of the liberal movements in Europe. They wish to go much further. We quote:

“In the mean time the agitation of Socialist theories sufficiently explains the fail-

ure of all recent attempts to establish constitutional governments on the continent. The purposeless character of merely democratic changes has been recognised by the great body of the democracy. Their leaders are either chosen for their advocacy of Socialism, or compelled, like Ledru Rollin, and many other political agitators, to adopt its language. Proudhon, Considérant, and Leroux, have sat in the French Assembly; Fröbel was a member of the Frankfort Parliament; Grün himself belonged to the extreme left of the Prussian Legislative Assembly. Discussions on public measures for the maintenance of order and for the security of property are shared in by those who openly profess to wish for the overthrow of order as the first step to the destruction of property.

"The present tendency of Socialist politics may be collected from a recent publication by Bruno Bauer, who was probably, to judge from internal evidence, the author of the manifesto of the German democrats, which appeared in the newspapers about the time of the insurrection in the Bavarian Palatinate. . . . The whole pamphlet (one which he has just published) consists of one continuous sneer at the liberal, reforming, revolutionary *Bürger*. He is described as a purposeless, timid, envious opponent of all superiority, anxious only to bring all things down to his own common-place level. He is taunted with his incapacity to contend against the intrigues of the governments, with his moderation in the Frankfort and Berlin Assemblies, and even with the violence with which he sometimes struggled to acquire power, which he was afterwards incapable of using. . . . In general, it may be said that the indignation of the Socialist agitators is at present chiefly directed against the middle classes, against constitutional governments, and even against strictly political democracy. Conscious that they must obtain all if they would gain any thing, they boldly proclaim their irreconcilable enmity to the whole system of existing society. Modifications of property or political concessions have no value to them, except as steps to the accomplishment of their wishes. In their contest against a system incompatible with their principles, they refuse to listen to compromise."

This is in Germany, but Socialism is the same every where. 3. *Its Protestantism*.—This is, as yet, a feeble, but to us most interesting element in the condition of France. The Free Church Assembly has met; but we wait for full accounts of its proceedings. The Societies are in active operation. One of them—the Evangelical Society—has in its schools, in the city of Paris, *one thousand* children, who are receiving a sound Christian education. These continental Christians and their labours should have a constant interest in the prayers of the faithful. Few in number, they are labouring with untiring zeal against hosts of able, sagacious, and untiring adversaries: on the one hand, against the disciplined armies of Popery; on the other, against the still more dangerous votaries and victims of a rationalistic theology. The following graphic description of the parties now occupying the field of theological controversy in France and in Europe, we find in the pages of the same Review:

"We know few more instructive studies than that of the spectacle, sad and depressing in many of its aspects, which is presented to the thoughtful mind, when, surveying the present state of Europe, it singles out, for special consideration—such as well befits its transcendent importance—the battle, often renewed and still pending, between faith and unbelief. On the one side we see arrayed a motley and seemingly heterogeneous assemblage of men, all contending for the independence of reason, the rights of science, the progress of society, and the blessings of civilization; but in their camp there are ominous sounds of discord, and every detachment has its own party-coloured banner. On the other, we see a formidable power, darkly looming through the haze which envelops it, and the more impressive by reason of the very darkness which shades its boundaries; often silent, always mysterious; but when it does speak, using one cabalistic watchword, which summons every partisan to its standard, and rivets them, as with bolts of iron, to its cause; while between the two, and doing battle alternately with both, there is a small but ill-organized body of serious, thoughtful, enlightened men, Bible Christians, who recoil alike from the reveries of Rationalism and the superstitions of Popery, and who refuse to resolve their faith either into the light of reason or the authority of tradition, while they submit with the docility of little children to the teaching of the Word and the Spirit of God. This small but

select band, maintaining a constant conflict with each of the great antagonistic powers of Evil, and bearing on its scroll the honoured names of Olshausen, Hengstenberg, D'Aubigné, Monod, Gasparin, Tholuck, and others, all more or less devoted to the cause of Christian truth, is at the present time the 'forlorn hope' of Europe, and they deserve, as much as they need, the sympathy and prayers of their brethren in England."

Ireland.—The Queen's visit is awakening the dormant loyalty of the Hibernians. She has been received in Cork, Dublin, and Belfast, with the greatest acclamations that ever saluted the ears of a sovereign. Arches, flags, illuminations, &c. &c., were the order of the day. The correspondent of one of our dailies takes a very sanguine view of the results to be looked for from the legislation of the last Parliament. He says:

"The Sale of Encumbered Estates Bill will take immense properties out of Chancery, and so dispose of them as to ensure the investment of capital and the employment of skill and enterprise, to make them productive, beneficial to the resources of the country, and affording employment to the people. Unhappily, it was not accompanied with another for settling the tenant right, without which the agricultural interests of Ireland can never be rightly adjusted, or full scope given to the development of her agricultural resources. But provision is made, by loans for land drainage, for the encouragement of land improvement when once it is set free from its legal and creditorial trammels, and bills have been carried for completing trunk railways that connect Dublin with Galway, and Cork with Belfast. If now the London companies shall carry out their plans of extensive land purchases—the legislature having thus opened the way for making such investments at once safe and profitable—and if other capitalists shall enter upon other enterprises in mines and manufactures, with such facilities in water carriage and water power as are unrivalled, except in America, now that the spirit of combination and outrage has passed away, the sunrise of prosperity may follow the midnight of desolation, and the characteristic of Ireland cease to be that of "a country for which God has done so much and man has done so little."

Speaking of the Queen's Colleges, he says:

"The Queen's Colleges are to be opened in October, and, at length, the Professors have been appointed. Most of them are men whose names are high in the departments of science or literature which they are to teach, either as authors or lecturers; and I notice that the press of Galway, Belfast, and Cork, in which towns the colleges are situated, speak approvingly of the persons chosen. Two were Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin; and the fact of their relinquishing what is considered as worth £750 per annum, is proof that they expect the new colleges to succeed. Others are Oxford and Cambridge men; some from the continent, and others, the great majority, Irishmen. The Professorships include the whole range of classics, modern languages, the intellectual and physical sciences, and also, engineering, agriculture, the Irish language, and the various departments of medical science. When you consider that the national schools provide an elementary education for the people, and reflect upon the legislative and social influences that are brought into operation, and add to all, these institutions in the extremities, south, west, and north, bringing a collegiate education within the reach of the whole population, you will not wonder that I am sanguine as to the results."

As to these colleges, we have little confidence in them. They are established upon the principle of compromise between Popery and Protestantism, and are, besides, altogether irreligious. Such institutions must, in the long run, be of little benefit. As to the other extract, we agree with the writer that the legislation to which he refers is in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. Legislation, to do *much* good, must have in view the utter demolition of the landlord system. This is, at least, the second great curse of Ireland. The tenants must be converted into actual proprietors.

England.—The Church of England can hardly escape much longer

the perils of lively internal strife. One of the bishops refused to induct an evangelical clergyman, on the ground that he denied the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. An appeal was taken, which has resulted, unexpectedly, in favour of the bishop. From this decision another appeal has been taken to the Privy Council—that is, to the Queen as Head of the Church. Should the decision be confirmed, the evangelical clergy will find themselves in no pleasant position. In the language of a distinguished correspondent of the *British Banner*, “there must then result either a reform of the offices of the church, or a separation from the Anglican Church of all who hold Protestant and Scriptural doctrine.”

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

The Free Presbyterian Church.—This church has taken strong ground against the liquor traffic, and voting for immoral men. As to the former, they say:

“It is high time now, after exhausting every human expedient, to try *God’s plan* for removing moral evils. He has set up His church in the world as the great reforming agency. By the faithful preaching of her ministers, and the faithful administration of discipline by her officers, and by the faithful illustration of its spirit in the lives of her members, she becomes the salt of the earth, and the light of the world. So long as the church fosters in her bosom any sin, all efforts to remove that sin from society will be abortive. Nearly all the world is opposed to the existence of slavery. In the United States, literature, science, and politics, have declared against the system; and yet it stands, and is increasing in its demands for power. The reason is, that the church sustains the system; and as there is no power out of the church that could sustain it if the church opposed it, so there is no power out of the church that can abolish it so long as the sin is brought to the communion table. In like manner, so long as the manufacturer, vender, and seller of intoxicating liquors are allowed to come to the Lord’s table, and there have their characters endorsed as *Christian*, intemperance will triumph. The jails, poor-houses, courts of justice, and hell itself, will be crowded with victims. Now, the place to begin this reform, as well as all others, is the church. See to it, then, dear brethren, that the spirit of the Synod’s action is carried out—that no man be tolerated in the communion of the church who is so deficient in Christian character, as to make, sell, or use intoxicating liquors as a beverage, or contribute in any way to the odious and sinful business. To be guilty of such conduct is an *immorality*, and every immorality is a breach of the great rule which God has laid down in the moral law as the standard for judging Christian character. Let us as a church have no part nor lot in the ignominy of sanctioning and sanctifying the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. And let us in our religious capacity, endeavour to bring the law to bear upon the traffic in ardent spirits as it does upon theft, arson, and other crimes. The men who are engaged in poisoning the happiness of society in this way are not to be reached by moral and religious considerations. Like other criminals they have become hardened to iniquity, and neither fear the authority of God nor regard the interests of man. As fifteen years of moral suasion has been used, and still drunkenness is increasing, it is time to abate the nuisance by the use of legal suasion. We speak not this because any makers, venders, and drinkers of alcoholic spirits are found in the communion of the Free Church, but to warn you against the danger of allowing such persons to connect with the church. Experience proves that it is easy to keep sin out of the church, but that it is extremely difficult to banish it after it has gained an entrance.”

On the subject of voting, this church has not come up to the high Scriptural ground of withholding all active support; but they tell some important facts, and give some salutary warnings.

“In the choice of political rulers, American Christians have hitherto forgotten that civil government is an ordinance of God, designed for the preservation of human rights; and that the moral character of political functionaries is expressly described and required in the Bible. We have been in the habit of casting our votes at the dic-

tation of a political party, whose leaders have generally been men of unprincipled character; and thus we have despised God's ordinance by disobeying His commands; and the consequence of such conduct we see in the present character of the government. Immoral men, who despise every thing which is holy—duellists, slaveholders, drunkards, profane swearers, and debauchees—have been called by Christian voters to administer the affairs of civil government, which all admit to be the ordinance of God. How can the liberties of a nation be safe in the hands of such men? It is high time, therefore, for Christians to act *as Christians in their citizen as well as their church capacity*. We emancipated ourselves from the dominion of the slave power in church affairs. Let us not be guilty of the folly of building up with one hand, while we pull down with the other. Let not the finger of scorn be pointed at our inconsistency of testifying against slavery as a crime while, by our solemn votes, we bestow the highest honour upon those who are notoriously guilty of the crime."

Light is increasing. We hope to see this energetic body rising to a higher level, and repudiating altogether, not merely slaveholding *candidates*, but slaveholding *institutions*: the last are worse than the first.

Associate Reformed Synod of New York.—At its late meeting, this body transacted a good deal of business. They had before them the subject of Missions, Foreign and Domestic. They hope soon to enter upon the former. As to the latter, they urge increased efforts. In regard to voting for church officers, they have adopted a rule altogether excluding—we believe unscripturally—females from the elective franchise. For *the first time*, this synod also took action upon the subject of slavery. It was brought before them by letters from the Free Church of Scotland, the General Assembly in Scotland, and the synod of the United Presbyterian Church, Scotland. Their resolutions, so far as they deal with the abstract question, are—if we understand them—good and true; but when they come to the practical part of the matter, they yield the question, substantially,—by permitting the slaveholder to retain the legal right to his slaves, though requiring him to treat them as hired servants. Would they deal this way with any other course of conduct "in itself morally wrong?" Certainly not. Besides, what need to say that "it is a moral duty," to set free slaves, "when the civil laws *enjoin* their release?" We hope this synod will soon come to see it to be its duty to require of its members to forsake wrong-doing, the wicked laws of men to the contrary notwithstanding.

Temperance—New Hampshire.—This State has dissolved its connexion with the sale of spirituous liquor as a beverage, by the passage of the following law, which has just received the Governor's approval:

"The selectmen of the respective towns shall license one or more suitable persons to sell wines and spirituous liquors for medicinal, mechanical, and chemical purposes. If any person not licensed as aforesaid, shall sell wine or spirituous liquors, mixed or unmixed, he shall be subject to all the penalties provided in the existing laws."

The Cholera.—This plague has nearly ceased its ravages. It still lingers in a few localities,—in some it is still epidemic. Would that we could see some evidence of national reformation. Such visitations, if not improved, are but precursors of other and heavier judgments.

THE COVENANTER.

NOVEMBER, 1849.

[For the Covenanter.]

LITERATURE.—CHRISTIAN OR PAGAN?

What literature is best adapted to train the minds of youth for the ministry? This question was always important to the Christian church; but in the present day it seems peculiarly so. All churches now seem to admit that the ministry should be educated, well educated, literary, very literary and scientific men, thoroughly educated in all branches of literature that may be subservient to the reputable and profitable execution of the high functions of their office. The question then is not, shall they be learned or not; but shall their mental discipline in early life be principally and chiefly in heathen or Christian books? shall the Bible, and books which breathe Bible principles, and scriptural purity, be text books of the schools of literature? or shall the old classical books of the heathen, reeking with blood and dipped in all pollution, be the volumes that our sons shall peruse while prosecuting study for the ministry?

The question needs only to be stated fairly, to secure a correct answer from every unprejudiced mind. The difficulty with Christians is, and perhaps with some ministers, that they conceive that we cannot have our sons educated unless they study Ovid and Virgil and Horace. The time was, too, when the learned world thought it necessary to teach Aristotle, otherwise we could know nothing about the art of thinking. Times have changed. We have a new organon of mental philosophy; why not of Christian literature? Till Bacon, and Locke, and Reid, and Stewart, &c., arose to shear the locks and expose the nakedness of the Stagyrite, he was considered as important to form the mind for reasoning as Virgil and Horace, and Pindar and Sappho are, to give pinions to the imagination, and refinement to the taste.

This question is peculiarly interesting at present to Covenanters, who are employed in erecting two literary institutions for training youth for the ministry. The Presbytery of the Lakes, some time ago, concerted the plan, with great unanimity, for teaching and erecting an initiatory school and college which they call Geneva Hall, within the bounds of Mr. Johnston's congregation, near Belle-Centre. The friends of Biblical and Christian literature have patronized this institution beyond the expectations of its friends, both by contributing to the erection of necessary buildings and by sending pupils to cultivate their minds by study.

The Pittsburgh Presbytery are now in progress towards having a school for the same laudable purpose at Wilkinsburgh. The wish, I suppose, of all the friends of literature and religion would be that both of these institutions might prosper in co-operating for the same ends. As

it is, it is natural to suppose that the friends of Christian literature should be partial to Geneva Hall, and the friends of Pagan classics to Wilkinsburgh. An essay on the Latin and Greek classics in the Reformed Presbyterian of September, gave rise to these thoughts. From the circumstance of that essay being published by the intended Principal of that institution, without animadversion, I conclude that the Pagan classics are to be the books of that college. Now it is natural to ask, why do Covenanters incur the cost of erecting a college at very considerable expense, if it is to have the same kind of drill as other institutions in the immediate neighbourhood? There are two institutions—the Western University and Duquesne College in Pittsburgh. Jefferson College, Washington College, Athens and Richmond are all near by and conducted by very devout principals and professors, endowed and chartered. Why erect in the heart of these a new institution unless for some great moral purpose, that the education of students may participate something of the peculiarity of a Covenanter school and be peculiarly Biblical and Christian? As we advocate, theoretically and practically, Bible psalms, Bible laws and government; thus we should have our standard bearers trained up in Bible and Christian literature.

But it is said Paul and the Reformers were classical scholars, and we must be drilled in the same classical books, or we cannot be like them—cannot be useful and great men. Now let us see whether this be conclusive reasoning or sophistry. Paul, it is true, was learned in the philosophy of the Greeks, had read the Greek classics, Aratus and Epimenides, and quoted from these great men, but the rest of the Apostles had not that education. But it will be said, “He laboured more abundantly than they all.” It must be remembered, too, that he had an education under Gamaliel. If because he was acquainted with Grecian literature and trained that way from his youth, which seems to be assumed rather than proved—then surely more plainly should we be trained at the feet of some Jewish Rabbi like Gamaliel. That the training, however, which he received from Rabbinical and Grecian lore helped to form his mind for arguing in synagogues and on Mars hill we do not deny, but that he enforced the same course upon his successors or upon us is not, to our mind, at all proved. No. Neither he nor his divine Master inculcated any thing like the course of study which this essay urges. The Master does not say, Study Homer, search Juvenal, but search the Scriptures: and Paul does not tell Timothy and Titus, You must train your minds in the study of the Latin and Greek classics, but congratulates them, particularly the former, that he had been trained and educated in the scriptures, which are able to make wise to salvation. All his Jewish and Gentile learning he counted loss for Christ, and gave them an example to strive to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. I do not wish to be understood, nor do any of the advocates of the Christian institution, that any thing of real history or moral principle should be hidden from students. We want them to know all that can be conveniently known of the developements of divine purpose in providence and in the ways of man in society; but we do insist that far more of this can be known by studying scripture and the writings of the Christian Fathers and Reformers than can be known in ten times as long study of the Latin and Greek classics. If human nature be always the same, we do not need a long process to show us its deep depravity, and if it be important that we should study this, let us

have classics *without any expurgation*, and, then, go to drunken bar rooms and filthy brothels! and on the same principle we should make Voltaire and Rousseau, Balzac and George Sand, and Eugene Sue the text books for French in our schools, and for Italian, Alfieri with his impure dramas! Why, surely, my worthy brother, the writer of that essay did not think of the natural inference that would be made from his reasoning, or it would not have come to light. We will see wickedness enough, and so will our sons, without spending thousands of money and years of study to explore it. That the Bible narrates great wickedness is readily admitted, but it is to denounce and rebuke it; whereas the Latin and Greek classics exhibit every thing that is furious and fierce and base, adorned with the fascinations of eloquence and song. One might as well argue that because Mr. Chrystie testifies against profanity and debars debauchery, therefore, we might and ought to go to the haunts of ribaldry and schools of obscenity. "It is a shame to speak of those things that are done of them in secret." "Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners."

And suppose we admit that these books may serve a good purpose in convicting the heathen from their own mouths of the most abominable crimes, is that any reason why we should put them in the hands of youth and set them poring over them for years, drinking in their filthiness? Suppose we grant, that men of mature minds and sanctified hearts may make this use of them, what has that to do with the question as to what is proper for youth? The confirmed Christian may be called to read Paine's Age of Reason, or Rousseau's Confessions, or even to look into the foul pages of the French press, but is that any reason why we should put their books into our schools? We ought to read the best books, keep the best company, and after all, if we have a right sense of ourselves and of the purity of God, and of His law, we will see our great need of the fountain of purification opened in the house of David for sin and uncleanness. We do not need to dabble in the filthy mire of antiquity.

In other respects what a school of morals for our youth are these Pagan classics! Bates in his work on the Divine Attributes gives us the following description of the moral principles and rules of some of the best of them. "The Cynics assert that all natural actions may be done in the face of the sun; that it is worthy of a philosopher to do those things in the presence of all, which would make impudence itself to blush—a maxim contrary to all the rules of decency, and corruptive of good manners; for as the despising of virtue produces the slighting of reputation, so the contempt of reputation causes the neglect of virtue. Yet the Stoics with all their gravity were not far from this advice. Besides, among other unreasonable paradoxes, they assert all sins are equal; that the killing a bird is of the same guilt with murdering a parent—a principle that breaks restraints of fear and shame, and opens a passage to all licentiousness. They commended self-murder in several cases; which unnatural fury is culpable, in many respects, of rebellion against God, injustice to others and cruelty to one's self. *Zeno*, the founder of the sect, practised his own doctrine; for falling to the ground, he interpreted it to be a summons to appear in another world, and strangled himself. *Aristotle* allows the appetite of revenging injuries to be as natural as the inclination to gratitude, judging according to the common rule, that one contrary is the measure of another. Nay, he condemns the putting up with an injury as degenerating and servile. He makes indignation at the prospe-

city of unworthy men, a virtue; and to prove it, tells us the Grecians attributed it to their gods, as a passion becoming the excellency of their natures. He also allows pride to be a noble temper that proceeds from a sublime spirit. He represents his hero by this among other characters, that he is displeas'd with those who mention to him the benefits he hath received, which make him inferior to those that gave them; as if humility and gratitude were qualities contrary to magnanimity. He condemns envy as a vice that would bring down others to our meanness, but commends emulation, which urges to ascend to the height of them that are above us. And *Plato* himself, though styled divine, yet delivers many things that are destructive of moral honesty. He dissolves the most sacred band of human society, ordaining in his commonwealth a community of wives. He allows an honest man to lie on some occasions; whereas the rule is eternal, We must not do evil that good may come thereby. In short, a considering eye will discover many spots, as well as beauties, in their most admired institutions. They commend those things as virtues which are vices, and leave out those virtues which are necessary for the perfection of our nature; and the virtues they commend, are defective in those qualities that are requisite to make them sincere." Is this the code of morals that we wish our children to learn?

What the intelligent and pious will regret and censure most in the essay is the wresting of holy scripture from its natural and holy purpose to support the object that it has in view. For instance, "To the pure all things are pure." Now, it is true, that this text proves that every scene that may meet the sense of the pious will be sanctified, but, surely, it does not prove that we should voluntarily expose ourselves to the corrupting principles of obscene books, either Jewish or Gentile fables, Latin or Greek classics. Of all such the Apostle charges the Evangelist to "Beware." The Apostle does not say, Ponder over these for years and direct all that are designed for the ministry to make these fables the study of years, but beware of them as dangerous. If the quotation of that passage have any meaning, it is this: The Latin and Greek classics have a great deal of unclean and obscene sentiment, but the students designed for the ministry are so pure that there is little danger of their contamination. But, O! how different is the matter of fact, and how differently the Apostle and our Reformers considered the matter. See the sins forbidden in the 7th commandment in the Larger Catechism, and the Directory in relation to the education of the ministry. In the former lascivious books are forbidden, as well as pictures, &c. In the latter there is not a word said about the Latin and Greek classics, but they are required to be well acquainted with the original languages, i. e. Greek and Hebrew, and with science subservient to the understanding of the word of God. These intelligent and pious men seem'd all along to have the Bible in their eye, as the rule and the guide of their lives. The culture of taste was a matter of very inferior importance to the culture of holiness in the heart. They wanted to have the ministry trained to edify the church by demonstration of the Spirit and right dividing of the word of truth, and not to tickle the fancy by classical allusions to heathen mythology and other meretricious ornaments of style, such as the study of Latin and Greek classics was calculated to impart.*

* As to the adage, "A nice man is a happy man," it is well to know that its author, Dean Swift, was among the most filthy and obscene of all writers. A fine source for an adage to guide Christians in educating their children.

Still the advocates of Christian literature are friendly to the diligent study of not only Latin, but also French and German. The study of language is a useful discipline to the mind, and it affords facilities of learning useful knowledge exhibited in those languages. Still to old and young, the Book of books is the Bible. I cannot but be grieved to contrast the sentiment of the essay with that of the dying Sir Walter Scott, who asked of his friend, Give me a book. The friend inquiring what book, he sharply answered, There is no book but ONE. O, that that sentiment might more and more prevail! O, for the time when the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem! May the Father of Lights soon turn to the people a pure language, that all may serve Him with one consent, and particularly, may the watchmen on our Zion's walls, see eye to eye and speak with the voice together. Amen and Amen.

J. M.

SECOND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.—DEACONS ABROAD.

Under this heading we purpose to consider some statements that have come under our notice, which, in our judgment, it would neither be right nor safe to pass by. We begin with what relates to the position of the second book of discipline, and waiving, for the time, all the arguments advanced in our last number, none of which have been met, we have no fear of establishing *all* that we have said respecting it, from the very pages in which an attempt is made to set it aside. And first, the article alluded to admits that the form of church government "does not cover all the ground of the Second Book of Discipline," and then proceeds to give an account of a directory of government which the Church of Scotland was employed in preparing in the years just preceding 1649. This was to be a portion of the "fourth part of the covenanted uniformity." Now does not this writer see that he has conceded every thing? Is it possible that the Scottish Church, under these circumstances, *could* let go, or intend to let go, the second book? If she had, then would she have stripped herself *completely bare*, at least in all those matters in which the Form fell short of covering the whole ground of her existing standard. Did she do this? Had she so little regard to her solemn covenants? Ah! But she set about supplying the deficiency. True, she commenced to prepare a directory, but *did she do it?* This writer himself admits that she did not—"it was not formally adopted." In other words, it was as though it had not been, the second book still remaining, necessarily, in force.

2. This writer furnishes evidence that the second book was considered as authority *after* the adoption of the Form. We refer to his quotation from one of Baillie's letters, in regard to a debate in the Scottish Assembly, 1649, respecting "an act concerning the election of ministers." We insert it in its proper place, the clause in italics.

"Mr. David Calderwood was peremptory, that according to the second book of discipline, the election should be given to the Presbytery with power to the major part of the people to dissent, upon reason to be judged of by the Presbytery. *Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Ward were as peremptory to put the power and voices of election in the body of the people, contradistinct from their eldership.* Mr. D. Calderwood and Mr. John Smith reasoned much against it, (the act that finally passed,) where against my mind the Book of Discipline was pressed against them, and a double election made, one

before trial and another after, as if the election before, and the trial by the second Book of Discipline were given to the people, and that after trial, before ordination, to the Presbytery. This I thought was nothing so, but was silent, being in my mind contrary to Mr. David in the main, though in this incident debate of the sense of the book of discipline I was for him."

Now we ask, in all fairness, how could the second Book of Discipline "be pressed against" Mr. C., if it was not a recognised standard? If we are not mistaken, no little opposition was made to its being pressed lately against another Mr. C. on this very alleged ground. This is another conclusive argument furnished us by this writer. Certainly this book was not regarded by the Assembly of 1649 as it is by T. S., or no one would have thought of "pressing" any body with it. Moreover, if the Form is clear on this point, why was it not "pressed?"

Again, this quotation goes far to settle the question as to the teachings of the second Book of Discipline in regard to the election of ministers. If authority is worth any thing in a matter of this sort, we prefer Rutherford to Baillie: we ought to say we prefer the whole Assembly, for they passed an act for free-election, to Baillie, Calderwood, and a few others.

So much for the position of the Second Book. We must notice some other matters in this article.

1st. It contains a charge against us of false quotation, and attempts to make capital out of it. Referring to his quotation of the paragraph in the old Scottish Testimony, in which the standards of that church are mentioned, the writer says:

"It is not a little remarkable, that in the place where we find the above extract employed in defence of the scheme we are opposing, it is without the reference to "the sum of saving knowledge." In the orator it might have been a lapsus linguæ, but in the amended report its absence must be accounted for in some other way."

Yes, in some other way, but not, as this paragraph insinuates, fraudulently. We omitted the Sum of Saving Knowledge for the best of reasons. *It is not there.* It was in the edition of 1762—how it crept in we do not know. In the later edition, from which we quoted, it is not found. The Church had herself, on a review of her own work, omitted it, and we did not take the responsibility of inserting it.* When we begin to make false quotations—any one may fall into an inaccuracy—it will be time enough to charge us with it. But suppose the "Sum of Saving Knowledge" had been embodied and *retained* among the standards of the Scottish Church, would that have proved any thing against the Second Book of Discipline occupying the same position? But what does T. S. mean when he says on the next page?

"Nay more, it proves that we are sworn to the Rutherglen, Sanquhar and Lanark declarations—to the informatory vindication—to the cloud of witnesses, for we find a reference to them in the very same language as in the above extract, in the next page of the testimony. An argument that proves too much, proves nothing. However highly we prize all the above excellent works, we cannot believe that we are sworn to them, and we are sure neither did the Reformed Church in Britain."

Of course, then, the Scottish Church only meant to say that she "highly prized" the Confession of Faith, &c.—she did not consider

* Another person is involved with us in this charge. We will leave him to vindicate himself, which he can well do.

herself bound to them! Is that the position in which this writer would put the Scottish Church? In his zeal to get rid of the Books of Discipline he would make it out that she was sworn to nothing! But is this writer a true witness in the case? He is not. In the paragraph respecting the standards the Presbytery say "they testify and declare their approbation &c. of . . . as agreeable to and extracted from the sacred oracles." In regard to the other documents they premise a proviso "as" evidently meaning "in so far as" they are founded upon and agreeable to the word of truth, and as a just and proper vindication of the Scottish covenanted cause." They then add, "and particularly with the above provision and limitation—they declare their adherence," &c. We dislike the whole passage. And we would like to know how T. S. will reconcile his language here with our fifth term of communion, in which we approve of the faithful contendings of the witnesses and martyrs!

2d. An attempt is made to call down the *odium theologicum* upon all those who maintain that the Form did not supersede the second book, as if they rejected the entire second reformation. Hence this writer goes on to quote from the Scottish testimony against the revolution settlement, as if it had any thing to do with the subject. Does this writer believe that we wish to get rid of the bond affixed to the national covenant in 1638—of the solemn league and covenant—of the proofs to the confession of faith—of the Form and Directory—of the catechisms, larger and shorter? Does he believe this? If he does not, how can he reconcile it with a good conscience to quote against us the condemnation pronounced by our fathers upon those who abandoned all these and went back to the Church as it was in 1592? If he does—if this is his inference, we can reply that the whole Scottish Church is in the same position, for she *admittedly* recognised among her standards this very book of discipline.

But what follows? We quote. He is speaking of the revolution settlement.

"Now, if the act of parliament had named the form of church government in connexion with the confession, the settlement would have been what our fathers desired, and in it they would have joined. It would have secured to the Church all the privileges to which she had attained at the second reformation."

Is this possible? We can scarcely believe our own eyes. All that was wanted by our fathers was the recognition of the Form of Church government, in addition to the confession, and they would have joined the revolution settlement! Of course, in the judgment of T. S. they were all ready to give up the bond annexed to the national covenant—the solemn league and covenant—the directory and the catechisms—all the laws in behalf of reformation, and all the real attainments made during the twenty-eight years' persecution—only give them the form of government! What are this writer's ideas respecting the second reformation? Is it possible that he would make it all consist in the framing of this Form of government, and *that* a Form which, he confesses, does not even cover the whole ground of the second book of discipline! We consider this as no less than a slander upon our fathers. We pass from this article. We leave the conclusion of it to others who may think themselves called upon to notice it.

Deacons Abroad.—Our readers have before them the doings of the

Irish synod on this subject, and many of our readers know that an attempt has been made to put upon them such an interpretation as to make them correspond exactly with the views and proceedings of those who in this country have been opposing, with all their might, the reintroduction of this officer into the Church; and along with this such expressions as the following have been used in relation to the efforts made during the last ten years on behalf of this office in this country:—"Extreme opinions"—"ill-timed and ruinous agitation," &c. Now, beginning with them, what are the opinions here characterized as "extreme?" Neither more nor less than that the deacon has to do with all dedicated church property—that this office should be found in all congregations which have funds to manage, and, in the language of the Westminster form, that all the officers of the congregation should "meet together at convenient and set times for the well-ordering of the affairs of the congregation, each according to his office." If these are "extreme opinions," we are willing to bear our share of the reproach belonging to them. These statements appear under the editorial head. It is well to know that the editor has, at last, taken his stand, and ranged himself openly with those with whom he has long been acting in the Church courts.

As to the agitation, as it is termed, let us look into its history. The first step was taken on the subject of deacons in the year 1834, in the appointment of a committee to prepare a book of government. This committee, D. Scott chairman, reported, in 1836, a document containing the following clauses.

"The scriptures specify another class of office-bearers, whose office is not spiritual, like those of preaching and ruling elders, but relating only to temporal matters, namely, deacons. The office of the deacon is to attend to the temporal concerns of the congregation."

"To the session, with the deacons associated, belongs the management of the temporalities of the congregation."

This was sent down in overture, and was taken up in 1838, and passed so far as the first of these clauses, with an amendment proposed by the New York (then Southern) Presbytery, specifying the duties of the deacon respecting the poor. At that meeting the opposition to this office made its appearance, as it had before done in the Pittsburgh Presbytery. This opposition controlled a majority of the Synod of 1840, Messrs. Scott and Roney voting in the minority, the latter arguing, very correctly, that the "affairs" mentioned in the section of the form referring to the "meeting together" of the officers of a congregation, include the temporalities. Soon after Synod a pamphlet was issued entitled "The Deacon," discussing the whole subject, and that, as all must admit, temperately and fairly, whatever may be thought of the ability with which the design was executed. A vehement opposition was at once awakened. Every effort was made, especially in the bounds of the Pittsburgh Presbytery, to keep this essay out of the hands of the people, and some even went so far—we do not know whether any of the ministers were concerned in this—as to threaten the author with Church censure for the publication. Indeed, it was complained of to the Synod in 1841, by some persons then in connexion with the Philadelphia congregation. Synod did not receive the complaint, and nothing was then done upon the subject. In 1843 the subject came up on a libel presented against Rev. C. B. McKee, based upon a pamphlet which he had issued just previously, entitled "Anti-Deacon," in which he denies

entirely the deacon's office, maintaining that this is merely a scriptural title for a spiritual officer, minister, or ruling elder. He was censured. In the mean time every effort was made to prevent the *discussion* of the subject—the pages of the magazine were closed against it, and such as referred to this office in their sermons or their *prayers* were branded as agitators and disturbers of the peace of the Church. In 1845 Mr. Scott introduced a set of resolutions, several of which we approved, with the design, and we give him all the credit due to him for this design, to effect a peaceable settlement of the question. However, the resolutions were so drawn as to have the appearance of a gag-law, and we are assured—as much was intimated upon the floor of Synod—that, had they passed, attempts would have been made to inflict censure upon such as would make public allusion any where, except in their own congregations, to this office. One clause was, that “the people were to be left to the free and unbiassed management of their temporalities, according to the existing modes.” No other way by which they could be “biassed” was known, except by discussion, for not a step had as yet been taken, or *even proposed*, directing congregations to have deacons. In view of this clause, it might not have been altogether safe for any pastor to attempt to “bias” his own charge in favour of this office. Another set of resolutions passed, and again, in 1847, an additional series, both of which are before our readers in the published minutes. This is all the legislation on the subject in eleven years—and surely none can complain of it—none who believe in the office of the deacon as exhibited in our standards, as either too much or too stringent.

Now, where could those who believed this office to be of divine appointment, and that it should be exemplified in the Church—where could they stop? Was it wrong to write “the Deacon?” Was it wrong to censure “the Anti-Deacon?” Was it wrong to declare the trustee system an innovation and unscriptural? In short, was it wrong to defend this part of the Church's faith? We do not say that the controversy has been always conducted with that courtesy and kindness that ought to characterize debates among brethren, but we do honestly believe, that to have abandoned the field would have been equivalent to selling this part of the Church's organization. We would then have been taunted as lukewarm—as not believing what we professed—as unworthy the Church's confidence. If there has been agitation, it is due to the opposition of a part of the Church to the introduction of deacons, and to the attempts to stop discussion. Nor has it been “ruinous.” The Church has been gradually coming right, and every year has seen deacons ordained in some of our congregations.

As to the resolutions of the Irish Synod, we believe that they have gone as far as we ever have done on some points, and farther on others.

1st. They take for granted that there should be deacons in all the congregations. To introduce them is the design of these resolutions. Nor can any thing else be inferred from the remark that all admitted the propriety of having deacons in the Church when circumstances might require them, for, be it remembered, *all* admitted this; others, we are prepared to assert, would have taken higher ground. Still, much depends upon the import of the word “circumstances” in this connexion. In this country, in the mouths of anti-deacon men, it would mean that there is no propriety in getting deacons so long as, in any way, the elders attending to the poor, and trustees, committees, &c., to the other

funds, they could manage to get along without them. We cannot believe—we will not, without evidence, that the members of the Irish Synod so intended to disparage a divine institution. And yet we do not affirm that they all perceive distinctly the great importance of the office. We have good grounds for believing that not more than two sympathize with the extremely lax opinions of some in this country; but we are perfectly aware that in the case of others the subject has not sufficiently occupied their attention. They are employed in investigating it.

2d. The Irish Synod has directed the discussion of the subject. And here is the grand distinction between their doings and that of a portion of the Church here. In this they fully coincide with us. They do not say, as was said and re-said when this matter was first broached among us, that it is a trifling matter—that it is beneath discussion. They say the very opposite. Discuss, preach, converse, and by fair inference, read. Right this, perfectly right. If the subject had been met in this spirit in this country, there never would have been agitation. Ah! some one will say, they are to discuss the question in their own congregations. No. The Irish brethren are not given to petty jealousies of this kind. And does any one believe that a pamphlet on this subject, coming from a respectable source, from any of the ministers or intelligent members, would not receive a ready reception and careful examination? Would it be stigmatized as a firebrand, and its author threatened? No. The subject is to be discussed, and this *more* than we ever directed.

3d. They wish that all may be brought to act harmoniously. With this no one can disagree, when taken in connexion with their order to give diligence to impart the necessary information. Had they talked about peace, and then attempted, as was attempted in this country, to bring about peace, by stifling discussion by gag-laws, or by the coercion of reproach as disturbers of the peace, applied to all who would discuss the question, we would have denounced their doings as the highest treachery to the truth of Christ, and the rights of Christ's freemen. They seek no such peace. They know that the subject has been in abeyance—that light is needed—they direct it to be circulated, and when sessions and congregations can be brought to understand the subject and act intelligently and harmoniously, they call for action. But let us not go too far. Are we to suppose that our intelligent brethren abroad will allow themselves to wait for absolute unanimity? that is, provided any opposition arise. Certainly not. And still more, provided any congregation proceed to ordain deacons to take charge of all its temporalities, will they regard it with a jealous eye?—will they bring the power of their ecclesiastical machinery to bear against it? Will they try to re-convert it *from* the office of the deacon? No, none of all these things. They will rejoice to see the movement proceed just as truly as we do, when we see congregation after congregation coming into the measure here, while—are we unjust or uncharitable in saying so?—our opponents in this country will lament to learn, that in the spirit and according to the design of these resolutions, our Irish brethren are ranging themselves on our side in completing the organization of their congregations.

Omitting, for the present, that part of the article which refers to the committee of ten and the Scottish Synod, we conclude by saying that the entire article presents the issue unfairly. It would represent the whole matter as one rather of manner and time than of substance. Now

nothing can be more untrue. If our brethren believe that the deacon should be in their congregations, why are they not taking the necessary steps to have deacons? Why are they not teaching their congregations? Why are they not disabusing the minds of their people of prejudices carefully fostered for ten years against the office of the deacon? Why, in short, do they not come as far as they can to meet those who occupy what they believe to be extreme ground? Do they do these things? No, far otherwise—bugbears are raised and shown—deacon-men are held up as not only maintaining odious doctrines, but as personally deserving of odium: they are sedulously excluded from pulpits and congregations, lest wrong impressions should be removed—their writings are cried down—put under the ban. Is this the way to make peace? Is that the peace party? If these manifest peaceful dispositions, how could they show hostile?

COVENANT RENOVATION.

BY JAMES R. WILLSON, D. D.

“And *this they did*, not as we hoped, but first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God.”—2 Cor. viii. 5.

Macedonia is on the North-East of Greece. Philippi was the capital. In that city there lived a milliner of the name of Lydia, who with some other devout women, kept society, in the year 53. Paul, Silas and Luke, directed by the Spirit, preached the gospel to them that year. Acts xvi. 12, 15. A large congregation was soon organized in the city. Three years after Paul wrote his epistle to the church at Philippi. In his second letter to the Christians in Corinth, written four years before that to the Philippians, he commends the liberality of the Macedonians, and in our text says they had done better than was expected, in that they had given themselves to God in ecclesiastical covenant, and then gave themselves to Christ at the Lord's table.

It is the duty of the church now to follow this example, and renew her covenant with her redeeming Head. This is demanded by the condition of the church. The action of the church in America, in the duty of covenanting, may be briefly related. At Middle Octorara in Lancaster county, Pa., the National Covenant of Scotland and the Solemn League and Covenant were renewed, in 1743, by our Covenant Fathers, one hundred years before the Solemn League and Covenant had been sworn in London. One hundred years after, 1843, at Rochester, N. Y., an overture of a covenant was adopted by synod and sent down to the Presbyteries. A majority of the Presbyteries reported against its adoption. A commission was appointed to draught an overture and publish it. That, too, was rejected by the Presbyteries.* A committee reported a new bond, 1847, at the sessions of synod in Pittsburgh.

* These overtures are semi-official. The synod expresses its approbation of the whole contents of an overture which it publishes. One overture on Covenanting passed unanimously. These documents are not sent down to the courts below for adoption or rejection, but for information and criticism. Presbyteries may not set aside a deed of synod, because, 1. They are subject to synod; the subject does not govern the ruler. 2. If they can do this, sessions may annul deeds of Presbyteries, and the people those of sessions. 3. A minority might govern. The small Presbyteries, with three or four ministers, would have as much power as those with ten or twelve. 4. The decrees of the synod of Jerusalem were not enacted by the votes of Presbyteries. 5. If the votes of Presbyteries may decide in one matter, they have the right in every thing. This would divest synod of all authority.

It was referred to a committee for publication. A majority of that committee kept back the publication until it was too late for the action of Presbyteries before the last sessions of synod at Philadelphia, the present year.

The following considerations show that covenant renovation is required by the present state of the church:

1. *We are far dispersed in this commonwealth.* "Israel is like dew among the nations." There are Covenanters in twenty of the thirty States of the United States. The church extends from Eastport, at the mouth of the river St. Croix, to California—a distance of 3000 miles; and from Pontiac, in Michigan, to Chester, South Carolina—not less than 1200. This does not include our six organized congregations in the British Provinces of North America, one in Nova Scotia, two in New Brunswick, and three in Canada. There are also many missionary stations. We need a common bond, "to strengthen the stakes" of these far-stretched out "curtains of our habitation." By uniting us more closely to our common Head, we shall be bound more firmly to one another in the ties of brotherly love.

2. *Our Covenant brethren are diversified by many shades of character.* We have members from Ireland, Scotland, England, Holland, Germany and Africa, and some Israelitish proselytes. While a large majority are natives of the United States, all retain most of the national peculiarities of their ancestors, in modes of thought, manners, customs, and diction. It is true, our forms of worship every where, in the old world and the new, are nearly the same. But these are considerably modified in practice. It is in this, as in the personal characters of the saints. All are "created anew in Christ Jesus," in the image of the one living and true God, while "there are diversities of gifts by the same Spirit." Were the people of God perfect, these distinctive features would only augment the strength, beauty and harmony of the body of Christ. But through the remaining power of in-dwelling sin, which turns them to bad account, painful discords are created, marring the church's beauty and impairing her vigour. We have abundant reason to be thankful, that with all these disturbing causes, there is so much harmonious co-operation among a great majority of our ministers, elders, deacons and people. But a feeble minority, availing itself of these diversities, and aided by the subtleties of Satan, has often given the church much trouble, and crippled her energies not a little.

The church's Head has instituted the ordinance of ecclesiastical covenanting as a remedy for this evil. The embodiment of the great and blessed system of covenant truth and duty, in a short document, and the presenting of it to the faith of the whole church together, and its being embraced and sworn to by all, is one great means of knitting together the members of Christ's body, by that which every joint supplieth. What is wrong in their diversified characteristics is corrected, what is good garnished, and what works perversely brought into holy, harmonious action.

3. *The spirit of the world comes into the church with a malignant power, which nothing but solemn renovation of covenant with God can expel.* The members of the church militant are continually exposed to the almost imperceptible, but powerful, influence of the world of the ungodly. For many ages "the god of this world" has embodied this malignant power in the civil governments of the nations.

“The whole world” has long “wondered after the beast.” The church, it is true, has renounced allegiance to these corrupt institutions, by which, to a great degree, she escapes the corruptions that are in the world, through the lust of unholy power. But yet the baneful influence of governmental pollution is continually working harm to the Lord’s heritage. The church has often marred her beauty, by conforming her government to the framework of immoral organizations of civil society, by administering her regimen and dispensing her ordinances in accordance with the irreligious laws and spirit of sinful nations. Of the governments of the world that lieth in wickedness, the prophet Zechariah says:—“These are the horns that have scattered Judah.” They do this not by persecution only. In the latter part of the Old Testament dispensation, and in the early ages of the New, Satan employed bad governments to divide the church by the sword of persecution. He adopted the same infernal policy at the time of the reformation of the 16th century and down to the revolutionary settlement in Great Britain, 1688. Since that event, he employs chiefly the arts of seduction. “He prevails by flatteries;” “and would seduce, if it were possible, the very elect.” In this way, have the horns scattered Judah. A large fragment of the church, 1833, abandoned the testimony of Jesus and went over to an immoral government. For eleven years the church has been disturbed by a party, which is generated by the government of the State. The commonwealth does not regard the authority of Christ. “We, the people, ordain,” as the ultimate fountain of all power, “this constitution.” This party say, We, the people, manage Christ’s property, *if he has any*, in our own way. The church of Christ possesses no property on earth. This is the spirit of the world, “coming in like a flood.” The Head of the church has promised to lift up the standard of covenanting against it. The standard or banner is unfurled that the nation may rally under it for the defence of the sovereignty. Under the national flag of old the soldier swore fealty to the commander. The Spirit is promised to lift up the flag of the covenant in just such a time as that in which we live.

Some object to enter on the duty of covenant renovation, because the whole church is not unanimous in relation to her whole regimen. Let us wait, say they, until we are agreed to have deacons, or until we all agree to discard them; we shall then be prepared to enter into covenant with God. It is a sufficient answer to this objection to say, that it is as absurd as for a patient to declare that he will take no medicine till he gets well.

It is evident that God has given the spirit of the world power to trouble us, as an appropriate chastisement for the long neglect of an imperative duty. The good Lord pardon our sin, and give us grace to display soon the banner of the covenant. Amen.

A WIDE INVITATION.

A series of essays has appeared in the Banner of the Covenant, on the subject of Covenanting. They are understood to be from the pen of one of the most able and most respectable members of the New Light Synod, a most decided and uniform opponent of the late exploded union project. The following reveals the cause of his opposition—it was too small a business: his views are directed to a more comprehensive union.

"In previous remarks our persuasion has been sufficiently indicated, that in the orthodox evangelical departments of the church there is abundance of material, if well arranged, to form a platform on which they all, pleasantly and profitably, could meet and remain as one. Why, then, do not the men of mind and heart in those departments—for such there are—put forth *their* united energies, in giving form to such a scheme as would sustain and secure the entire interests of truth, worship, and order, in the household of faith? and in so doing present an object to be sought, of such commanding power, as would produce forgetfulness, on the part of smaller men, of the mere technicalities of a *mere* party spirit? Men there are, in the several portions of the *partially* divided church, who themselves are prepared for such a result; but the majority are not. That majority must, by the legitimate means, be prepared for it."

If no more was meant by all this, than that efforts should be made to bring the churches generally to embrace the whole system of truth embodied in the church's covenants, and on this basis to become "as one," no objection would lie against it; it would be no more than the reiteration of an admitted duty. This it does not mean. The "materials" are *now* in "the orthodox evangelical churches"—all that is wanting to a union, "pleasant and profitable," is to bring "the majority" to the ground of the more intelligent minority—*said* to exist in these churches. The writer is a man of sense. He has no idea that any considerable amount of "materials," much less "an abundance" can be found in these churches ready to embrace the doctrine of Messiah's headship—and of the duty of nations to foster the church and to discountenance error—the doctrine of covenanting according to the followers of the scripture covenant and those of our reforming fathers; ready to lay aside their human compositions in the worship of God; to exercise a faithful discipline; to withdraw their support from infidel and tyrannical civil institutions. He has no such idea. What then? So far as we can see, the only answer to this inquiry is, that he is willing to put *all* these in abeyance, and take that amount of truth that can be culled out of all the various creeds around us, in which *all* will join—Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists and, perhaps, Methodists—embody this in a covenant, and adopt this as a platform of union, and so all "become as one"!

This interpretation of the writer's views, is confirmed by some remarks in the No. for September. He says:

"The *principle* of his covenant the Scottish covenanter, in a foreign land—any more than in his native isle, may not; will not deny, and its appropriate application in the place of his chosen residence he will feel himself morally obliged to seek; but from fellowship with the Christians or citizens of a strange land where he makes his home, he will not keep back merely because they were never, and are not, under the bonds of the society of the land of his fathers; it being always well understood, that such communion, whether of church or state, will cast no obstacle in his way of duty, or oblige him to act inconsistently with his previous obligations; from which, without incurring guilt, he cannot recede."

That is, the National Covenant of Scotland and the Solemn League are not obligatory on the church, as such, in the United States: they should not be regarded as incorporated with the creed and public professions of

the witnessing church. How, we would ask, does the writer reconcile this statement with his professed acknowledgment of the *fourth* term of ecclesiastical fellowship, still retained, nominally, by the body to which he belongs? Consistency and honesty would require its expunction. We present the above as an exhibition of the real views—and most probably not *all* the real views—of the leading New Lights on the subject of covenanting. How can they hold themselves up as *the* witnesses?

EXTRACTS.

CHRISTIANS IN THE DESERT.—In strange and unexpected places you meet with fresh and lofty Christians. You wonder how they thrive. They do not grow as the lily; for the lily is found in green pastures, and they do not belong to a lifesome communion. Nor do they spring as the willow; for it springs by the water-courses, and they have not the benefit of the purest ordinances and the most refreshful ministrations. They are trees of the desert, like Enoch among the giant sinners of an early world; like Joseph among the wizards and beast-worshippers of Egypt; like Daniel in voluptuous Babylon; like David Brainerd among Indian savages; like Henry Martyn in stony-hearted Persia. Their life is hid. So pure amidst depravity, so loyal to God amidst idolatry, so devout and fervent amidst atheism and blasphemy, their heavenly-mindedness is a miracle. But beneath the dusty surface of this godless world, there is a well of water springing up to everlasting life. There is no spot so barren, and no soil so burning, no situation so adverse, but faith can find the Holy Spirit there. It needs only faith's penetrating root descending beneath the things which do appear, to fetch up spiritual refreshment and invigoration where others pine and die. From a secret source the believer in Jesus draws his life. The morning portion of the word, the morning prayer, the morning meditation; these are the "stolen waters" which keep him green all day; and even in the desert there is a dew which, descending on his branches over night, brings him forth fragrant and lively to the morrow.

Rev. James Hamilton.

THE CHRISTIAN IN HIS MATURITY.—If your character be completely Christian, if there be in it so much of grace that the gracious has all grown natural, if your affections be brought obedient to Christ Jesus, if your maxims of conduct be scriptural, and your motives in acting be Christian, there will be instruction and joy in beholding you. Your growth will be erect and aspiring. The ivy creeps and the bramble trails, but the palm, in its perpendicular uprightness, dwells on high, and seeks the things above. And the fairest Christians are those whose pure and lofty affections lift them sublimely above all that is low and debasing, and whose heaven-pointing demeanour betokens an up-going heart. Whosoever is anxious to become a consistent and conspicuous Christian, must keep aloof from the mean enjoyments and paltry expedients, the fattling curiosity and malignant constructions, of a world incredulous of the highest goodness, because incapable of exerting it; and, aware that no permanent motive to well-doing can be found here below, he must seek it in that Saviour whose smile it elicits, and in that heaven where it will all be found again.

If yours be a flourishing Christianity, there will be no crooks nor

zigzags in it. A conscience void of offence will give a gay security to your goings out and comings in. Never meeting the neighbour whom you have injured, nor the man who has aught ignominious to allege against you, haunted by no sense of hollowness, and no forebodings for the future; harbouring no bitter feelings, and hiding no sinister designs, you will readily come to the light, and never fear that it will make your deeds too manifest. And just as your frank explicit character will declare you a child of day, your evenly sense and the sweetness of your disposition, will justify you as one of Wisdom's children.—*Ib.*

THE BENEFICENT CHRISTIAN.—In the tender mercy of God there are distributed through the Church of Christ, and consequently through the world, many persons who, in beneficence, flourish like the palm. To do good and communicate they never forget. They cannot avoid it. It is now spontaneous with them, for God gave them the disposition when he gave them their new nature. Like a cool shadow in a scorching day, their counsel revives the perplexed, and their sympathy cheers the sad. Like the clustering dates ungrudgingly showered on the passenger, their generosity and hospitality are a boon to all who need them. And like the palm tree pointing to the hidden well, their sure direction guides the weary seeker to the Fountain where he drinks and lives for ever. Such a one was Barnabas, the Son of Consolation, in whose large heart and tender wisdom, afflicted consciences and wounded spirits found the balm which healed them, "a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost." And such were Gaius, and Aquila, and Lydia, and Dorcas, whose willing roof and untiring bounty made churches their debtors, and who found in the prayers of the poor their payment. And such was Philip the Evangelist, who put the timely question to the Ethiopian, and business-like and brother-like sat down in the chariot beside him, and pointed out so plain that way to heaven which the earnest stranger was so fain to find. And such in later times have been many of the Church Universal's worthies: Bernard Gilpin, whose open hand and inviting door softened towards the Gospel the rude heart of Northumberland; John Thornton, of whom it was remarked, "Were there but a thousand loving Christians of great opulence like-minded with him, the nation would be convinced of the good operation of the Gospel;" William Wilberforce, who, in addition to countless acts of considerate philanthropy, sought out and sent to college young men of principle and promise, and saw his liberality rewarded when they became judges of the land, and distinguished ministers of the Gospel; Howell Harris, who filled his Trevecca mansion with scores of disabled and destitute Christians, and, amidst the tears of a hundred adopted children, passed away to that beloved Saviour whom hungry he fed, and a stranger he had taken in; Mrs. Fletcher, of Madeley, who devoted her long widowhood to prayer and active kindness, and re-peopled her desolate home with orphans and the pious poor; John Newton, whose dusky Coleman-street chamber shone with a heavenly radiance in many a memory, for there, amid his affectionate explanations, the cross stood out to their tearful view, and for the first time they learned to find in a Saviour's side the double refuge from sin and from sorrow. And such in your place and your measure may each of you who are Christians at all, aspire to become.—*Ib.*

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD—IRELAND.

We present our readers with some further notices of the Irish Synod—extracts from the reports of Presbyteries, and from their doings in reference to the National System of Education, and the Queen's College, Belfast. These latter, especially, are of no little interest.—ED. COVENANTER.

“The Northern Presbytery regret having been obliged to devote so much time to the financial affairs of the several congregations under their care. Until 1845, the subject scarcely required time or attention, the several congregations so acquitting themselves that ministers rarely had any occasion to make complaints; but the four years now approaching a close leave traces behind them, likely much to influence the state of society in time to come. Ministers, whose very limited means of support depended almost entirely on the contributions of their people, were very much incommoded. In addition to their own privations and sufferings, they were obliged to sympathize with the poor, by whom they were surrounded; and the common pressure lay more on them than on any other class. Presbytery feel grateful to synod for having taken up this matter, and for having put measures in train, which, if vigorously carried out, may be of great benefit in time to come. Presbytery have it not yet in their power to report, either progress or success; but the general opinion is, that active perseverance, on the part of the more opulent, in setting a good example, may induce others to take an interest in supporting the institutions and ministers of religion; and there is ground to hope that there are better times approaching, and that many who have been sowing in tears shall yet reap in joy. Presbytery have pleasure in reporting that many are emerging from the ordeal through which they had passed much improved, and there have been larger accessions to the Lord's Table during the last three months than during six months in the time preceding. Rev. James Smyth is Moderator; Rev. Dr. Stavely, Clerk.”

This Presbytery has one student under its care—Mr. Moody.

“The Southern Presbytery reported that on the 30th of May last, Mr. Alexander Savage, Licentiate, was ordained to the work of the ministry and pastoral charge of the congregation of Ballenon. Presbytery has under its care the following students:—Messrs. William Hanna, Thomas and John Hart, and James Harvey. Messrs. Hanna and Thomas Hart attended the Theological Hall at Paisley, during the past session. Rev. W. S. Ferguson is Moderator; Rev. Thomas Carlile, Clerk.”

“The Western Presbytery reported that at some of their meetings discourses were delivered on the continued obligation of the British Covenants, social worship, and the propriety and necessity of terms of communion, and by this means, it is trusted, some amount of good has been effected. With gratitude, Presbytery would record their trust that the interests of vital godliness have not been declining within their bounds during the past year, and while there have not been any very marked manifestations of revival, yet there have not been wanting in some instances, gratifying indications that the power of Divine grace has been accompanying the administration of word and ordinances. The students under the care of Presbytery are, Messrs. Andrew Tait, John Barr and John Bates. Mr. Tait, who has been one session at the Divinity Hall, has proposed, after mature deliberation, to devote himself to the work of the mission to Hayti. Entertaining, as Presbytery do, a very high

opinion of his piety, talents, and general qualifications for the work, they would earnestly recommend to synod the propriety of devising means, by which his designation as a missionary to that field of labour may be expedited. Rev. J. A. Chancellor is Moderator; Rev. Robert Nevin, Clerk."

"The Eastern Presbytery reported, that the state of the congregation of Manchester formed a subject of deep and painful interest to the Presbytery at several meetings. Owing to a large debt against the house of worship, and the depression of manufactures in Manchester, the congregation were unable to contribute what they had promised for ministerial support, or to struggle with their difficulties. The Rev. Robert Johnson sought, in consequence, to be disannexed from his pastoral relation to the congregation, a measure to which the people ultimately offered no opposition. Deeply bewailing the necessity for taking a step of this kind, and desirous of trying every means in their power to avoid it, the Presbytery sent a deputation of their number, consisting of a minister and an elder, to Manchester, to make all requisite inquiries concerning the condition of the congregation, before they could consider themselves warranted to accede to the petition for disannexion which had been presented. The report of this deputation appeared to the Presbytery to render it indispensable to separate Mr. Johnson from his flock in Manchester: and they did, at their meeting in Belfast, on the 14th February last, dissolve the pastoral relation between him and that people, and furnish him credentials of his standing, as a minister of the church, with which he soon after emigrated to the United States of America. Presbytery have satisfaction in reporting, that on the closest inquiry, they found nothing in the proceedings of the pastor, or congregation, that unfavourably affected the moral character of the parties. The Sacrament of the Supper has been dispensed for the first time in Killinchy, this summer, and we are encouraged to hope for spiritual fruits from the solemn occasion.* The students at present under the care of the Presbytery are Messrs. J. Newell, Wm. S. Graham, and John Robinson. Messrs. Newell and Graham have been presenting trials for license, while they have been prosecuting their theological studies. Rev. Dr. Houston is Moderator; Rev. William M'Carroll, Clerk."

It will be seen from these reports, that there are eleven students at different stages of progress, looking forward to the ministry—a goodly proportion.

Report of the Committee on Education.—The Committee on Education respectfully report, that they met in Belfast on the 13th of June, and after lengthened and solemn consideration of elementary education viewed in connexion with the National system, agreed to submit to synod a series of resolutions on the subject. Your committee farther report, that collegiate education, and the constitution of the Queen's College in particular, engaged a large share of their attention. The statutes of the college, and the resolutions of its board, were received and compared with the standards of this church. It is respectfully submitted, that in this college there is no positive recognition of the Christian religion, no provision made for bringing its salutary influences to bear

* This was the scene of John Livingston's ministry in Ireland. It is about fifteen miles S. E. of Belfast, in the bounds of Dr. Houston's congregation. It is cause of rejoicing that the old wells have been re-opened.—Ed. Cov.

upon the youth of this country, and no distinction made between evangelical principles and the grossest forms of error, or between scriptural ordinances of worship and superstitious and idolatrous services. In this college no branch of knowledge is to be taught, which has any immediate relation to religion, or morality; there is to be no teacher of Hebrew and none of Moral Philosophy: the Greek Testament is not included among the books, on which students are to be examined at entrance or for scholarships. The Professors shall be required, however, to give a pledge, to advance nothing derogatory to revealed religion, and nothing injurious, or disrespectful, to the religious convictions of the students; and the students shall be required to sign an engagement, to use no language contrary to religion or morality. The Professors are to be appointed by the Crown, from which also, even the Deans of residences, being Clergymen, or Ministers, to whom the moral care and spiritual charge of the students of their respective creeds, residing in licensed boarding-houses are intrusted, are to receive their appointment. With the exception of Moral Philosophy and Hebrew, the collegiate establishment contains arrangements for an extensive literary and scientific course of education.

The committee humbly submit, that in their judgment the proposed college is inconsistent with the word of God and Reformation attainments; that it has very serious defects, and includes some positive moral evils. They have come, nevertheless, to the conclusion, that the students of this church may avail themselves of its advantages, inasmuch as these are not connected with any immoral condition, and students do not become responsible for the evils of the constitution and administration of the college. The committee brought under their view other collegiate institutions, to which our students have been accustomed to resort, less exceptionable in constitution, but whose administration and actual condition afford no better prospect of a sound and efficient education.

Your committee finally recommend to synod, to take measures for supplementing the defects of the college when compared with the requirement of your "*plan of education.*"

Signed in the name of the committee,
Belfast, July 12, 1849.

THOMAS HOUSTON,
Convener.

Resolutions respecting the National System of Education.—

I. Resolved,—That considering how much the interests of a nation are involved in the character of the system of education for the lower classes of the community, adopted by the government of the country; and as the merits of the National System of Education for Ireland, are still under discussion; this synod, as the guardian of the educational interests of the people under its care, and a witness for truth, is imperatively called to issue another condemnation of that system, chiefly on the following grounds:—

1. Because it separates a religious from a secular education; the system does not permit even prayer, or the reading of the word of God to be associated with the literary exercises, and it leaves it contingent on the will of parents, committees, or patrons, whether any or what religious instruction shall be imparted to the pupils.

2. It gives encouragement and provides facilities for imparting to the pupils, educated through this national institute, separate religious instruction on the latitudinarian principle, that all religious systems,

true and false, have the same claims on the government of a Christian country, and should receive equal countenance and support. . . .

7. Because the system is inadequate to the wants of Ireland. Sound religious and moral instruction is what Ireland requires; from the want of this proceeds much of her wretchedness and degradation. It depends much, under God, on the kind of education imparted to the youth of Ireland in the national schools, whether the next generation shall be wiser and better than their fathers, and whether greater uniformity of religious sentiment shall prevail. The character of the national system affords no hope of improvement;—there is no security that the pupils educated through it shall receive instruction in the Bible;—could the principles of the system be fully carried out, the several religious denominations in the land would be perpetuated in their present numerical proportion.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, perceiving the anti-missionary character of the system, and the inefficiency of the national schools as instruments for imparting religious instruction; are supporting by private subscription scriptural schools in the South and West, rival institutions to that system with which they are as closely connected as any other religious denomination in the land, and from which they derive aid for their schools in the North.

Ireland requires also to have her sectarian divisions and religious animosities removed, but it seems to be of the nature of the national system to perpetuate them by perpetuating the cause of them,—the conflicting religious systems that prevail. In national schools where children of several religious denominations are educated, the children are daily reminded of the greatness of their religious differences, by being draughted away from the place where they together receive literary instruction, to receive separately, from their religious teachers, instruction in their respective creeds.

It is not instruction in every creed that Ireland needs, to heal her diseases, religious, moral, political, social, and physical, but instruction in that religion which God in his infinite mercy has revealed to man, through the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. . . .

VII. Resolved,—That this synod enjoins on ministers, elders, and people, to encourage scriptural schools.

Some of these resolutions we have omitted, as they are chiefly local in their character.

[For the Covenanter.]

A CORRECTION.

MR. EDITOR,—We were astonished to find in the May number of the Covenanter, over the signature of A. Stevenson, a letter, in which the writer makes some statements respecting the Seminary and its venerable Professor, which we think calculated to leave false impressions on the minds of persons at a distance; and in which we conceive he does great injustice to the congregation in this city.

He says, “while the professor was enabled to occupy his own hired house, the students were sure of a place to recite. For many *years* he furnished recitation rooms, kept them in order, and provided an abundance of fuel at his own cost, without expense either to the synod or the

students." And further on: "He can no longer furnish a house for himself or a hall for the students. This winter these noble young men were compelled to receive the instructions of the Professor in a small room of an humble boarding-house."

Believing the above statements to have been made hastily, or from incorrect information, and wishing the facts in the case to be fully understood, as the congregation feel themselves somewhat aggrieved, we wish to give a statement of the facts as they are.

At the meeting of synod, held in Allegheny city, in 1845, when the seminary was removed to Cincinnati, there was an inquiry made respecting a place of recitation. It was stated in reply, by the member from Cincinnati, that the place hired by the congregation, for public worship, could be used, and was suitable for that purpose. This was considered satisfactory. Accordingly the place was used the following session for a recitation room, altogether free of charge. Before the opening of next session, the congregation passed a resolution to allow the seminary the use of their place of worship, and to furnish as much fuel as would be necessary; and we know of no reason why the accommodations provided by the congregation have not always been used by the seminary, except the inability of the aged Professor to walk to the place provided. The students have always used our place of worship, for their societies, &c., free of expense. Thus far the congregation have adhered to their resolution, and would have continued to do so, if it had pleased synod to continue the seminary among us.

By making these statements, (the truth of which the Professor and all the students of the last four years can testify,) as public as those of your correspondent, you will do justice to all parties, and extricate the congregation of Cincinnati from the disadvantageous position in which she has been placed by the mis-statements of which we complain.

In behalf of the congregation,	M. T. GLASGOW,	}	Committee.
	M. CARUTHERS,		

THE NEW YORK PRESBYTERY.

This Presbytery met in the 2d Reformed Presbyterian Church, 11th st., New York, on Tuesday evening, October 2d; and was opened with a sermon by the Moderator, R. Z. Willson, from Isaiah lviii. 1: "Cry aloud, spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." After stating the doctrine of the text—that the Christian ministry should bear faithful testimony in defence of truth and against error and sin—the preacher proceeded, I. To enforce the duty: arguing, 1; from the nature of the case; 2, from the practice of the prophets and apostles; 3, from the example of Christ. II. The manner of performing this duty—1, clearly; 2, fully; 3, faithfully; 4, compassionately. III. Some circumstances were enumerated calling special attention to this duty—1, the general disregard of truth; 2, the deep root which error and sin have taken in society; 3, the times indicate approaching changes. In conclusion, the attention of the court was called to this duty as especially obligatory upon us as witnesses, and encouragement held out to unwavering fidelity.

All the ministerial members were present, except J. Douglas and J. Kennedy, both absent through indisposition. The ruling elders

were—John Renfrew, Conococheague; Wm. Crawford, 1st, Phila.; Ebenezer Craig, 2d, Phila.; John Nightingale, 1st, N. Y.; Jos. Torrens, 2d, N. Y.; James Carlisle, 3d, N. Y.; Wm. Thompson, Newburgh. Rev. Robert Johnson, placed within the bounds of this Presbytery by Synod, was, on motion, admitted to a seat. J. M. Willson was chosen clerk for the remainder of the year, in place of Mr. Chrystie, resigned.

Of the business of Presbytery, we notice particularly—1. *Call from Newburgh upon Mr. S. Carlisle.* Received, sustained as a regular gospel call; and, on its presentation to Mr. C., accepted. Presbytery afterwards appointed a meeting to be held in Newburgh, the 2d Wednesday (the 14th) of November, 10 o'clock, A. M., for the examination of the candidate and the hearing of his trials; to proceed the following day, at 10½ o'clock, A. M., to his ordination, if the way be clear. J. M. Willson to preach the ordination sermon, and preside; J. Chrystie to deliver the charge to the pastor, and A. Stevenson to the people.

2. *Students of Theology.* But one was present, Mr. Wm. Thompson, who delivered a highly creditable specimen of his gifts as a public speaker, from Ps. cxxxii. 15, 16; which, after a good deal of criticism, was unanimously sustained. Mr. T. was then permitted, at his own urgent request, to pursue his studies, the ensuing winter, under the direction of Mr. Chrystie; Rom. x. 4, being assigned him as the subject of a discourse to be delivered at spring meeting of Presbytery. Mr. J. R. Thompson, necessarily absent, was directed to have his piece in readiness by next meeting.

3. *Home Missions.* The following resolutions, on this subject, were unanimously adopted:

“Resolved, 1. That a Presbyterial Home Mission Fund be established.

“2. That the unsettled ministers and sessions under the jurisdiction of this court, be directed to bring this subject before their respective congregations, in order that collections may be taken up in such form as may be most convenient, and at as early a date as practicable, for this fund.

“3. That this fund be appropriated to the giving of aid to public congregations, and to the furnishing of supplies of gospel ordinances to such missionary stations as may be designated by Presbytery.

“4. That James Wiggins be appointed treasurer of said fund.*

“5. That a committee be appointed to digest a system of rules to be observed in the distribution of said fund. Committee to report at the next meeting of Presbytery.”

This committee—A. Stevenson, J. Chrystie, J. Nightingale, and J. Torrens, with J. Wiggins, a member *ex officio*.

We express the hope that this movement will commend itself to the entire church within our limits, and that all will extend their hearty sympathies and co-operation to this effort to make some provision, more nearly adequate than heretofore, to meeting the just demands upon us, both from feeble congregations struggling to obtain a settlement, and from the many localities to which we have easy access and ample opportunity to lift up the Reformation standard.

4. *Appointments of Supplies.*—J. M. BEATTIE, 2d Sab. Oct., and Sab. before next regular meeting of Presbytery, *Albany*. 4th Sab. Jan., and 4th Sab. March, 1850, *Topsham*, to moderate a call there when requested by the session and congregation.

R. Z. WILLSON, 3d and 4th Sabs. Dec., and 3d and 4th Sabs. Feb., 1850, *Topsham*; and to moderate a call in *Argyle*, when requested by the session and congregation.

A. STEVENSON, 1st and 2d Sabs. Jan., 1850, *Whitelake*.

* Address 212 Greenwich street, New York.

J. W. SHAW, 3d Sab. Dec., and 2d and 3d Sabs. Feb., 1850, *Whitelake*; and two Sabs. discretionary in *Argyle*.

J. M. WILLSON, two Sabs. *Conococheague*; and two in missionary labour in the neighbourhood of *Philadelphia*.

S. O. WYLIE, same amount of missionary labour.

J. LITTLE, 1st Sab. Dec., *Whitelake*.

S. CARLISLE, 2d and 3d Sabs. April, 1850. *Whitelake*.

5. *Granting Certificate*.—Rev. R. Johnson asked and received a certificate of standing and of dismissal to the Rochester Presbytery.

These, with the settlement of some cases of discipline—among others, the restoration to the enjoyment of church privileges of Rev. J. Henderson, formerly of Scotland, occupied the time of Presbytery two days. Business was very harmoniously issued. Adjourned to meet in Newburgh, Nov. 14, 10 A. M., to attend to ordination of Mr. C., and other business.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Russia and Circassia.—Since the conquest of Hungary, the Autocrat has renewed the war with these hardy mountaineers. Their stronghold has been attacked and taken by a large Russian army.

Turkey and Russia.—The position of these powers is full of interest. The latter has demanded the surrender of Kossuth, Bem, Dembinski, &c., under a threat of instant war should the demand be refused. The Sultan, in full council, has finally refused to give them up. In this he is sustained by Sir Stratford Canning and General Aupick, the English and French ambassadors—no doubt, with the entire concurrence of their respective governments. The Russian ambassador has left Constantinople, and all now depends upon the decision of the Czar. If he proceeds to carry out his threat—and it is generally thought that he will do so—a general war must ensue: for France and England, which act together in this matter, will not stand idly by while the last barrier to the grasping ambition of Russia is broken down. This new phase of events in Eastern Europe has awakened the most lively concern in both countries; and *all* the papers, whatever their political views—among them, of course, those which took sides with Russia in the affair of Hungary—are unanimous in commending the firmness of the Turkish authorities, and in urging upon the English and French governments to resist, *to the last*, Russian aggression. Turkey is making great preparations. She has 100,000 men grouped around Constantinople.

Switzerland. 1. *Its Foreign Relations*.—These are by no means in a safe state. The great powers look with jealousy upon this refuge for exiled patriots, and the Federal Council has been compelled by their threats to order many of them out of the country. It is plain that an excuse only is wanting to fall upon the Swiss and destroy their republican institutions. There is some danger, also, of internal strife. The Popish cantons are again threatening the federal government. This may furnish the excuse. 2. *The Free Church of the Canton de Vaud*.—The following presents some encouraging, but more discouraging, facts respecting the condition and prospects of this body. It is from the pen of the foreign correspondent of the *Evangelist*:

“The dissenting assemblies continue in great numbers, and stately upon

the Sabbaths, the private houses in which they are held are of the best class, and the audiences composed of the most respectable portions of society. It is now some time since they have been molested, and notwithstanding the decree of June, there is a prevailing expectation that full religious liberty will be granted before long. The pastors have been so well supported that they have not yet drawn upon the donation of the Free Church of Scotland; they hope to keep the principal, £1500, as a fund. They have commenced a theological school with seventeen students, and they have a paper which advocates the principle of the separation of the church from the state. But, at the same time, justice requires us to say, that so far as men are concerned, and in respect to displays of character, this movement possesses far less interest upon approach than at a distance. The number of the pastors who appreciate the important position of the Free Church is exceedingly small, of all who attend upon its retired services, very few take hold of the principle of separation from the state; the majority of both parties are looking back; they feel the great inconvenience of these narrow accommodations for their worship; they have not the means to build new temples if the law would allow them, and they are hoping that some arrangement will be made by which they can honourably get back into the national church. Indeed, there is no proper church organization among them. The pastors are associated, and arrange each week as to where they will preach; they find, to be sure, very respectable little audiences, but they have, as yet, no discipline, any one may come to the communion who pleases, and no one is responsible, by any public vow or covenant, to stand by the church for a day. Personal attachment to the pastors is the great binding principle, if it can be called such, in the continuance of these assemblies, and if the Free Church were tolerated, the National Church would be nearly deserted out of preference for the preaching of certain among them. It is then a critical moment for this Free Church in the Canton de Vaud. . . . The subject of organization and discipline has been talked of, and the necessity for it admitted, but the fear is that the people will not bear this distinction between the church and the world—they have never been accustomed to it, and to attempt to establish it now would cause division even among worthy church members."

If this be true, and the writer is well informed, we must abate some of our expectations of good to result from this secession.

Italy. 1. *Florence.*—The return of the former regime has been signalized by a rapid return to old measures. They are about to prosecute those concerned in printing an edition of the Bible. Still, we have not heard of any direct attempts to stop the circulation of those printed elsewhere. The Scottish Church is yet allowed to enjoy her privileges. 2. *Rome.*—Roman affairs are still unsettled, and likely to be for some time. Louis Napoleon, in a published letter, sanctioned by his cabinet, declared the purposes of France, viz: "an amnesty, the secularization of the administration, (civilians instead of ecclesiastics as civil rulers,) the code Napoleon, and a liberal government." To this the only reply has been in the shape of a manifesto, defining the extent of the reform which the Papal authorities are prepared to concede, and limited enough they are, all real power being kept from the people. The following are the leading articles of the manifesto:

"Article 1. There is instituted at Rome a council of state. It shall give its advice on bills before they are submitted to the sovereign sanction. It shall examine all important questions in each branch of the public administration on which it shall be consulted by us or by our ministers.

"Art. 2. A state consulta shall be instituted for the finances. It shall give its opinion on the budget of the state; it shall examine into the expenses; it

shall advise on the establishment of new taxes and on the reduction of existing ones; on the best mode of assessment, on the most advisable means to be adopted for the re establishment of commerce, and on all that concerns the interests of the public treasury. The members of the consulta shall be chosen by us from lists presented by the provincial councils.

“Art. 3. The institution of the provincial councils is confirmed. The counsellors shall be chosen by us from lists presented by the communal councils. The provincial counsellors shall discuss the local interests of the province, the expenses to be laid to its charge, the account of receipts and expenses of the interior administration; that administration shall be directed by an administrative commission, chosen by each provincial council, and for which it shall be responsible.

“Art. 4. The representations and the municipal administrations will enjoy the most extensive franchises as far as regards the local interests of the communes. The election of municipal counsellors shall be based on a large number of electors, principally having regard to property. Those elected, besides necessary qualifications, must be in the payment of a certain amount of taxes, which shall be determined by a law. The chiefs of communes shall be named by us, and their deputies by the governors of the province, from the triple list presented by the communal council.”

In other words, the Pope means to be an absolute ruler—here is no secularization, no real power allowed the people. All is left in the hands of the priesthood, the people can only advise, and, that, as they are asked.

As to the amnesty, one has been proclaimed; but it excludes *all* the active promoters of the late revolution. These documents have met with little favour. The papers say:—“The manifesto of the Pope has appeared in an official form, and has been received with feelings of deep disappointment, if not resentment, in all quarters. The feeling was especially participated in by French soldiers, several of whom were put under arrest for having torn down or otherwise defaced the copies of the manifesto affixed to the walls. The amnesty, in particular, was made the object of popular odium. The attitude of the French military authorities is quite expectant—it awaits orders from Paris, but disapproves de facto the measures ordered by the Papal government; and whilst the Cardinals dare not walk the streets of Rome for fear of encountering the popular fury, the victims marked out by their inquisitorial decrees walk about freely.” In the mean time, let us see what the commission of cardinals—the present Papal government in Rome—are doing:

“They have removed the actual incumbents, and placed priests in all the offices. The supreme commission, its secretary, the judges of the tribunals of the rota and consulta, the ministers of foreign affairs and of the interior, the administrators of all the hospitals and charitable establishments, the prefect of police at Rome, the attorney general, the governors and extraordinary commissioners in the provinces, are all prelates, priests, or monks. The ministry of public instruction has been suppressed, and replaced by a committee of cardinals and prelates. This committee is now engaged in searching out all the teachers of every grade who have sympathized with or aided the liberal movement, and removing them from office. This is done, as the official journal says, ‘to relieve the rising generation from *godless* teachers.’”

There can be no question that the Pope is secretly abetted by Austria, as he is openly by Spain and Naples in this resistance to the demands of France. If so, he will not readily recede. Nor can France, with honour. Should a general war break out, the Pope will never see Rome.

In the mean time, there is ample testimony that the people incline towards Protestantism. Dr. Achilli, previously to his imprisonment—he is now in the Castle of St. Angelo—wrote thus:

“Every day is so much gained, as every day the desire for the Holy Scriptures increases. Yesterday, for instance, I distributed eighteen Bibles and New Testaments, without even leaving my home, and the greater part of them to persons whom I had never seen, but who came recommended by brethren; so that I had not time to leave my home, nor even to take a meal, until in the evening, my whole day being passed in speaking to these men of the truths of religion. You may imagine how joyful I felt at the close of the day, and what thanksgivings I render to the Lord for showing so much mercy to this people. Now, after such encouragement, how shall I ever be induced to leave this dear land, where every day the Lord is making his own light to shine, and taking some of its inhabitants under his own protection! And am not I myself one of these chosen ones?—What, then, should induce me to fly?—and more especially as political events change so rapidly; our enemies of to-day may be our friends to-morrow. . . . The entry of the French into Rome, after the siege and cannonading of the city—which the people attribute entirely to Pio Nono and his priests—has convinced them that these men are not God’s representatives, nor ministers of Jesus Christ. From this they have thought that the doctrines taught by them must also be false, and invented by themselves; and hearing that there is a book containing the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the letters of the apostles, translated into Italian, all are anxious to see it, and to read what is the religion of Christ, and to compare it with the religion they have learned from the priests. The next step is a desire to talk about these things, and they think themselves fortunate in finding a person able to answer them correctly. And these are the means which the Lord uses to carry on my mission; He sends them to me, whom they hold to be faithful in my ministry, in order that I may lead them to Christ.”

The following, from a letter addressed by Mazzini to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, confirms what we stated in our last number, that the Papacy has lost its influence in the Roman States:

“You aimed,” he says, “at saving the sovereign, and you have killed the Pope; destroying the moral *prestige* which surrounded him, by the aid of your arms—degrading in the eyes of Italy him who is the sole arbiter of the religious question, by foreign support, and separating him from his people by a torrent of blood. In that blood the Papacy was stifled. The only means of saving it—the only means of withdrawing it from the foreign influence which is its ruin, was to snatch it from the sphere of political influence to the more pure and independent one of the soul. You have now closed for ever the last road to safety. The Papacy is extinct. Rome and Italy will never forgive the Pope for having, as in the middle ages, called in foreign bayonets to transfix Italian breasts.”

It is estimated—we fear it is too high—that there are *three thousand* Protestants in Rome.

France.—The most interesting event which we have to record respecting France, is the constitution of the Free Church by a Convention or Synod, which held its sessions in Paris from the 20th of August to the 1st of September. There were *thirty-nine* members, claiming to represent *twenty-four* churches, some of them, however, very small. Their constitution, entitled “Union of the Evangelical Churches of France,” has greatly disappointed us. Instead of going back to the standards of the Reformed Church of France, the Synod prepared a very brief and general creed—evidently a compromise. The language

is sound, indeed, as far as it goes, but will prove a very feeble barrier against errorists. As to government, they are to have a representative Synod; but each congregation is to adopt, or retain, its own organization, whether that be Congregational, as in some, or Presbyterian, as in the most. On baptism they are silent—said to be because they are not agreed: in other words, some of them are Baptists. Of the success of this church, with such a constitution, we can cherish very slender hopes—nor, perhaps, should we wish them success *as a body*. These compromises never accomplish any good in the end. The error incorporated, or winked at, will ultimately rule the body. Nor can peace, even, be looked for. So soon as the outward pressure diminishes, the individual predilections become active, and each begins to push upon the whole his favourite scheme. The attempt was made in this country to amalgamate Congregationalism and Presbyterianism: with what success, we well know. We will observe this new body with interest.

Ireland.—This unhappy island has again been smitten. The last steamer confirms the accounts of another blight on the potato crop. The early planted escaped—the late are rotting: and, it is feared, that the destruction will be even greater than that of last year. Nor is this all. A struggle is going on in many parts of the south, between the landlords and the tenants for the possession of the other crops. The former to secure arrears of rent—the latter to keep themselves from starving. In some instances, these conflicts have ended in bloodshed: the tenants having combined to cut and carry off each other's crops—the landlords employing the police to resist them. The correspondent of one of our journals, thus describes the state of things in some districts:

“The state of this country continues to be truly deplorable. In the south, west, and centre the landlords and poor law collectors continue to race for the possession of the crops, to satisfy the arrears of rents and rates; and as when they are satisfied, the amount left the farmer to meet current demands would be nothing, and the political economists have not solved the problem how he is to make ends to meet on the remainder, he tries to be beforehand, and get the whole carried off and secreted. Conflicts, perilling the loss of life, occur, and secret societies are formed that create alarm for the peace and safety of society during the coming winter. To add to the distress, the failure of the potato crop is likely to exceed what, a fortnight ago, it was expected it would be. And now it is said that those English companies that propose purchasing land in Connaught, intend them for grazing—induced thereto partly by the probability that it will prove more profitable, cattle having such a market in England, partly by the impossibility of competing in agricultural produce with the continent and America, now that free trade is established, and partly from the fear of an anti-rent combination, and so the work of extermination will go on, to leave the lands clear.”

That we may give some idea of this work of extermination, we select a few paragraphs from a lengthened description of the destruction by the landlord's agents, of the town of Toomavara in Tipperary. The writer, an eye-witness, says:

“The scene, as I passed through the western end of the village, will not soon be effaced from my recollection. The entire range of houses from the cross at the Rev. Mr. Meagher, P. P.'s house, to Mrs. Hill's coach-office, had been tumbled down, and all were roofless with the exception of three. The wretched creatures who had inhabited them were sitting on the road alongside

their little effects, or were busied erecting huts with the timber of the roofs against the ditch at the opposite side of the road. Some of these huts, or shantees, were erected, and here they were huddled in groups. . . . Church-street. Only two houses were taken down in this street; twelve families were turned out, and the doors secured by driving staples into the jambs. The way was covered with furniture and beds; and many of the wretched creatures, as they staggered about the road, poured out sad lamentations, and showed feebleness and extreme misery. . . . Passing out of Church-street, the party of bailiffs entered what is called the Main-street. Some of the houses in this street contained four and five families, all in great destitution; they were scarcely half clad, and many of them had apparently got up from their miserable pallets of straw to go out on the road and lay their bodies in the ditch. In one instance a wretched looking creature named Gleeson, with gaunt and fleshless jaws, and eyes of most unnatural size and hideous wildness, was pushed from the house by the bailiffs, greedily devouring some repulsive looking substance like paste, from a metal pot which he held in his arms. The poor type of humanity, as he grasped the vessel which contained his disgusting meal, looked a perfect representation of king famine. . . . The rain, *which had been falling all day, increased violently*. I left the scene for a short time to see the condition of the people in other parts of the village. It was heart-rending, absolutely terrific. To describe the contrivances resorted to in order to ward off the 'pelting of the pitiless storm,' would be an endless task. Chairs were arranged in squares, quilts, sheets, and pieces of old canvass were stretched on poles; wigwams were thus formed, under whose covering the poor creatures were seated, completely saturated with the rain, which fell through the flimsy awning overhead nearly as plentifully as it did from the skies without. Ass's cars and turf baskets were also upturned, and gave shelter to scores of half-clad wretches. . . . I should suppose that the entire number turned out of their houses on Thursday would reach 150 families, or 600 individuals. Of this number, I could learn that about 30 families, or, on an average of four to each family, about 120 persons were to be allowed other dwellings in the village. So that 480 persons, or 120 families, would thus appear to be thrown on the 'waves of the world,' as some of the unfortunate people themselves stated it."

This is dreadful, and, yet, similar scenes, on a smaller scale, constantly occur, and the coming season will witness many more. Is it any wonder that a sullen gloom pervades the masses? or that the leaders throw out intimations of another agitation? In the north, things have not come to quite such a pass, and yet there it is bad enough.

The West Indies.—How has emancipation wrought in the West Indies? Has it failed? So say those who form all their judgment by the prosperity of the sugar planters—a large proportion of them absentees, living in England and conducting their plantations through the expensive intervention of stewards, agents, and crowds of well-paid and profligate subordinates. We have other and better testimony. The testimony of men on the spot; and the more credible not only on that account, but because they also abound with complaints respecting the colonial policy of Britain. A meeting, composed of inhabitants of Jamaica, was held in May last, at Spanish-Town, for the purpose of considering the effect produced by the non-observance of the treaties for the suppression of the slave trade, by which Spain and Brazil are bound. It was the largest meeting ever witnessed on the island. The Lord Bishop presided. Now where do they throw the *blame*? Upon the abolition of slavery? No. Upon the measures since adopted.

They applaud the emancipation act. We quote from two of their speakers :

“The Rev. Dr. S. H. Stewart remarked, ‘Estate after estate has been thrown out of cultivation, and want and misery stare every man in the face, from the man who owns the estate to the humblest labourer upon it, all are suffering, and the only cheering reflection is, that this has arisen out of the abolition of slavery, an act which God approves, and in which all religious men must rejoice. *But, my lord, it is not necessarily so, for if justice were done to the British Colonies, if Great Britain did justice to herself, prosperity would again dawn.*’ ”

“W. W. Anderson, Esq., ‘Said the existing distress was the consequence of those great measures of emancipation and philanthropy to which many good men had devoted their lives, not having been fully carried out, and faithfully supported.’ ”

The newspapers bear the same testimony. The Morning Journal, Jamaica, says :

“There can be no doubt, that to have persisted in upholding the system of slavery in the West India Colonies, would have been to persist in exposing them to ruin—and that the change in the social condition of these dependencies was dictated by motives of prudence as well as of humanity. Some, no doubt continue to deplore that change. We are charitable enough to believe that these are few in number. To attempt to convince these that ‘inextricable ruin’ might have overtaken them, even though slavery had never been abolished, is useless. The change ‘*has been highly beneficial to the mass of the community, however injurious or ruinous it might have proved to some of the proprietary body.*’ ‘With the settlement of that question (slavery) the proprietors generally, and the slave population unanimously, were contented. As between the government and the slave-owners the arrangement was on the whole face reasonable and satisfactory.’ ”

And still more to the point, the following from a report presented in the Antigua Assembly. It bears invaluable testimony to the character of the emancipated on that island, and the results of emancipation :

“Taking all the before-mentioned considerations into review, your committee cannot but feel the utmost anxiety at the prospect of the future ; the only staple commodities of the colony realizing an unremunerative price, they are, nevertheless, not unmindful of many sources of consolation to be found in the peace and order maintained throughout the land—in the reasonable submission of the labouring population to the indispensable reduction of wages—in the performance of certain work required for the same—in a better supply of labour than has been witnessed for years past—in less differences between employer and labourer, as manifested by the reports from the different police stations, and in the diminution of the number of persons confined in the common jail, among whom not one female appeared before the visiting justices at their last monthly inspection.”

These extracts demonstrate the peaceable dispositions of the labourers—their improving condition—that they are not unwilling to work at fair wages—and that whatever suffering exists among the planters it arises, in part, at least, from causes independent of the abolition of slavery.

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

The American Board of Missions.—The annual meeting of this board was held a few weeks since at Pittsfield, Mass. It appears from the annual report, that there are 25 missions under the care of the board, and 103 stations. The whole number of labourers sent out from this

country is 407, divided as follows:—Ordained missionaries, 103; licentiates, 5; physicians, not ordained, 7; other male assistants, 26; females, 210. The whole number of native assistants is 130, making a total of 537 labourers. There are 12 printing establishments, which printed last year 36,061,118 pages; and from the beginning 752,542,318 pages. Number of churches, 87, and of communicants, 25,325, of which 1925 have been added during the last year. They have 7 seminaries, containing 349 pupils; 24 other boarding schools, 726 pupils; 305 free schools, containing 9,355 pupils—making 336 schools and seminaries, 10,430 pupils. Their financial condition appears from the report to have improved since last year, when it was in debt some \$60,000. About \$50,000 has been subscribed during the year towards the liquidation of this debt, which, together with \$240,000 contributed towards its ordinary expenses, gives them \$300,000 as the whole amount of their annual receipts. There still remains, however, a deficiency of \$30,000, which must be made up as it was last year, or the board will be compelled to curtail somewhat the expenses of its operations. It was mentioned as a lamentable fact, that only eight new missionaries had offered, where thirty-eight were imperatively needed.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

LIFE OF JOHN LIVINGSTONE, with a historical introduction and notes, by the Rev. Thomas Houston, Knockbracken, 18mo., pp. 270. John Johnstone, Edinburgh, 1848.

This is a seasonable republication of Livingstone's Autobiography. A most interesting volume, containing a mass of important facts elucidating some of the public movements during the second Reformation—particularly the extension of Presbyterianism to Ireland, before the commencement of that period, and the fatal bringing in of the infamous Charles II. at its close. It also contains some of his letters, embodying a rich Christian experience—his farewell sermon at Ancrum—some of his memorable sayings—and his Characteristics, or short notices of some of the eminently godly of his times. The introduction and notes add much to the value of the work.

SERMON preached before the Associate Reformed Congregation of Richmond, on the 3d day of August, A. D. 1849, that being the day of the National Fast, by Rev. Wm. Lorimer, A. M., pastor of the congregation. 8vo., pp. 18. Pittsburgh, 1849.

This discourse is based upon Ps. xciv. 10—“*He that chastiseth the heathen, shall he not correct?*” and embraces the following topics: I. “That the subjects of the Divine government, who enjoy less advantages, but who break his law, are the subjects of Divine chastisement.” II. “It is in vain that they who enjoy superior advantages, but whose conduct is displeasing to God, should hope to escape the divine correction.” III. “In view of the Divine procedure, in so chastening the sinful and disobedient subjects of his government, it is but reasonable and righteous that he should correct us for our sin.” These topics are all highly seasonable topics of discussion; and Mr. L. has, under each of them, exhibited many valuable principles and facts. He has, certainly, proved all his propositions. Under the last topic, he enumerates, among the sins of this nation—“The little regard that is had to the Scripture qualifications of civil rulers;” “the legalized and continued robbery of God's sacred time;” and “the general, the legislative, and the executive disregard of the rights of our fellow men; rights given of God, but of which, through civil enactment, many are robbed.”

We are pleased to find in these pages so explicit a rebuke of some of our great national sins. Still, we must notice one omission—to us, a painful omission. In speaking of national sins, Mr. L. makes no reference to the neglect—the refusal to acknowledge the authority of Christ. Indeed, we do not remember that he any where intimates that a nation can sin against Christ. Now, this we believe to be the root, and monster sin of this land—it despises Christ, his Scriptures, and law. Even magistrates have to deal with Christ. “Kiss ye the Son,” is addressed to “kings” and “judges.” If they do not obey, they “shall perish.” The omission to allude to this is a serious defect. A still more serious defect is, that we cannot find from this discourse, “whether there be” a Christ; if He is mentioned in it, or his atonement, we have overlooked the place. Let it be what it may otherwise, a sermon without Christ, is a sermon without light, or warmth, or quickening power.

Mr. L. thus deals with slavery:

“Slavery, not only in the opinion of the village pastor, but in the estimation of the most eminent statesmen in the land, north, south, east, and west, is a *moral, social, and political* evil. Such is the testimony of that branch of the church with which we stand connected. And if it be an evil of such a character, as our nation gives it support and protection, she is guilty of unrighteous legislation, and as a nation must God deal with her for her sin. Whatever may be said of slavery as existing and protected in the States, one thing is certain: in this professedly free Christian land, there is a small territory of ten miles square, in the centre of which stands our nation’s capital, and which is held as the joint property of all the States, and in which every individual in our nation has an interest—*national domain*. There is God’s image enslaved; there is a man made a *chattel*, a thing; there are men, who, with their oppressors, must appear before the same judgment bar; allowed the privilege of using their bodies and bodily members, with their powers of mind and soul, in the service of God, only as a man of a different colour will allow, and who, under the protection of law, may claim the service of such bodies and such minds, to the utter neglect of the service of God, the maker of all; *there* are men, women, and children bought and sold, being bound in chains as unruly cattle, so that *there, THERE* is the chief market for men; the nation’s prisons being at all times ready for their safe keeping, should they assert what all believe, ‘that all men are created free and equal.’”

A DISCOURSE, delivered in the Second Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on the 3d of August, 1849, by A. Bower, pastor. 18mo., pp. 16. Philadelphia: William S. Young, 50 North Sixth Street, 1849.

This sermon has not been sent us by the author, but we cannot refrain from bringing it to the notice of our readers. It is a faithful exhibition of many of the great sins of the land which have provoked the Divine displeasure. It is founded upon Amos iv. 12: “Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.” It establishes and illustrates the following important principles regarding the Divine administration over the nations:—“That nations, as well as individuals, are dependent upon and accountable to God;” “that rebukes unimproved will procure more and severer strokes;” and then expands the exhortation of the text. Under the first topic, the following passage occurs:

“The grand defect in the bond of our national union is, that it contains no express recognition of the being of God as the governor of the world. This is the grand national sin of omission. It gives the infidel occasion to glory, and has no small influence in fostering infidelity in the affairs of state and among political men. For this national insult the supreme ruler of the uni-

verse will lift over us again and again his rod of iron, and smite till we be affrighted, and give glory to his name, who is the king of kings and lord of lords. Rev. xi. 13, 14; xix. 16."

Of the doings of the General Assembly (O. S.) last spring, when they resolved that "it be considered peculiarly improper and inexpedient for this General Assembly to attempt or propose any measure in the work of emancipation," Mr. B. says:

"Can it be that a branch of the Christian Church, so respectable for numbers and influence, and so venerable for attainments and usefulness, could so *resolve*? They admit the right of the state to liberate the slave; but has not the church the power and the right to be as pure as the state; to enforce as high a standard of morality over all her members as the state has over the entire citizens; it is true the state includes the whole, but the church only a part; but for this very reason the church should be as a city set on a hill to enlighten the world. Is the church only to follow in the wake of great moral reforms? God has stirred up earnest inquiry and a deep agitation, which is his voice to the churches to repent and do what they can in the work of emancipation—to wash their hands from this sin of Babylon, lest they partake of her plagues. But the assembly pervert this loud call to duty into a reason for neutrality. 'I would ye were cold or hot,' said Christ to Laodicea. The assembly appear exceedingly fearful of fanaticism, but there is no fanaticism like that of disobedience to God."

He does not miss intemperance and its causes. Speaking of covetousness, he says:

"It leads to the manufacture and traffic of intoxicating drinks. To sell these indiscriminately, though it be known that the unrestricted traffic is the greatest curse on earth, and has destroyed more than the pestilence and the sword, and destroyed both soul and body for ever. Hear their cries from beneath the altar of justice. How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood on those who, for appetite or interest, have in any way been instrumental in our damnation?"

Under his last topic, "motives exciting to prepare to meet God," the following passage occurs:

"O thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet! How can it be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against the people of his wrath? This sword thirsts for blood, and will make the whole earth a vast sepulchre, except ye repent; and holy men of God stand like the mitred Israelite, between the dead and the living, that the plague may be stayed. Our world hath often been afflicted, but history records no period in which judgments were so severe and so general. God proposed a choice to David; but now he inflicts all at once: famine and pestilence in Ireland—war and pestilence over all Europe and Asia—pestilence, with the alarms of war, in America. Though we have suffered less, and enjoyed more than others, it is not for any good in us, but for the Lord's mercy. We have been warned; the threatening rod stretched over us, hath smitten us repeatedly. The crops have fallen short in places, by blasting and mildew; the locust and the caterpillar have left the death-track. High-handed wickedness scatters fire-brands, arrows, and death among the people—in feuds, and mobs, and burnings, and murders; the noisome pestilence sounds the death-alarm through the land; the voice of wailing is heard in almost every dwelling, and fresh graves appear in the place of the dead. To what object can you look, to what voice can you listen, which does not say, 'Prepare to meet thy God.'"

We would have been glad, however, in connexion with all this, had the author insisted more directly upon the duty of the nation to acknowledge Christ.

THE
COVENANTER.

DECEMBER, 1849.

THE COVENANTER, THE SEMINARY, AND THE PITTSBURGH
PRESBYTERY.

Mere personal controversies are always unpleasant. Generally, it is wiser not to meddle with them. There are times, however, when this course cannot be pursued—when silence would only embolden wrongdoers. And, besides, there may be public interests involved in what appears to be a matter merely personal, which imperatively demand that the case be fully and publicly met.

This is, now, our position in regard to some late doings of the Pittsburgh Presbytery. We refer to a report embracing a series of resolutions, published in the Reformed Presbyterian for November, with their reply to dissentients. Under some circumstances, we might let these things pass for what they are worth—we would, certainly, do so, if they contained nothing more interesting to our readers than a personal attack upon the Editor of the Covenanter. But they do not stop there—they assail the Seminary, and, by implication, the Synod. We feel compelled to notice them. And in so doing, will quote the report entire, with some of the most important parts of the answers to reasons of dissent.

The report begins by taking us to task for styling certain persons the “anti-deacon party.”

“The phrase, ‘Anti-Deacon party,’ is applied to individuals who respectfully and conscientiously petitioned Synod for the repeal of certain acts, which, they believe, infringed on the integrity of our standards, and the established practice of our church. For the exercise of an inherent and constitutional right—yes, of the poor privilege of begging, they are published to the world as an ‘Anti-Deacon party.’ Is this generous? Is it the treatment one brother owes to another? ‘We have not so learned Christ.’”

Now, the middle clause of this paragraph misrepresents us. We have never called them “the anti-deacon party” for any such reason as is here assigned. We have indeed called them by this name, assigning on the same page a very different and *sufficient* reason—*which they must have seen*—viz.: that they obstinately refuse, in the very face of that form of which they say so much, to ordain deacons in their congregations, even to take care of the poor.* We only add, that a Presbytery which undertakes to establish a charge of wilful misrepresentation against another, should have exercised more care not to misrepresent—should have told the truth.

* See August No. of Covenanter.

The report proceeds:—

“If to contend for all divine truth—if to maintain the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms Larger and Shorter, the Directory for Worship, the Form of Church Government, and the Testimony emitted by the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, as the only and exclusive subordinate standards of the Church—if to oppose earnestly and strenuously the introduction of strange and foreign elements into our religious creed, constitute a party, we plead guilty to the appellation. But if the setting up of a new order of things in the sanctuary, the introduction of a fiscal machinery, to which we and our fathers have been strangers, subject to the opprobrious epithet ‘Anti-Deacon party,’ we most earnestly deny the charge. We wish to mind the same things, and to walk by the same rule that guided our fathers, and now regulates the action of our brethren in Ireland and Scotland. They and we can go hand in hand in maintaining the testimony of Jesus. We are pressing toward the same mark, and to the utmost of our exertions defending the same truths.”

Now, we do not urge here, in view of all these professions and as a test of them, which we might very fairly, the statement of T. S. in the Reformed Presbyterian, for October,—that our fathers would have entered into the Revolution Settlement had the form of church government been adopted—thus leaving room to infer what *he* would have done—that *he* would have left in abeyance the covenants and all the testimonies issued during the persecution. We do not urge this, which we might do, as an offset to some of these professions of zeal for the attainments of our fathers, but we do protest against this Presbytery styling the deacon—as we, and Synod understand his functions—“a fiscal machinery to which we and our fathers have been strangers.” Nothing can be more incorrect. Our fathers had them in their congregations, and esteemed them a valuable part of the church’s organization. This the Presbytery knows, or it is wofully ignorant of the footsteps of the flock. *We* wish to see the church—the whole church—occupying, practically, the position which our fathers, *in the best times*, occupied. Again, is it the 2d Book of Discipline that is here stigmatized as a “strange and foreign element?” If so, we have only to say, Settle that with the Church of Scotland, in whose National Covenant this book was sworn to—and which, in 1762, not satisfied with bestowing upon it the highest commendations as exhibiting a complete model of Presbyterian church government, *went on to incorporate it, in the most explicit terms, among her standards*. Brethren, remember, that in assailing this book you assail not us, but the Church of Scotland. Perhaps, they mean consistory. If so, we refer them to the form of church government which directs meetings to be held of *all* the officers of the congregation for the management of its “affairs.” Call it what you please, this is what we advocate, and it is no “strange or foreign element.” Had we advocated the late “civil capacity” discoveries, we might be charged with introducing strange innovations. They proceed:

“But the injustice which is done to the petitioners in attempting to make them guilty of the sinful waste of time at the late meeting of Synod, excites the indignation of all who love the ways of truth and righteousness. On the 23d page of the late August number of the *Covenanter*, we find the following statement: ‘Three days were occupied, with a few intervals, in reading papers, most of them long ones, except Presbyterial reports, being petitions for the repeal of the Deacon resolutions, or for that sort of elective affinity congregations which this party favours.’ It is with feelings of regret we

question the truth of a statement made by a brother. But in justice to the petitioners and in defence of right, we are compelled to assert that the above statement is gratuitous and contrary to fact. According to the showing of the minutes, part of the afternoon of the first day of Synod's sessions, the whole of the second, and a part of the forenoon of the third, in all about a day and a half, was the whole time spent in reading all the papers. These were thirty-nine in number, and but five of these were for the repeal of the resolutions. Nor was there a petition presented to Synod for the organization of a congregation on elective affinity principles. The only paper that could be so construed, was a short one, that came up, not as a petition to Synod, but as an accompanying document with the protest and appeal of the Miami congregation. But if it is important to know the way in which the time of Synod was wasted the reader has only to turn to the minutes of Synod, and he will find that three days of this precious time was spent in considering the libel presented by Dr. Willson, *which was not sustained as proved, but was at last dismissed.*"

There is a slight print error in the above quotation from the Covenanter. It occurred with us, but we supposed that every reader would make the correction, in as much as it is required by the rules of grammar. Instead of "most of *them* long ones," it should read "most of *the* long ones."* Making this correction, we leave this paragraph, so far as we are concerned, to the judgment of the church. Our good name cannot be affected on such trivial grounds. And it was scarcely worth while for a large Presbytery to attempt our injury, unless they could find some more important error than this one. We cannot, however, pass so lightly the clause in italics, inasmuch as it bears upon the doings of the church. The libel was not, indeed, *formally* sustained, but it was *virtually*. The doctrines taught by Mr. C. were condemned—he was warned not to teach them in future—and, *then*, the libel was dismissed. And why dismissed? As this Presbytery very well knows, because the Synod wished to deal mildly with the accused, and did not wish by formally sustaining the libel to put themselves in such a position as would compel them to proceed to inflict censure not merely upon the writing, but upon the writer. If Mr. C. was acquitted, as any one reading this statement would suppose, why did Mr. Sproul and a number of others dissent from the vote? And why did Synod order Mr. C. not to teach *such* doctrines in future? A very unfounded and unjust resolution, unless Synod were satisfied that he had already done so. The libel was *virtually* sustained, and the Pittsburgh Presbytery knows it. Dr. Willson gained, substantially, what he wanted—Mr. Crozier was *virtually* found guilty. A Presbytery that undertakes to charge others, should take care not to fall into the same condemnation.

* In their answer to reasons of dissent, they say: "It is plainly stated that three days of Synod's time were spent in reading papers, and that the most of these papers were for the repeal of the deacon resolutions, or for elective affinity congregations." We stated no such thing. This is not a correct representation. We made no statement whatever about the number of papers, many or few. We must have been demented to have published that "most of the papers" were "for the repeal," &c., and find it difficult to believe that the Pittsburgh Presbytery thought so. We stated the fact—though the print error somewhat obscured our meaning—and no one at Synod will dispute it, that "most of *the* long ones," &c. They go on to say, "Of these, but five—less than one-seventh of the whole—were for the repeal of the deacon resolutions, and not one sent directly to Synod for elective affinity congregations." Now, what matters it whether these elective affinity papers came to Synod directly or indirectly? They had to be read, and accompanying documents are parts of papers.

The report proceeds with six resolutions:

“Deeming that enough is presented to show the unfairness and injustice of the articles in the Covenanter, we recommend to Presbytery to adopt the following resolutions:

“1. That we most earnestly and solemnly warn the people under our care against giving credence to the above and similar statements* in the Covenanter, as they are calculated to make false impressions, alienate the feelings of brethren, and are divisive in their nature and tendency.”

We have little to say to this. A great matter, certainly, about which to warn the people “earnestly and solemnly!”

But, again:

“2. That Presbytery commend to the congregations under our care the judicious and peaceful course of the Synod in Ireland as proper to be pursued by those, who in endeavouring to restore Deacons, would not change the nature of their office, nor enlarge the sphere of their duties beyond that defined in the Form of Church Government.”

Now here, we again protest against the injury done the Synod, as if it were “changing the nature of the office of the deacon,” or unduly “enlarging its sphere.” And how they came to introduce the church in Ireland we cannot see, except for the purpose, for which *they have no warrant*, of insinuating that the Irish Synod would restrict the range of this office, in some way, more than we would do. If this Presbytery approve so highly the course of that Synod, why do they not follow their example, and direct their ministers and sessions to discuss the subject, and, by fair inference, their people to read? This is what the Irish Synod has done, and *not* what they would insinuate. But, to proceed:

“3. That any insinuation or statement calculated to impress on the minds of our people, that we have any intention to deviate from the Confession of Faith, Catechisms (Larger and Shorter,) Directory for Worship, Form of Church Government and Testimony, as our only and exclusive subordinate standards, is utterly unfounded. And we also declare our determination to resist by all lawful means every alteration or proposed amendment which any may attempt to introduce in any other way than as the church herself has provided.”

As this resolution is no more than a reiteration of their creed, we would not be justifiable in making any further remark upon it than merely to say, that we always intend to judge people by what they *do*, rather than by what they *say*; and until they *get* deacons, we will not believe that they are very anxious whether or not they “deviate” from that part of the Form which says that deacons are “requisite” in every congregation. These repeated declarations of fidelity to the standards are not calculated to strengthen the confidence of the church in the integrity of those who make them.

The next is a singular resolution:

“4. That as the Presbytery is to be satisfied not only as to the life and ministerial abilities of candidates for the ministry, but also as to their orthodoxy in the faith, and attachment to our subordinate standards, we will neither license nor ordain any until by close examination we have satisfactory evi-

* This clause is inserted *for effect*. If they could have fastened upon any thing except this *great* matter, would they have failed to do so? This clause is one of the worst specimens of scattering surmise.

dence of their determination to maintain by their utmost exertions the whole doctrine and Testimony of a Covenanted Reformation."

On this, we have only to say that in the part of the church where we reside, this has always been done. Does the Pittsburgh Presbytery mean to acknowledge that it has been remiss in this matter? Perhaps it means that it will not hereafter license or ordain any one who does not hold its doctrines respecting the deacon. What does it mean?

They proceed:

"5. That as the Professor in our Theological Seminary has published that he teaches that a Consistory or Deacons' Court is of divine right, and entitled to representation in the superior courts when transacting pecuniary business, we earnestly and affectionately warn our students against such sentiments as novel, dangerous, and unscriptural; and we also declare that if hereafter we find this doctrine taught in the Seminary, we cannot conscientiously recommend our students to that institution."

This is a serious resolution. And we ask, why did not this Presbytery bring a charge against the Professor in Synod? There was an attempt, indeed, to suspend the Seminary, upon the ground that the Professor was not well paid—and that when he had received within a trifle of the amount promised him; but not a word was said about his teachings. We do not anticipate any great harm to the Seminary from this resolution; but it is a serious matter when a Presbytery attempts to nullify an institution of Synod, and that without giving any opportunity of defence. It would have been to the purpose, moreover, could it have been said that the Professor taught that our fathers would have joined the Revolution Settlement, could they only have carried in with them the Form of Church Government. Such teaching would, indeed, look very much like introducing something "novel, dangerous, and unscriptural."

But, more than this. This resolution is disingenuous. It ascribes their opposition to the Seminary to the teachings of the Professor respecting a consistory; whereas the fact is that what they oppose it for, is that the doctrine of the deacon, as the fiscal officer of the church, is taught there. This they let out in their answer to dissentients, where they say:

"Synod, at the same meeting at which this union took place, evinced in a most unmistakeable manner its opposition not only to a consistory, but also to the extension of the deacon's power over all ecclesiastical temporalities. A resolution asserting that the exercise of the deacon's office extends to all ecclesiastical temporalities was negatived, and Synod's own exposition of the meaning of that vote is found in the following answer to reasons of dissent. 'The point decided by Synod was, that *all* church property, such as meeting-houses, &c., is not *by divine right* put into the hands of the deacons.' It was in the confidence that this decision of Synod would be regarded, that a union of the Seminaries was agreed to by the members of this Presbytery, and we are persuaded, by a majority of the Synod."

This lets out the secret. They hold up consistory as a bug-bear; and then, *when it is drawn out of them*, give us the true reason. But what is this consistory, so much dreaded, so solemnly resolved against by the Pittsburgh Presbytery? We will state what it is in Philadelphia. Here we have deacons—who meet by themselves as often as they find necessary—who attend to all the pecuniary affairs of the congregation, collect, and distribute. They keep their own records.

Every quarter they and the elders meet together,—a report is presented by the board of deacons,—that report is examined,—and, if correct, approved. The consistory then takes up such matters as the deacons find too difficult, or on which it is desirable to have the consideration of the entire body of officers in the congregation. A committee of consistory audits every year the whole accounts of the deacons and the treasurer; and a report is made out by the treasurer *annually*, which is laid before the congregation on the first Monday evening in May. This report shows what funds have been received—what paid. On this the congregation acts; and, as it finds matters progressing, takes its measures accordingly. If any repairs are needed—if any additional expenses are to be incurred, the congregation decides upon it. The consistory has to do only with devoted funds—it is the business of the congregation—and, then, of individuals, to make the dedication—it orders no one—it censures no one—it merely sees that the business of the diaconate in the congregation is attended to, and helps if necessary. The meetings are opened with prayer. Now, whoever finds fault with this arrangement, finds fault—1, with the doctrine of the Form of Church Government; 2, with the practice of all the reforming churches; 3, with the practice—the present practice—of the congregations in Ireland; for in most, if not in all, there is a meeting of committee with the session, in most annually, in one instance, we know, quarterly. They don't call it consistory—nor is it exactly the same thing in form, but it is in substance; for it is a meeting of all persons engaged in the affairs of the congregation, for the purpose of auditing and balancing accounts.* Now, we believe that no unprejudiced man will conceive such a consistory as we have described to be a dangerous, or, in any way, objectionable arrangement. And, surely, if the old doctrine be true, that the higher office includes the lower, it is any thing but unpresbyterian.†

But, does not Dr. Willson hold more than this? Not much. Dr. Willson does not hold that consistory has any power to order or direct the congregation—to take money out of any body's pocket, or to inflict censure upon any church member or officer. He does hold that the meetings to which we have referred should be not merely opened with prayer, but solemnly constituted in the name of the Head of the church—that is, that some time during the opening prayer, the moderator should use the formula of words with which the proceedings of other meetings of church officers are commenced. To the ignorant and superstitious this may be something dreadful—the intelligently devout will find nothing awful in it. And, without endorsing any opinion on this subject, we would like to see some of the learned members of this Presbytery, assign some good reason why in the convocation of the diaconate, this formula might not be used, as well as in the convocations of the presbyterate of the congregation.‡

* Any difference is in our favour, inasmuch as the elders do all the voting in these meetings in Ireland—(*voting on money matters*, by the way.) We would give the deacons a vote, thus enlarging the basis.

† We understand that it has been reported, that in the deed of the Cherry Street congregation, a clause has been inserted binding the property to the Synod. This is not so. There is *nothing* like this in that deed.

‡ In regard to the doings of Synod in 1847, referred to in the reply to the dissentients—we would like to see where Dr. W., in his reasons of dissent from these doings, states *any* view of the power of consistory.—See minutes of 1847.

But what brings this Presbytery out so violently upon Dr. Willson *now*? His doctrines were before them many years ago; why have they never accused him before? Why did they not at the last Synod? Why have they reserved their fire, altogether, for Allegheny, October, 1849? They will excuse us if we do not set all this down to the account of zeal for the house of the Lord. It is well, moreover, that they can find no charge of error against Dr. W. on any other than a matter of trivial moment indeed.

The sixth resolution is:

"6. That while we confine our influence and exertions within our own Presbyterial limits, we disapprove of members of other Presbyteries interfering with the congregations under our care; thereby alienating their confidence, and exciting suspicions of our faithfulness and attachment to all the institutions judicially recognised by the church."*

On this we only observe, that so long as we have any thing to say in the public matters of the church, we will not be terrified by any such resolutions from exhibiting what we believe to be the real state of every portion of it. If the Presbytery of Pittsburgh is really faithful, it can easily repel any insinuations. It is, evidently, very much afraid that it will lose character among its own people where it is best known.

As the answers are only a reiteration of what we have already commented upon, and as the most important portions of them have been quoted, we leave them, and conclude by saying that we do not wonder the Pittsburgh Presbytery should wish to impair the influence of the Covenanter. It has given no uncertain sound. That they could find nothing more important to condemn, is pretty good evidence, moreover, that we have left little room, even for the unfriendly, to charge us with unfairness. As we have done before, so we mean to continue. Doing justice, as we think we have done, to our opponents, both in the church and out of it, we will be sustained. The Covenanting Church is not

* The following reasons of dissent from this report were entered upon the minutes:

"We, the undersigned, while we do not wish to be understood as approving every act of any individual or individuals in the church, or as servilely following any man's dictation, must nevertheless respectfully enter our dissent against the adoption of the report of the committee on the editorials of the Covenanter, and the position of the Pittsburgh Presbytery in relation to the difficulties in the church, for the following reasons:

"1. Because we do not consider the course pursued to be the proper one. If the Presbytery think itself aggrieved, the orderly Christian course would be to seek redress in the courts to which the parties referred to are amenable.

"2. Because we think it has a tendency to circulate slander rather than to promote good order in the church.

"3. Because we consider many parts of the report to be founded on a misconstruction of the real meaning of the articles referred to.

"4. Because it tends to shake the confidence of the church in the Theological Seminary, and to undermine that institution, established and supported by Synod.

"5. Because we deem the whole tendency of the paper to be to alienate affections, excite prejudices, and inflame the passions of the members of the church, and to open the way for schism and division.

"A. M. MILLIGAN, WALTER M'CREA, JAMES FORSYTHE, JAMES SHAW, R. B. CANNON."

sunk so low, as to regard any anathemas on grounds so trivial, and especially, attended with so much misrepresentation. If we may judge by the past, these assaults will do us more good than harm. The Covenanter was condemned in the same quarter before it was issued.

In concluding this article, we must call attention, more directly than we have yet done, to the nature of the controversy among us in its present aspect. What are we contending about? From 1838 to 1845, the point in controversy was, whether the church should reiterate her doctrines on the office of the deacon, or not. In that year she did reiterate them. The main object was gained. What has occasioned our controversies since—and especially since 1847? Can this be traced to any thing else than the efforts of the anti-deacon party to undo what Synod did in those years, to get the church to unsay what she had said respecting the deacon's office, and trustees? If we were the assailants for seven years, what are they now? We wish it to be distinctly understood that *they* are now contending and throwing the church into confusion, for the purpose of getting the doctrines of the church *repealed*, and set aside, and of *introducing* into our creed the "civil capacity" doctrine—a complete innovation—to attain in this way, the church's sanction for the trustee system. This is the true aspect of the existing controversy. Let all understand it. *We* are resisting innovation. *They* are endeavouring to foist upon the church a secular, unscriptural, and now often condemned, trustee system. And in regard to the manner in which they carry on the controversy, we are deceived if the church will give its approbation to these attacks upon individuals, and particularly upon her aged professor.

We now close our article—begun reluctantly, and written under painful feelings. So long as we are in the field of argument, or commenting upon public doings, we feel at home—to the work of personal crimination, we hope to be strangers.

Foreign Correspondence.

Paisley—its Antiquities, Manufactories, Martyrs, Theological Seminary, Social and Religious Condition.

Paisley, which I visited on the 28th of September—having left Kilmarnock the day before—was once a flourishing place, and notwithstanding its adversities, still holds an important place among the manufacturing towns of Britain. It occupies the site of an old Roman camp—a ridge some two or three hundred feet high, some half-mile in length, and half as much in breadth, lying nearly north and south, steep on its western side and northern end, less so on the east, where, and on the south, with the plains at their foot, lies the body of the town, and tapering off towards the south until it is lost in the beautiful valley, extending far to the south-west: the western side still retaining its precipitate outline. From the summit of the hill—a vacant green, once the actual site of the Roman encampment—the vision ranges over a wide and varied scene, in every direction, except on the east, where it is soon arrested by spurs shot out by the great central plateau. On the west and south lie the rich plains of Renfrew and Ayr; in the far distance are seen the bare and lofty peaks of the high

mountain summits of Arran, often capped with clouds: on the north and north-east, the mountains of Bute and Argyle, with the Gowrie hills. In all, eleven counties are represented in this panorama, which the venerable Professor, whose dwelling is but a few steps distant, takes great delight in exhibiting to the inquiring stranger. Paisley is not without its objects of interest. I have already mentioned, in a previous letter, the Wallace oak and mansion, two miles distant on the south, in the quiet vale of Ellerslie. There is no doubt of their identity. The tree is, however, in the last stages of decay. The dwelling still remains—a substantial stone edifice, some forty feet in length, two stories high, with projecting wings of equal length: evidently built in times when every man's house was literally his castle. Part of it is still inhabited. In the town itself, near the banks of the Cart, is an ancient abbey, erected, probably, in the 14th century, but most of it still in excellent preservation—indeed, a portion of it, the southern extremity of the old, double church, is still used as a place of worship; the northern portion being the only part of the abbey building that has gone entirely into ruins, enough only remaining to show its original extent and form. The other portions of the abbey, consist of ranges of high buildings, enclosing a square, these in the olden time having been occupied as the residence of the monks and their retainers—on some occasions, furnishing a temporary place of sojourn to the Kings of Scotland. In the Sounding Aisle, so called from its prolonged and rolling echoes, is a tomb, said to be of Marjory Bruce, the ancestor of the fated house of Stuart. And, in the church itself, as in many of the ancient chapels and all the cathedrals, are any number of tombs and tablets, and slabs, marking the last resting-place of the great, *in their day*. What a mockery do most of the inscriptions appear. 1. A name—some title—and, then, “here they lie!” The oldest of these that I noticed was 1433.

Leaving the abbey, we passed over to the factories. Of these, we visited but one—Kerr's—where sewing cotton is spun and prepared for the market. It is a large establishment, employing, in all, nearly three hundred hands, two hundred and fifty of whom are females, who, when working by the day, earned about 6s. and 8d. sterling (\$1,64) per week; working by the piece about 8s. and 6d. or 9d. sterling (\$2, 16) per week; out of this, of course, meeting *all* their expenses. The work is not, now, oppressive, the law having limited the time employed in factory work to, I think, twelve hours. Those that we saw appeared to be generally healthy. They were dressed very much alike, in dark dresses, sufficiently neat and comfortable, and manifested no want of cheerfulness. I made inquiry, however, and found that spitting of blood was not at all uncommon, and do not doubt that in many instances close-confinement, in a heated atmosphere—many of them, moreover, sitting at their work—is followed by the very worst consequences as to health.*

Paisley had its martyrs. James Algie and John Park, I quote from Dr. Symington, “who were executed at the market cross, Feb. 3d, 1685; and were ignominiously buried in the Gallow-green. On the enlargement of the town some fifty years ago, their remains were ex-

* Paisley is not now in a flourishing state. There has been a gradual decline, I was told, for twenty-five years past.

humed; and transferred; most respectfully, to a new burying ground in West Broomlands, which had recently been laid off in the view of erecting a new parish and a parish church to accommodate the increasing population. The scheme of a new erection was not carried into effect, and, after a few interments, the ground was abandoned as a place of burial, went into neglect, and became nearly obscured by surrounding buildings. The inscription on the slab at the graves had become, by time and weather, nearly illegible. A few friends, sympathizing with similar movements in other parts of the country, suggested the erection of a simple and durable monument; and the suggestion was promptly and liberally responded to, and funds realized for carrying it into effect. A chaste and elegant obelisk is now erected on the spot where the ashes of the Martyrs repose. On the east side of the pedestal is engraved the original epitaph:” *

Here lie the corpses of James Algie and John
Park, who suffered at the cross of Paisley,
for refusing the oath of Abjuration.
February 3d, 1635.

Stay, passenger, as thou go'st by,
And take a look where these do lie,
Who for the love they bare to truth,
Were deprived of their life and youth;
Tho' laws made then caus'd many die,
Judges and 'sizers were not free,
He that to them did these delate,
The greater count he hath to make,
Yet no excuse to them can be;
At Ten condemned, at Two to die,
So cruel did their rage become,
To stop their mouth caus'd beat the drum;
This may a standing witness be
'Twi'xt Presby'try and Prelacy.

On the north side of the pedestal is an inscription stating the time and circumstances of the removal of the remains from the Gallowgreen.

The stone containing the Epitaph, transcribed on this monument, was erected over the grave in the Gallowgreen, the place of common execution; and on occasion of the grounds being built upon, it was removed near to this spot along with the remains of the Martyrs, by order of the Magistrates,

JOHN STORIE, JOHN PATISON, and
JOHN COCHRANE.

—
MDCCLXXIX.

On the south side is the following inscription:

ERECTED
By the contributions of Christians of different denominations in and about Paisley, to renew and perpetuate a memorial of the respect and gratitude with which posterity still cherish the memory of the Martyrs of Scotland.

—
MDCCCXXXV.

* Preface to sermon on occasion of erecting monument.

And on the west side are inscribed the following truthful and beautiful lines from Cowper :

“ Their blood is shed
 In confirmation of the noblest claim,
 Our claim to feed upon immortal truth,
 To walk with God, to be divinely free,
 To soar and to anticipate the skies.
 Yet few remember them. They lived unknown,
 Till persecution dragged them into fame,
 And chas'd them up to heaven.”

The sequel is remarkable. We again use the Dr.'s language : “ During the recent movements in the extension of church accommodation an elegant structure was erected, in the immediate vicinity of the tomb, having a burying-ground attached to it, and appropriately designated Martyr's Church. The graves of the two martyrs, though adjacent, were not within the boundaries of the church-yard, and the obelisk stood outside of the wall. The plan, however, of enclosing extensive grounds in the neighbourhood for a new and spacious cemetery was formed, and the ground where the obelisk stood came in course to be included, and the remains, formerly buried in ignominy, *now lie in one of the finest burying-places in the country*; the erection now marking the spot forming one of its most interesting objects.”

My principal object in revisiting Paisley was to attend the annual examination of the students in the Hall, in presence of a Committee of Synod. In the course of the examination, which was entirely conducted by the Professor, portions of the Hebrew Bible, of the New Testament, and of the Septuagint were read—essays were exhibited, these being followed and closed by an examination upon the lectures on Systematic Theology, delivered by the Professor during the sessions—viz.: upon the offices of Christ and the work of the Spirit. The whole occupied about three hours, and was, certainly, creditable to both teacher and pupils, considering the very short period—six weeks—spent in the Hall. The exercises were brought to a close by a few excellent remarks by Dr. Wm. Symington, and an address read by Dr. McIndoe. The class of this session was a small one—thirteen, six from Scotland and seven from Ireland—not much more than half the number of some of the preceding classes. No where is the Professor seen to better advantage than in the midst of his class. Intelligent, affectionate, communicative and enthusiastic, he enters with his whole heart into his work, and appears surrounded with a halo of zeal and devotedness. No wonder, his pupils regard him with more than filial affection and respect! He is, indeed, a father among his children! I only regretted that instead of six weeks, he could not have six months to labour in this, to him, labour of love and delight! This is not the only examination. There was to be another at the opening of the ensuing session, Aug. 15th, this year: a much more extensive and thorough one, in which the class was to make preparation during the interim.* The Hall, I may add, is a small, neat building oppo-

* The following course of study was prescribed by the committee. We insert it, both as an index to what the students are expected to become acquainted with and as exhibiting what books are regarded by the committee as furnishing the best *reading* for Theological students.

site the Professor's dwelling, suited for, perhaps, seventy or eighty persons.

I was sorry to learn that the religious and social condition of Paisley was far from being what it had once been. It has suffered greatly in common with all manufacturing localities, both in Scotland and England, from the inroads of infidelity, bringing in its train Sabbath violation, and domestic and personal debasement. Nor are the churches in a very thriving condition. True, multitudes attend public ministrations. In this respect there has been, as elsewhere, an improvement resulting from the Free church movement, but as much cannot be said respecting vital religion. There has been a decline, especially among the more youthful portion of the population, in regard to Sabbath sanctification, nor is family worship attended to with that degree of punctuality which formerly distinguished the households of Scotland. However, these things are not unknown, nor uncared for. There are many godly persons—ministers, elders, and others, who not only sigh and cry over these spreading evils, but who exert themselves to bring about a reformation. May their labours be successful. May

"Course of Inter-Sessional Study for the Students of the Reformed Presbyterian Hall, '48-49.

"FIRST DIVISION.—Theology.

"Students of the *first* year to be *examined* on Wardlaw's Christian Ethics; Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*; Edwards on the Freedom of the Will. Books recommended to be read for personal improvement,—Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*; Augustine's *Confessions*; Isaac Taylor's *Spiritual Christianity*. Examiner,—Dr. Macindoe.

"Students of the *second* year to be *examined* on Butler's *Analogy*; Princeton *Essays on the Early History of Pelagianism, Original Sin, and the Doctrine of Imputation*, Nos. iv.—viii.; Hurrión's *Sermons on Christ Crucified*. Books recommended,—Bridges on the 119th Psalm; Hall's *Help to Zion's Travellers*; Buchanan on the *Work of the Spirit*. Examiner,—Dr. Bates.

"Students of the *third* year to be *examined* on Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*; Treffrey on the *Sonship*; Symington on the *Atonement and Intercession*. Books recommended,—James' *Pastoral Addresses*; Bates on *Spiritual Perfection*; Henry on *Daily Communion with God*. Examiner,—Mr. Graham.

"Students of the *fourth* year to be *examined* on Witsius on the *Covenants*; Witsius' *Irenicum*, with Bell's *Notes*; Owen's *Death of Death*. Books recommended,—Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*; James' *Earnest Ministry*; Howe's *Redeemer's Tears*. Examiner,—Professor Symington.

"SECOND DIVISION.—Exegesis.

"Students of the *first* and *second* years,—New Testament, John i. and viii. Critics to be consulted,—Calvin; Campbell on the *Gospels*; Titmann on *John*; *Biblical Cabinet*; Bloomfield's *New Testament*; Middleton on the *Greek Article*. Old Testament, Psalm ii. Critics to be consulted,—Calvin; Hengstenberg on the *Psalms*; Rosenmüller on the *Messianic Psalms in Biblical Cabinet*; Horsley on the *Psalms*; Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*.

"Students of the *third* and *fourth* years,—New Testament, Romans vi. 1—viii. 4. Critics to be consulted,—Calvin; Hodge; Moses Stuart; Fraser on *Sanctification*; Macknight on the *Epistles*. Old Testament, Isa. lii. 13—liii. 12. Critics to be consulted,—Calvin; Hengstenberg's *Christology*; Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*; Alexander on *Isaiah*; Henderson on *Isaiah*. Students expected to master—language of the original text; various readings in the text; steps of the argument; result established; critical difficulties. Examiner,—Mr. W. H. Goad.

"THIRD DIVISION.—Church History.

"*All* the students to be *examined* on—History of the Church from the ascension of Christ to the period of Constantine. The following authors to be studied on the subject,—Mosheim; Milner; Neander; Giesler. Points in reference to which the examination will be conducted are,—Progress of Christianity; origin of important heresies; dates of the principal events; the different Pagan persecutions; eminent persons. Examiner,—Dr. Wm. Symington.

"It is designed by the Committee that the examination take place at the opening of the Hall, in August, 1849. Written answers will be asked to questions announced by the different examiners. Should any student wish further information in regard to the subjects or authors in which he is to be examined, he is requested to consult the gentleman appointed to examine on them, according to the above programme.

W. H. G., *Secretary of Committee.*"

“Ichabod” never be written upon the glories of the Scottish Sabbath and the Scottish household.

As might be expected, with the decline of religious interest there has been growing distress—if the latter be not, in part, the cause of the former. Paisley presents much of the aspect of a decaying town. Few improvements are going forward, and not a few objects, pitiable to the sight, presented themselves to my notice in its thoroughfares. Glasgow is drawing off its enterprising youth, while the evils of which I have spoken, and the decline of its manufacturing activity, combine to deprive many of the residue of that thrifty and orderly disposition which lies at the basis of all social prosperity.

This was my last of Scotland. The same evening I bid farewell to the friends I had found there, and returned to Ireland, to fulfil an engagement to preach at the opening of the meeting-house of which we have spoken in other connexions, as having been erected in the town of Killinchy, the scene of John Livingston’s Irish ministry.

In my next, I will present some impressions of England—hastily sketched in my earlier letters. J. M. W.

PAGAN TEACHINGS.

We object to the use of heathen text-books in our schools, not merely or chiefly on account of the beastly obscenity of many of them, but because they are pervaded with error—deadly error—throughout. Failing as they do, without exception, to impart any correct knowledge of God, or of duty, they are calculated to instil, by a silent influence, the most pernicious principles; and thus counteract, or even nullify, the effect of Scriptural instruction. What the notions of the heathen were—the best of them—on matters of the very highest moment, is well shown by Bates in his work on the Attributes of God. The following is a summary made up from his pages, omitting his comments and arguments. Read, and then say, whether such teachings are those with which we would choose the minds of our sons to be occupied during their tender years? Is any argument necessary to show that to pore over books imbued with these doctrines must be hurtful, if not ruinous? Ed. Cov.

In respect to piety, which is the chiefest duty of the reasonable creature, philosophy is very defective, nay, in many things contrary to it:

First, by delivering unworthy notions and conceptions of the Deity. Not only the vulgar heathens “changed the truth of God into a lie,” when they measured his incomprehensible perfections by the narrow compass of their imaginations, or when looking on him through the appearing disorders of the world, they thought him unjust and cruel; as the most beautiful face seems deformed and monstrous in a disturbed stream: but the most renowned philosophers dishonoured him by their base apprehensions. Some asserted the world to be eternal; others that matter was; and in that denied him to be the first cause of all things. Some limited his being, confining him to one of the poles of heaven; others extended it only to the amplitude of the world. The *Epicureans* totally denied his governing providence, and made him an idle spectator of things below. They asserted that God was contented with his own majesty and glory; that whatever was without him was neither in his thoughts nor care. Others allowed him to regard the great affairs of kingdoms and nations, to manage crowns

and sceptres; but to stoop so low as to regard particular things, they judged as unbecoming the divine nature, as for the sun to descend from heaven to light a candle for a servant in the dark. *Seneca* himself represents fortune as not discerning the worthy from the unworthy, and scattering its gifts without respect to virtue. Some made him a servant to nature, that he necessarily turned the spheres: others subjected him to an invincible destiny, that he could not do what he desired.

Secondly: Philosophy is very defective as to piety, in not enjoining the love of God. *Aristotle*, who was so clear-sighted in other things, when he discourses of God, is not only affectedly obscure to conceal his ignorance, as the fish which troubles the water, for fear of being caught; but it is on the occasion of speculative sciences, as in his physics, when he considers him as the first cause of all the motions in the world; or in his metaphysics, as the supreme Being, "the knowledge of whom," he saith, "is most noble in itself, *but of no use to men.*" And in his morals, where he had reason to consider the Deity as an object most worthy of our love, respect, and obedience, in an infinite degree, he totally omits such a representation of him, although the love of God is that alone which gives price to all moral virtues. If in the Platonic philosophy there are some things directing to it, yet they are but frigidly expressed, and so obscurely, that like inscriptions in ancient medals or marbles which are defaced, they are hardly legible.

Thirdly: the best philosophers laid down this servile and pernicious maxim, that a wise man should always conform to the religion of his country. *Socrates*, who acknowledged one supreme God, yet, according to the counsel of the oracle that directed all to sacrifice according to the law of the city, *advised his friends to comply with the common idolatry*, without any difference in the outward worship of him and creatures; and those who did otherwise, he branded as superstitious and vain. And his practice was accordingly; for he frequented the temples, assisted at the sacrifices, which he declares before his judges, to purge himself from the crime of which he was accused. *Seneca*, speaking of the heathen worship, acknowledges it was unreasonable, and only the multitude of fools rendered it excusable; *yet he would have a philosopher to conform to those customs*, in obedience to the law, not as pleasing to the gods. Thus they made religion a dependence on the state. They performed the rites of heathenish superstition, that were either filthy, fantastical, or cruel, such as the devil, the master of those ceremonies, ordained. They became less than men, by worshipping the most vile and despicable creatures, and sunk themselves, by the most execrable idolatry, beneath the powers of darkness to whom they often sacrificed.

Fourthly: they arrogated to themselves the sole praise of their virtues and happiness. This impiety is most visible in the writings of the *Stoics*, the Pharisees in philosophy. They were so far from depending on God for light and grace in the conduct of their lives, and from praying to him to make them virtuous, that they opposed nothing with more pride and contempt. They thought that wisdom would lose its value and lustre, that nothing were in it worthy of admiration, if it came from above, and depended upon the grace of another. They acknowledged that the natural life, that riches, honours, and other inferior things, common to the worst, were the gifts of God; but asserted

that wisdom and virtue, the special perfections of the human nature, were the effects of their own industry. Impious folly, to believe that we owe the greatest benefits to ourselves, and the lesser only to God! Thus they robbed him of the honour of his most precious gifts. They ascribe to their wise man an absolute empire over all things; they raise him above the clouds, whatever may disquiet or disorder; they exempt him from all passions, and make him ever equal to himself; that he is never surprised with accidents; that it is not in the power of pains or troubles to draw a sigh or tear from him; that he despises all that the world can give or take, and is contented with pure and naked virtue: in short, they put the crown upon his head, by attributing all to the power of his own spirit.

Fifthly: philosophy is very defective in not propounding the glory of God as the end to which all our actions should finally refer. The design of philosophers in their precepts, was either—1, to use virtue as the means to obtain reputation and honour in the world. This was evident in their books and actions. They were sick of self-love, and did many things to satisfy the eye. They led their lives as in a scene, where one person is within, and another is represented without, by an artificial imitation of what is true. They were swelled with presumption, having little merit, and a great deal of vanity. Pride had a principal part in them.—Or, 2, the end of philosophy was to prevent the mischiefs which licentiousness and disorders might bring upon men from without, or to preserve inward peace, by suppressing the turbulent passions arising from lust or rage, that discompose the mind. This was the pretended design of *Epicurus*, to whom virtue was amiable only as the instrument of pleasure.—Or, 3, the height of philosophy was to propound the beauty of virtue, and its charming aspect, as the most worthy motive to draw the affections.

Philosophy was defective also in its directions about moral duties that respect ourselves or others. Philosophers were not sensible of the first inclinations to sin. They allow the disorder of the sensitive appetite as innocent, till it passes to the supreme power of the soul, and induces it to deliberate or resolve upon moral actions; for they were ignorant of that original and intimate pollution that cleaves to the human nature; and because our faculties are natural, they thought that the first motions to obtain forbidden objects, that are universal in the best as well as worst, to be natural desires, not the irregularities of lust. Accordingly, all their precepts reach no farther than the counsels of the heart; but the desires and motions of the lower faculties, though very culpable, are left by them indifferent.

The *Stoics* not being able to reconcile the passions with reason, wholly renounced them. The tender and melting affections of nature towards the misery of others, they entirely extinguish as unbecoming perfect virtue. They attribute wisdom to none, but him whom they rob of humanity.

Philosophy is ineffectual by all its rules to form the soul to true patience and contentment under sufferings. The arguments they used for comfort are taken—1, from necessity; that we are born to sufferings; the laws of humanity, which are unchangeable, subject us to them. 2. From reflection upon the miseries that befall others. 3. Others sought for ease under sufferings, by remembering the pleasures that were formerly enjoyed. 4. The *Stoics'* universal cure of afflictions

was, to change their opinion of them, and esteem them not real evils. Thus Posidonius, so much commended by Tully, who for many years, was under torturing diseases, and survived a continual death, being visited by Pompey at Rhodes, entertained him with a philosophical discourse; and when his pains were most acute, he said, "*Nihil agis, dolor, quanquam sis molestus; nunquam te esse confitebor malum.*" "In vain dost thou assault me, pain; though thou art troublesome, thou shalt never force me to confess thou art evil." 5. Others composed themselves by considering the benefit of patience.

And as these, so many other arguments they used to fortify the spirit against sufferings, are like a hedge which at a distance seems to be a safe retreat from gun-shot, but those who retire to it find it a weak defence. This appears by the carriage of the best instructed heathens in their calamities; professing themselves to be wise in their speculations, they became fools in practice, and were confounded with all their philosophy, when they should have made use of it. Some killed themselves from the apprehension of sufferings: their death was not the effect of courage, but of cowardice, the remedy of their fear. Others, impatient of disappointment in their great designs, refused to live. I will instance in two of the most eminent among them, *Cato* and *Bru-tus*. They were both philosophers of the manly sect; and virtue never appeared with a brighter lustre among the heathens, than when joined with a stoical resolution. And they were not imperfect proficient, but masters in philosophy. *Seneca* employs all the ornaments of his eloquence to make *Cato's* eulogy: he represents him as the consummate exemplar of wisdom, as one that realized the sublime idea of virtue described in their writings.

[For the Covenanter.]

PHILIPPIANS, III. 10.

That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death.

The apostle in this verse expresses the peculiar and proper desires of every child of God, as they fill the heart from the first moment of regeneration.—For from that time Christ appears altogether lovely, the chiefest among ten thousand. The Spirit of God by Paul here gives utterance in emphatic terms to the quenchless desires of every believer—according to the measure of faith—to have Christ made known to the soul—Let us endeavour briefly to unfold the meaning of these phrases.

"*That I may know him.*" This is a general term including the two that succeed, but it has also its distinct meaning. The believer already loves the Lord Jesus Christ, he is already assured of his interest in him, but he desires a more intimate communion with him, and a more experimental knowledge of him. He earnestly wishes to know more fully *who* he is, *what* is his character, what station he occupies and what he has done. To know more clearly and experimentally that he is the eternal Son of God, the infinite Jehovah, and co-equal with the Father, so that reverence may fill the soul. To know that he is God-man, "bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh," tempted in all points like as we are, so that the utmost confidence may be put in him. It expresses the desire to have

a more clear conception of him as the Mediator of the everlasting covenant, the only way of access to God—the substitute of sinners, and the Redeemer of his chosen people. A fuller knowledge of his obedience and sufferings, and of the satisfaction made by them to divine justice is earnestly sought; a saving knowledge of his gentleness, meekness and love, forbearance and long-suffering is also here intended. All may attain some knowledge of these things by the word of God, by the mere exercise of the intellect, but it is not such knowledge that is desired;—it is an experimental and realizing sense of all this brought home with power upon the soul by the efficient operation of the Spirit of God—knowledge that ennobles the mind, purifies the heart and impels the will.

“And the power of his resurrection.” The power of the resurrection of Christ is shown in its primary sense in 1 Peter i. 3, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” The believer desires still more and more a realizing sense of the bestowment of that spiritual and eternal life which Christ as Mediator received from the Father at his resurrection, that he may have a clear knowledge that he is regenerated; but there are other consequent and subordinate influences which the resurrection of Jesus Christ has upon his people. It was the close of the Redeemer’s suffering and humiliation; it was the first fruits of the Father’s acceptance of the Mediator’s atonement, and it was an earnest of that full reward which was given to the Lord Jesus Christ at his ascension: in all these aspects the believer desires to experience the power or influence of the resurrection of Christ in comforting him in his trials, as an assurance of the Father’s complacent love; and a pledge of that reward which shall eventually be granted to all those who are found in him, being clothed with his righteousness.

“And the fellowship of his sufferings.” The word rendered “fellowship” denotes “participation,” “communion,” and it doubtless primarily denotes that oneness with Christ by which his sufferings become ours, and are set down to our account, imputed to us; this “fellowship” or “participation” in the sufferings of Christ may be viewed in two aspects: as they, in connexion with his obedience, free from guilt, and as they deliver from pollution. Both are intended, but the latter is here specially designed, since the former is plainly included in the preceding clause. Participation in the sufferings of Christ in both these senses begins in regeneration, and though freedom from guilt is perfected at once in justification, yet the child of God desires greater assurance of this. His freedom from pollution gradually progresses, as the Spirit of God more and more sprinkles the “conscience from dead works,” and the believer at length is made perfect through suffering by the saving application of the blood of Christ.

“Being made conformable to his death.” This is the combined effect of the knowledge of Christ, of the influence of his resurrection, and the participation of the fruits of his sufferings, being made like the Lord Jesus Christ in our character and conduct; as he manifested himself while enduring the excruciating agonies of that cursed death to which he became obedient. As his death was an expression of the wrath of God against him as the surety and substitute of his people; as it was meritorious, and procures reconciliation, none can be conformed to it. But there are other aspects of the death of Christ, to which the believer greatly desires to be

made like him. His death was a most wondrous instance, of humility and meekness, of perfect obedience to God, complete submission to his will. This death was a wonderful exhibition of self-denial, of unquenchable love to his people, and of zeal for the honour of God. To these the believer desires to be conformed, and these are produced and strengthened by an experimental knowledge of Christ; these are the results of the resurrection of the Christ, and the effect of his sufferings as they are savingly applied by the Holy Spirit.

The apostle obtained his desire, he and all other departed saints now "walk in uprightness" while their bodies rest in their beds. "awaiting the resurrection of the just." Let us earnestly desire and seek for these blessings, that we with Paul may receive that crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give to all them that love his appearing. R.

THE NEW YORK PRESBYTERY—ORDINATION, &c.

This Presbytery met at Newburgh, Nov. 14th, and continued in session two days; the greater part of the time being occupied in the hearing of trials from Mr. SAMUEL CARLISLE—his examination, and the ordination services. Mr. C. delivered a lecture on the 43d Psalm, and a sermon from Gal. v. 1, and was then examined, at considerable length, in the Hebrew and Greek languages, on Systematic and Polemic Theology, Church History, Church Government, and the duties of the ministry. The entire examination was unanimously sustained, as giving ample evidence of ability and attainments fitting the candidate for the work of the holy ministry. On Thursday, the 15th, Presbytery proceeded with his ordination. J. M. Willson preached the sermon from 1 Cor. iv. 1, "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ." Doc.—That ministers of the gospel are peculiarly and eminently the servants of Christ. I. He has established their office. II. He calls them to their work. 1. By endowing them for it, and inclining them to it. 2. By actually investing them with office through the instrumentality of the church. III. He assigns them their duties—appointing them. 1. To teach in His name; 2. To exhibit and apply his law—to vindicate His claims and honour as Lord and King; 3. To take the oversight of the faithful; and, 4. To feed sacramentally His professed disciples. In conclusion, the ministry were *first* called upon to remember the dignity of their office—to take Christ's will as their rule—to labour in faith—and to look to their Master for their reward. The people were exhorted to be thankful for the ministry—to receive their scriptural teachings—to give them countenance and support in their responsible and arduous labours.

The usual questions having been proposed, and satisfactorily answered, Presbytery then proceeded to set apart the candidate in the great name of the Head of the church to the work of the holy ministry, and instal him as pastor of the congregation. An impressive charge was then delivered to the pastor by J. Chrystie, and one of a highly practical character to the people, by A. Stevenson. The services were closed, and the congregation dismissed with the apostolic benediction.

The occasion was one of no little satisfaction to us, and to the congregation. The attendance on the day of ordination was large, and the entire services were marked by the closest attention, and evident interest. Our brother has entered upon an important field of labour, with

encouraging auspices. It is our earnest desire and prayer that his labours may be followed and crowned with a signal Divine blessing.

The Presbyterial Mission Fund.—The committee appointed on this subject at the October meeting, reported :

The Committee on the Presbyterial Mission Fund respectfully report,—

That they have very carefully deliberated upon the question assigned them, and the result of their deliberations is to recommend to all the congregations under the care of Presbytery, to take up semi-annual collections for said fund, and transmit them to our treasurer in season for him to report at each stated meeting of Presbytery, and that Presbytery have entire control of said fund, subject to the following regulations, viz.:

1. That no vacant congregation or society shall receive aid from said fund, till they have informed Presbytery that they have among themselves a fund for the support of gospel ordinances, and also the annual amount of said fund.

2. That when Presbytery deem it expedient to commence new stations, the expenses connected therewith shall be supplied from this fund.

3. That all missionary stations and societies to be benefited by this fund be designated by Presbytery.

4. That no ministerial labours shall be remunerated out of this fund, except those performed by appointment of Presbytery, and in stations previously designated.

5. That each missionary, labouring in stations thus designated and to be benefited by this fund, shall receive six dollars a Sabbath, and his travelling expenses; and when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is dispensed at these stations, two ministers being employed, each shall receive twelve dollars, with travelling expenses.

6. That congregations and societies so aided, having contributed what is in their power, due report of the same shall be made by the missionaries serving, that the above remuneration may, if necessary, be made up out of this fund.

7. That the treasurer accept no order upon the treasury, unless the same be signed by the Moderator and Clerk of Presbytery, and contain the name of the missionary for whose services it is drawn.

8. That the treasurer submit a minute and detailed report of receipts and disbursements at every stated meeting of Presbytery.

We cherish the hope that this effort of the Presbytery to engage in the work of home cultivation and church extension, will be zealously seconded by all our congregations and societies. Vacancies will see, in reading these resolutions, that it will be necessary for them, if they wish to be benefited by this effort, to take measures, if they have not already done so, to ascertain how much they can raise among themselves. On making this known to Presbytery, attended with an application for further supplies, Presbytery will endeavour, according to the means at its disposal, to give them such supplies as their necessities and the prospects of success warrant. In this way, feeble societies located where audiences can be had, will enjoy the privilege of a far more frequent administration of ordinances than they could otherwise hope for; and as travelling expenses are paid, the remote will be on a par with the more central. If our Presbytery have the means furnished them—and we cannot doubt it—feeble congregations will be able to obtain settlements earlier, and under more favourable circumstances, than they could otherwise hope to do.

Committee of Supplies.—J. Chrystie, A. Stevenson and J. M. Willson, were appointed a Committee of Supplies until next meeting of Presbytery.

Moderation of a Call.—The moderation of a call was granted to the congregation of White Lake. S. Carlisle to moderate in said call, when requested by the session and congregation.

Next Meeting.—Adjourned to meet in the first Reformed Presbyterian Church, New York, the 2d Tuesday of April, 1850, at half-past seven o'clock, P. M.

[For the Covenanter.]

LETTER FROM REV. R. JOHNSON.

MR. EDITOR,—*Dear Sir*,—You lately published an extract from the *Missionary Chronicle* of last May, respecting the state of the Manchester Congregation, which, you say, must afford pleasure to its contributors in this country. The writer of this is one of the largest of these; and, in order that your readers, and all friendly to that object may know what has been done, he respectfully asks space for the following statements.

When the Missionary Board having the charge of the station in that city, first sent him there, he laboured as diligently as he could till his appointment terminated. Upon this, he went home; but was soon after sent back to occupy the same field of labour. While there, a unanimous call was made upon him by the people to be their pastor. He requested a sufficient time for considering the matter. This was granted to him; and he continued his labours, making a further trial, yet still entertaining doubts respecting his adequacy to advance our cause in a place of so much importance. At length the congregation became so anxious about the issue of the call, that they would delay no longer; and he made up his mind to be ordained as a Missionary, to labour in Manchester; but he could not see his way clear to have the pastoral relation between him and them instituted.

When the call was presented, several members of the court reasoned with him on the subject; stating that such a course could not well be adopted, as it would introduce a principle hitherto unknown, when the congregation was present, at least, by its representative, and that it was better not to insist upon it. They assured him, also, that there would be no difficulty in obtaining a dissolution of the pastoral relation, provided that matters did not succeed according to expectation. This having been stated and confidently affirmed, the writer withdrew his opposition, and the ordination took place.

Soon after, the congregation, few in number, but apparently very active, began to think of getting a better house for public worship. The writer, then their pastor, was not indifferent to their uncomfortable situation—paying upwards of \$130 of rent annually for poor accommodation; nor was he ignorant of the difficulty of the undertaking—raising a church in such an expensive place—for he knew that on him it would principally devolve to procure the means for its accomplishment. Consequently, he did nothing more, for some time, than merely to listen to their suggestions and entreaties.

But as the attendance upon the ordinances seemed to increase, and the Sabbath-school, which had been established for the poor, to succeed, he was, at length, induced to suppose that better accommodation might be procured for those who waited upon his ministry. He declined, however, to move in the matter, till the members and adherents would first show, by their subscription list, how much they were will-

ing and able to do in the furtherance of the object. This was soon ascertained, and a paper was handed to him with names on it, having attached to them about 193*l.*, or \$965. This was encouraging; a large sum for such a small number of individuals to promise.

The next step that was considered necessary was to obtain the approbation of the Synod, and a promise of assistance. Accordingly, the case was brought forward at the annual meeting in Londonderry, 1844, and the following recommendation put on record, signed by the Moderator and Clerk. "The case of the Reformed Presbyterian Congregation of Manchester, having been brought under the consideration of Synod at its present meeting, the court unanimously agreed in recommending its claims to the special attention of our church, and to the favourable notice of the friends of religion in general." These steps having been taken, and a suitable location secured for the buildings, the work was commenced; and on the last Sabbath of 1844, the church was opened for public worship.

As the ground for the erection could not be bought out, but only leased for a term of years at an annual rent, the congregation determined that, in connexion with the church, school-room, vestry, &c., a dwelling-house should be raised, that the income derived from it should meet the yearly chief rent, and thus render the property more secure in case of a commercial crisis occurring to weaken their hands. Towards defraying the expenses of these buildings, the writer collected, with the exception of a few small sums forwarded to him, 794*l.* 12*s.* 4*d.* in Great Britain and Ireland. And, subsequently, during his visit to this country, he collected for that object 490*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.* In all, 1285*l.* 0*s.* 7*d.*, or about \$6425, *free of all travelling and other expenses.* This was an arduous undertaking, devolving entirely on himself; for though the people, as already stated, promised liberally at the commencement, yet only about the one-third of what had been promised was paid, owing to the depression of trade. And, besides, they had fallen into arrear, unknown to the writer, in the rent of the house which they formerly occupied, and nearly all that sum was required to pay it, and meet incidental expenses.

He would farther state, that, whilst in this country collecting, he is not conscious of eating the bread of idleness, for he addressed public audiences above two hundred times, in eighty-one different places, endeavouring to proclaim to his fellow-men the unsearchable riches of Christ. Nor is he disposed, in the least, to boast of his feeble efforts to advance the Redeemer's cause; but he humbly conceives that justice to himself requires that the truth should be stated. He has never sought an adequate remuneration for his labour. He bestowed the congregation the stipend he could justly have claimed, whilst doing their work in this country. He also employed all the moneys that were given him for preaching here, as far as they went, to defray his travelling expenses. This, the Presbytery assured him, in all justice to himself, he ought not to have done. He was, also, amongst the first to subscribe \$100 towards the erection of the buildings.

Besides, the congregation is yet indebted to him for cash lent at an early part of the work, arrear of stipend, and some travelling expenses, about 200*l.*, or \$1000. And now he takes the liberty of stating, that he did not ask the Presbytery to release him from his pastoral charge till he saw not only that the work of collecting for the debt of

the church devolved on him, but also that of paying, in a great measure, for the supply of preaching that the congregation received in his absence. After he returned home, he found that a part of the remittances that had been made, at various times, from this country, was so appropriated.

He was dissatisfied at this, as the money had not been procured for such an object. And he acknowledges that he was somewhat disappointed, after he had spent so much of his own money in the undertaking, and laboured so long on their behalf, that they were still unable either to pay him any part of the stipend due, or even to promise as much as was necessary to keep him from incurring debt for his maintenance.

Such being the state of the congregation, he was constrained to ask, and the Presbytery to grant, a dissolution of the pastoral relation. He did this very reluctantly, as he was attached to the people of his charge; and he thinks he may say, without being accused of egotism, they held him in much esteem. He has been with them in their difficulties; he knows the efforts that they have made to promote the cause of Christ, and the weight of the burden that they have yet to bear; instead, therefore, of being inclined to find fault, he is disposed to sympathize with them. He laments that he is under the necessity of making some of these statements; but justice to himself, and a desire to give the fullest information to others, require them.

He knows that the congregation is yet in debt, but he knows, too, that they have some valuable property; and he is confident that he has done as much to put them in the possession of it as could be reasonably expected. As a part of that debt is due to himself, he may here state that it is not his intention to urge its payment at present. He can wait patiently for a time; earnestly praying that God in his providence may soon send them some measure of spiritual and temporal prosperity.

Yours, &c.,

ROBERT JOHNSON.

November, 1849.

[For the Covenanter.]

REPLY.

Dear Sir,—In your last number, some strictures appeared on an article previously published respecting the Seminary. Nothing could be farther from the mind of the writer of that article than to place the congregation of Cincinnati in an unfavourable light. Their friendship to the Seminary, and their persevering efforts to promote its prosperity, are so well known, that he did not deem it necessary to praise them. The Seminary had prospered among them, and it was his earnest desire it should remain with them. In order to this a hall for its accommodation must be erected. The brethren then agreed to erect a building without delay, if funds were furnished by the church. To bring the subject before the church, and especially before the members of Synod then about to assemble, a plain statement of the privations to which the professor and students were subjected was made. In this statement due prominence was not given to the liberality and kindness of the Cincinnati congregation, and some might think they had been unfriendly to the Seminary. This was an oversight. But to the charge of "*misstatements*," the writer respectfully pleads not guilty.

Misstatement No. 1, is as follows: "While the professor was enabled to occupy his own hired house, the students were sure of a place to recite. For many years he furnished recitation-rooms, kept them in order, and provided an abundance of fuel at his own cost, without expense either to the Synod or the students." This is true, every word of it, and he furnished stoves into the bargain. So far from this information "being incorrect, or hastily acquired," the writer had *years* of tangible and ocular demonstration. This occurred east of the Allegheny mountains, and before the re-organization of the Cincinnati congregation; so that the brethren there must see that making this statement was not designed to do them injustice.

Misstatement No. 2, is: "This winter these noble young men were compelled to receive the instructions of the professor in a small room of an humble boarding-house." This is also true, and the truth is manifest from the following considerations. No hall was provided by Synod for the Seminary. The brethren told us the church building was not used for recitation purposes—that the students recited somewhere their examination and pulpit exhibitions put beyond peradventure—the professor had no house, consequently they did not recite in his habitation. They did recite in a boarding-house, and the Cincinnati congregation could not help it. They did what they could; but circumstances which neither they nor the professor could control, rendered the offer of their place of worship unavailing, and made the duty of the church to provide a place for her students more and more evident.

With the kindest feelings to these brethren, and a grateful sense of their friendship during his brief sojourn among them, the writer's earnest prayer is that they may be continued faithful, and enabled to maintain the despised Covenant cause in that great city till our glorious King will arise and have mercy upon Zion.

ANDREW STEVENSON.

FASHIONABLE WORSHIP.

The following hits truly and well, the new fashions in worship prevailing at least in many city churches. We find it in the columns of the Presbyterian. It is from the pen of a correspondent:

"For the people to close their mouths and refuse to praise God in his assemblies, is bad enough: to forbid them to join in this exercise, is most intolerable tyranny and *impiety*, that must provoke God's displeasure." Are all blind in these churches to this great evil? Not all. But they seem to be powerless. Fashion and the giddy youth—how degrading!—bear the sway.

THE OLD STYLE OF PREACHING.

We commend the following to the attention of those who maintain that to deduce doctrines and then discuss them, is an innovation. It is from a sketch of the elder Fairley, in the No. of the Scottish Presbyterian for February last.

"He had what is called a *knack* at sermonizing. As *bonus textuarius est bonus theologus*—to be a good textuary is to be a good divine—he was strictly textual. . . . *The sense being ascertained, and substance stated in a doctrinal proposition*, it was illustrated by heads and observations growing out of it, followed by a close, searching application of the whole."

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

India.—The following account of the missionary congregations we take from the narrative of the state of religion prepared by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in India. In some respects, these accounts are sufficiently encouraging,—in others, they are calculated to awaken some fears. The facts are important:

“These churches are all small, and as yet exceedingly immature; consequently little can be said about them. The members in general have very imperfect and limited views of the great truths of the gospel; and their consciences, which have been doubly seared by heathenism, seem to perform but feebly the high office of directing their conduct as members of the body of Christ and of one another. Their views of sin, and of the claims of God’s law, are low and defective, and it is with much labour and difficulty that we succeed in making any proper impression on their minds in relation to these important truths. It is necessary to watch over them with the utmost care and faithfulness, to encourage and strengthen them when they do well, and also to admonish, entreat, and exhort, with long forbearance, those who err. They have need that the mantle of charity (in its widest sense) should be cast over them. With regard to some of the members of these churches, there has been an evident improvement in piety; while, with reference to others, it is found that a spirit of worldliness, pride, and self-sufficiency, has served, in a considerable degree, to grieve the Holy Spirit, and thus to check the growth of grace in their souls. There have been cases requiring the censures of the church, but the ordinary deportment of the members has been encouraging. There has been a good degree of regularity in attending upon the means of grace; and it is to be hoped that this has arisen, not from a mere feeling of necessity, but from a love for the ordinances of God’s house. The children and youth in connexion with these congregations have received systematic instruction in human knowledge, and especially in the truths of the Bible, and their improvement has been such as to afford encouragement to those who have been engaged in this toilsome but important work. A few persons have been admitted to the sealing ordinances of all the churches under our care: and when viewed in proportion to the size of the churches, the addition has not been inconsiderable. There are at present, also, applicants, in whose cases hope is entertained, that they will be made the subjects of renewing grace, and thus become witnesses for the truth in the midst of sin and gross idolatry.”

Their *Schools* are conducted upon Christian principles: better conducted, we have no doubt, than many in Christian countries:

“The several schools, which are under the supervision of the members of Synod, are in successful operation. In these schools are several hundred boys, all of whom are carefully instructed, not only in human learning, but also in the Sacred Scriptures, a portion of which is made the subject for study each day; and it is with gratitude we see the effect of this truth upon the minds of those who have received it. Although there have been few who have openly professed their faith in Christ, still many acknowledge the superiority of the Christian religion, and their hope of salvation in no other; while those who do not are losing their deeply-rooted and unreasonable prejudices. They read the Word of God with attention, and their inquiries as to its meaning manifest a desire to understand it.”

Sandwich Islands.—There is some reason to fear that France is about to re-enact in these islands, if she is permitted, the disgraceful drama of Tahiti. In August last, the French consul made certain demands upon the government,—following them up by some serious aggressions:

“These demands,” the papers say, were—“1st, a reduction of duties on brandies and liquors of one-half, and the return of one-half of all such duties as have been collected since 1846; 2d, the same right to Catholics and their schools as are granted to Protestants; 3d, the repeal of a law which compels whaleships, importing liquor for sale, to pay port charges; 4th, the remission of a fine imposed upon some captain of a whaleship.

“The King being absent, the Admiral waited until his return, when the government refusing to comply with the demands, the French troops landed and took possession of the fort. No resistance being offered, the gallant fellows spiked and threw from the ramparts the guns of the fort, destroyed the ammunition and public stores, and took all the Hawaiian vessels that were in port. The Hawaiian flag was lowered, and the French hoisted.”

In a few days, however, they abandoned their conquest, and the consul left for France. The English and American consuls entered their protest. Popery rules French policy, and has her eye, indirectly, upon the growing Protestantism of those remote islands. Surely they will not be abandoned, as the unhappy Tahitians were, to the exactions of France.

Syria, &c.—Missionary labours meet with no little encouragement in some districts of Syria. In all that region an interest is awakened. Rev. Mr. Thompson, a missionary, writes:

“All the native Protestants in Jerusalem speak with gratitude and enthusiasm of the great change which has so rapidly come over the public mind. Every where they find the people waking up and anxious to have the gospel. One of them has lately made a journey with Bibles and books as far east as Salt; and he found the people in that distant place ready to abandon their pictures, and renounce their church, if their priests would not preach the gospel to them. This testimony of our native friends is confirmed by the missionaries at Jerusalem, who justly trace much of this good work to the labours of our good brethren many years ago. And my own observation confirms this pleasing fact, not only in Jerusalem, but in Ramallah, Bethlehem, Ramlah and Jaffa. The good seed thus sown, is beginning to spring up and bear fruit. While I was in Jaffa waiting for the steamer, I preached in Arabic at the home of the British consul, to an interesting congregation of both sexes; and many of the most respectable people of the place expressed an earnest desire to have a missionary who could preach to them in their own language. These things are new for Jaffa; but such things are now occurring daily all over Syria and Palestine.”

Russia and Turkey.—The last accounts from these governments are more pacific. Russia has receded, in part, from her demands, and will be satisfied with the expulsion of the Hungarian refugees from the Turkish territories. She is not yet ready to measure her strength with England and France. Turkey has, in the mean time, taken another step in advance towards more liberal institutions, having granted to all Jews and Christians the privilege of choosing their own municipal officers.

The following interesting account of Turkish slavery, shows how widely different it is from that exclusive system as it exists in our Southern States:

“Slavery still exists in Turkey, but with none of its blacker elements. Its type is much like that of the slavery of ancient Scripture times. The slave, instead of being a soulless chattel, is really a member of his master’s family. He is neither despised nor degraded; he possesses his rights and

his privileges, and has many facilities for elevating his social condition. His compulsory term of service is seven years; and when he leaves his master, the latter is bound to settle upon him a *pecutium*. He is subjected to no such work as is imposed upon the American slave, since his business is not field labour, but attention to the personal wants of his master. Slaves in Turkey frequently rise to the highest places of trust and dignity, and become Seraskiers and even Viziers. The son-in-law of the late Sultan was originally a Georgian slave. Circassian slaves are now comparatively rare; not, however, because of any unwillingness on the part of the Circassian parents to intrust their children to Turkish control, but because the Russians prevent as much as possible their exportation from the Black Sea ports. The few that, in spite of all obstacles, find their way into Constantinople, are never exposed to public sale, but are to be purchased only at a few private houses in the suburb of Trophone. There is even no longer a market for black African slaves. It was abolished by the late Sultan, and will never again be tolerated."

Germany.—We have almost lost sight of the German churches. They have not been idle. They have been adopting measures for organization and action, in two assemblies composed of evangelical men—one held last year at Frankfort, another, and the most important, this year at Wittemberg, the city of Luther. We give the rest in the words of the correspondent of the Presbyterian. He is speaking of the Wittemberg Assembly:

"The origin of this Assembly dates from the spring of last year. Some weeks after the terrible revolutionary commotions of the month of March, a conference of sixty or seventy servants of God, who met twice in *Frankfort*, assembled in the midst of the serious and engrossing matters of the time. The separation of the temporal and the spiritual, of the State and the Church, had just been settled, as a principle, in all the political bodies rising out of the revolution. The Church, hitherto identified with the nation, was about to fall from the hands of the State into the hands of majorities, which were infidel, and hostile to the gospel. It might be expected from this, that these majorities would be eager to transform the Church into their own image, by removing from it, as far as they might be able, every confession of faith, and all the distinctive features of the Church of Jesus Christ. The wind which then blew, and the too famous attempts of the free communities, founded by the *Lichtfreunde* (Friends of Light,) left scarcely a doubt regarding this. It was in these very critical circumstances, that a member of the pastoral conference, of which I have just spoken, a pastor from the mountains of Odenwald, proposed a plan of an association of the Christians of the whole of Germany, for the threefold object of examining together the serious questions which had lately risen, to make preparation in common for the day of conflict, and to labour together for the advancement of the kingdom of God in the midst of the German populations. This plan was adopted; a general assembly was determined to be held in the course of the year, and men known throughout the whole Church in Germany consented to sign the invitation to the *assembly at Wittemberg*. Five hundred friends of the gospel, the *élite* of piety and science, responded by their personal presence to this fraternal invitation, which had been made *auf dem Grunde des Bekenntnisses* (on the basis of the Confession;) these simple words had been sufficient to exclude rationalism and heterodoxy. It was in this way that the assembly at Frankfort gave birth to that at Wittemberg.

"About *seven hundred* men, from all the countries of Germany, of every rank, of every profession, filled the body of the church, and shared in the deliberations, while the galleries were reserved for the public.

“They quickly passed the following question: *How ought the Church to look upon the desistance of the State from Christianity, (Lossagung des Staates von Christenthum,) and how ought it to act on this subject?* The report on this important question had been confided to Mr. Stahl. A better choice could scarcely have been made, in the point of view entertained by the Committee, who are favourable, in principle, to the union of Church and State, as *are the greater part of pious men in Prussia and Germany.* This pious, learned, and eloquent lawyer, familiar with this question, which he has handled in important publications, wherein he attempted to refute Mr. Vinet, endeavoured to prove, that if the State is not Christian, it must descend, step by step, until it is even unable to profess or defend any social morality whatsoever; whence he concluded, that Christians ought not to recognise the principle of a dechristianized State, but in every manner to oppose it. After the same tenor, with certain reserves, spoke Counsellor de Gerlach, Professor Nitsch, and several other distinguished men. After which, the assembly, by a large majority, adopted a protest against the State, if non-Christian—not, however, without some strong declarations in opposition.

“The second subject for the order of the day: *The preservation of the Christian School.* Professor Nitsch expressed, in a few words, the essence of the question. ‘We cannot deny,’ said he, ‘either the rights of the State, or the rights (or duties) of the Church over the School: if they are in conflict, we must reconcile them; but if the Church is separated from the State, she alone watches over religious instruction, with which the State is no longer occupied.’

“Finally, in the prospect of its being more or less widely separated from the State, or, at least, of its attaining a degree of independence, which compels it at present to think of its proper interior administration, the Church should get ready for this work. *Of the organization of the Church*—such was the third matter offered to the deliberations of the Wittemberg assembly. The reporter, Professor Nitsch, presented to the assembly a complete system of Presbyterianism, nearly such as was formerly developed in France, and as it exists in Scotland or America. It is to be observed, that no weighty voice was heard against the Presbyterian constitution of the Church. This result could scarcely have been expected in presence of an ultra-Lutheran party, which had a numerous representation at Wittemberg, and of an ultra-ecclesiastical party, the most influential organ of which is the Church Gazette of Professor Hengstenberg. But the cause of Presbyterianism appears to be in progress in Germany, as offering at once pledges of independence, and strength of unity and liberty. In the commotions of last year, the Presbyterian churches of the provinces of the Rhine and Westphalia almost alone escaped the action of the revolutionary movement. These churches are dependent on the State, but without compromising their spiritual liberty. These are nearly such Presbyterian churches as are answerable to the conception of Dr. Chalmers.

“They afterward attended to the question, whether the *Union* of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, under the late king of Prussia, renders, as was affirmed, a Confession of Faith impracticable. On this occasion the subject of the Confession of Faith was thoroughly treated, first by the reporter, Professor Schmieder, of Wittemberg, and afterwards by a great number of speakers. All acknowledged the necessity of the Confession; and the great principle was laid down, that a *Christian Church* cannot assume this title, without proclaiming before all, both friends and enemies, its faith in its Lord and Saviour.”

This is encouraging—light shining in a dark place.

The Jews.—Late events have awakened a new interest in regard to the Jews, and have brought out, very distinctly, the fact that no class

have greater influence upon the condition of Europe. The Foreign Missionary Record gives a minute and interesting account of their present state and position. We give a summary. It is worth a careful perusal:

“A considerable number of the older Jews are still strict Talmudists. . . . A second class of Jews having thrown off the Talmud, endeavour, perhaps vainly, yet earnestly, to find a resting-place in the Old Testament. Having left their old moorings, they endeavour to let down their anchor there; and, if it fixed, nothing would please them more. But, missing the right interpretation of the Old Testament, they can get no sure bottom. They are thus driven along, whether they will or not, by the spirit of the times. . . . A third class, far more numerous than the other two, whose reverence for authority being entirely destroyed, have thrown off the Talmud, and whose moral sense having become darkened and debased, have cast off the Old Testament too. The link which binds the first class to the Talmud, and that which attaches the heart of the second to the Bible, being broken, they have sunk down into avowed infidelity. . . . A *fourth* class is found a stage lower down than all the preceding ones. The last mentioned, though having given up all idea of revelation, stand at least on deistical ground. But this goes further, and treads the dreary wastes of pantheism.

“The Jews have taken a leading hand in all the late revolutionary movements on the Continent. A large majority of the democratic societies have Jews for their leaders and chief speakers. The two levers of greatest power at present in the political world are money and the press. In respect to the former, the Jews have had long the supremacy. They rule the exchange in the greater part of Europe. Even governments have been known to tremble in the antechamber of a Jew. Their very existence has sometimes seemed suspended on his nod of acquiescence or refusal. Powerful combinations against governments, on the other hand, can hardly be organized without Jewish money; and it flows freely where there is prospect of success. But the press of Continental Europe is no less in Jewish hands; every department of periodical literature, more especially, swarms with Jewish labourers. In the majority of cases, the newspaper press is conducted by Jews, as editors, sub-editors, and occasional contributors. The correspondence is almost entirely managed by them. When we consider the amazing influence now exercised by the public press, it gives a fearful intensity to the above statements. These men are, without doubt, the leaders of public opinion on the Continent, and are covertly or more openly, as it suits the circumstances of the moment, undermining at once the national institution and the national faith.”

On these data, the writer proceeds to urge greater attention to this people as objects of missionary effort. He regards them as the most suitable channel through which to disseminate gospel truth. He thus reasons:

“1st. If, in attempting to raise a standard for the truth in the midst of infidel Germany, we directed our efforts immediately on professing Christians, there is no doubt that our undertaking would meet with a thousand obstacles, and most probably it would prove a failure. The discussion of the same truths with Jews would be attended with comparatively little obstruction, and would excite comparatively few jealousies, nay, would be hailed with joy by the great majority of those whose countenance and sympathy it would be desirable to possess.

“The justness of these remarks has been tested in our own mission in Hungary. Had we directed our efforts immediately on the Hungarian churches, our influence in that direction would most likely have been com-

pletely nullified. Our main object, however, being the conversion of the Jews, we were put at once into a friendly relation to the native churches, and acquired a position from which, though indirectly, we could most effectively operate on them.

"2d. It results from the peculiar position of the Jews, that whatever work of God manifests itself among them, exercises a far greater influence on the world than if it took place elsewhere. A small number of Jewish conversions produced an immense impression throughout Hungary, and kindled anew, as by a spark, the fire which may increase and spread till reformation times are restored to that country. The very fact of a considerable body of Jews becoming convinced of the truth of Christianity, although not actually converted, would do more to stem the infidel torrent in Germany than tenfold the same amount of testimony in any other quarter.

"3d. The very questions which need to be taken up for the Jews are just those which are demanded for the Gentiles. The first I shall mention is the great subject of Christian evidence. But, further, it is to be remarked, that the questions which require solution on the Continent are for the most part peculiarly Jewish questions—I mean, such as the Jewish mind is peculiarly interested in, and for the discussion of which it possesses peculiar advantages. Take as an example the inspiration of Scripture, about which such loose notions prevail on the Continent. The same may be said of the doctrine of the Sabbath, the wrong decision on which, more than any other cause, has been the ruin of the German churches. The doctrine of the Trinity, also, as the proper antagonist to the pantheistic atheism, possesses a peculiar value for the Jew, who, on the ground of pure theism alone, endeavours to meet this most fundamental error."

Switzerland.—Our readers are already aware that the radical party in Switzerland are in open hostility against evangelical religion. All accounts go to confirm this; and also, that this hostility has there assumed a form unusually active. An intelligent and able writer says:

"We have recently had a demonstration of the world's hatred to the Word of God at Geneva. The presence of thousands of refugees from all parts of Europe, has afforded great opportunity for the activity of the various religious Societies here. The agent of the Bible Society gave or sold as many as eighty Testaments to the Baden soldiers found here in the barracks. The radicals, who are devout haters of the Free Church and all the Missionary Societies, went to the captain of these men, who by the way is a Jew, and warned him that the effect of reading the New Testament would be to make his men mean-spirited and unfit for service. Upon this the captain took occasion to administer a sharp rebuke to his company, in which he said many contemptible things against the New Testament, and taunted the men with the common slang phrases applied here to the Methodists. The few men who would gladly have received some instruction in the Scriptures, have since been so tormented by the ridicule of the Geneva radicals, that not one of them dares to show his Testament or go near the evangelists. In the Canton de Vaud, the persecution of the Bible agents by the authorities is open, and also in plain violation of the laws of the land. In Neuchâtel, also, the will of the authorities is the only law in religious matters. Affairs go badly in the Canton of Geneva also; the Radical Government has recently violated vested rights in a very gross manner, by seizing upon the charter of the savings' bank of the Society for the Religious Education of Youth, and several other foundations, on the ground that such corporations are aristocratic. The Government has taken the funds, and pronounced its intention to administer the affairs of these bodies after the most approved democratic fashion."

France. 1. *Political Changes.*—These are still the order of the day. Louis Napoleon is not altogether the imbecile he was thought to be. He has his designs, and apparently determination enough to accomplish them. He has dismissed his cabinet, and selected a new one composed of comparatively insignificant men. What renders this step the more serious is, that his former cabinet were sustained by the majority of the Assembly, particularly in reference to the policy to be pursued towards Rome—both differing from Louis. He was for establishing a liberal government there: they were more inclined to give all over into the Pope's hands. We should not be surprised to hear soon of a new revolution, having for its object the establishment of some new and more monarchical regime. 2. *Evangelizing Efforts.*—These are going forward in Paris and the provinces with no little vigour. As to the city of Paris, the Secretary of the Evangelical Society writes that they have incurred great additional expenses, which he thus accounts for:

“This increase in our expenses is explained by the fulfilment of the determination expressed in our Report, to apply ourselves forthwith, with great activity, to the evangelization of Paris. From the first of May we have taken under our care an establishment which has been in existence for several years past, in the *Faubourg du Temple*, under the direction of a committee of Christian friends. It comprehends a place of worship, where religious services are regularly held, a high school for boys and girls, an elementary school, an infant-school, and a sewing class. In this institution a Christian education is imparted to more than one thousand children, belonging, for the most part, to the labouring classes. Beside this, we have in the *Faubourg St. Marceau* a hall for public worship, where the Gospel is preached twice a-week to an audience consisting—for several months past—of six or seven hundred persons, who listen with attention, interest and reverence, to the message of salvation, and several of whom show, by a change of life, that they already feel its happy effects. Such a beginning gives us reason to hope that this work will prove a blessing to many souls, and will exert a most salutary influence upon that neighbourhood, one of the poorest and most populous in the whole city. Should our means allow, we shall increase the number of these missionary stations in Paris. In assuming the care of the establishments above-mentioned, we have augmented the list of our expenses by sixteen or eighteen thousand francs.”

This is encouraging,—and not less so the following respecting the provinces:

“Since the commencement of the current year, we continue to receive encouraging news from all our great centres of evangelization; the departments of *Haute Vienne*, the two *Charentes*, the *Manche* and the *Yonne*, as well as from the isolated stations which are not connected with any central post. The wants that develop themselves in all these localities are constantly requiring from the committee and from their fellow-labourers an increasing activity. Our agents extend their missionary labours every month to some new parish; and the committee, on their part, endeavour to respond to these exigencies. Thus, within a short time past, a new station has been founded at *Dunkirk*, an evangelist has been appointed to proceed to the department of the *Manche*, for the purpose of assisting the minister stationed there, whose field of labour already embraces four towns, and will now extend, with the co-operation of this evangelist, to a number of country parishes in the neighbourhood of one of them, *Saint Lô*. To instance another case: the committee have hitherto contented themselves with sending an evangelist to preach from time to time at *Mamers*, (department of *Sarthe*.) They have

now come to the determination of settling a labourer there permanently. This measure had become indispensable. The services held there, though at short intervals, were insufficient; the congregation which attends them, numbering from three to four hundred, were in want not only of preaching but of frequent visits; and we have, at their urgent entreaty, decided to send them a settled evangelist. We are persuaded that a very promising field of evangelization exists there, and trust that it will obtain an abundant blessing."

Rome.—Little new has taken place in the Roman States. The Pope was expected to return on the 25th of November, the anniversary of his disgraceful flight. The French armies still occupy the city. The cardinals are as zealous as ever in inflicting vengeance. They are sustained by the French. Dr. Achilli is yet in the Castle of St. Angelo. The people are as much opposed as ever to the priestly rule. They will be kept down only by foreign bayonets. The Italian refugees have been well received in Sardinia; some of them are in Switzerland, and some in England. One act of the drama is nearly or quite finished: none can tell when the curtain may rise for another, a more bloody and conclusive one. Something has been gained in every part of Europe—some concessions have been made, even in Rome. The popular voice will soon make itself heard—the popular will cannot for ever be controlled. The doom of Babylon, and of all anti-Christian powers, is decreed. The time is "not yet." There will be a day of reckoning.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

SONS OF ZION. A Sermon Preached at Mercersburgh, Pa, June, 1849. By C. Webster Pastor of the Associate Congregation in Philadelphia. 12mo. pp. 22.

In this discourse, founded upon Lam. iv. 2, the author illustrates the title "Sons of Zion"—describes some of their peculiar excellencies—and condemns the treatment which they experience from an ungodly world and carnal professors. The views of the author in regard to ordination, that it does not confer the ministerial office, but is merely a sign of their fellowship with the church in the exercise of it, will not find general acceptance—nor can they, we think, be easily maintained. The discourse will repay perusal.

YOUTHFUL DEVOTEDNESS; or, the Youth of the Church instructed in the Duties of Practical Religion. By Thomas Houston, D. D., Author of "Parental Duties," &c., Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Knockbracken. With Recommendatory Preface, by Professor Symington, Paisley. 12mo. pp. 339. Paisley. Alex. Gardner. 1849.

The excellent and laborious author has done good service by issuing this volume, replete as it is with sound doctrine, appropriate counsels, and earnest exhortations. He discusses such subjects as the following—baptism, conversion, profession of religion, character of those who have made a profession of religion, social relations and influence of the young upon society, and preparation for death. We cannot express our opinion of it better than in the words of the venerable Professor Symington in the preface:—"The subjects are presented in proper consecutive order; the observations made on them are brief, pertinent, lucid and impressive; they are supported by appropriate Scripture authorities; the illustrations are happy; they are enriched with short and apt quotations from old and modern authors; and they are enlivened with a fair proportion of anecdote; and they all breathe the spirit of an

earnest and fervent piety." We hope this seasonable and much-needed work will be republished in this country. The author promises another work, a brief Practical Treatise on Christian Baptism.

OBITUARY.

DIED, on Thursday morning, October 25th, at a quarter past four o'clock, at his residence in Pittsburgh, the Rev. JOHN BLACK, D. D.

John Black was born on the 2d of October, 1768, in the county of Antrim, Parish of Ahoghill, Ireland. He was educated in the University of Glasgow, Scotland, where he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and emigrated to this country in the autumn of 1797. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Presbytery of the Reformed Presbyterian Church met at Coldenham, New York, in June, 1799, and was, very shortly after, located in Pittsburgh as Pastor of the congregation. He had lived long enough to bury the last member of his congregation who signed the call to make him their Pastor!

In 1819 or 1820 he was appointed Professor of Ancient Languages in the Western University of Pennsylvania in this place, and continued to occupy that chair, actively discharging its duties, during twelve years. At the expiration of that period he resigned the Professorship, and was soon sent to visit the Reformed Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain as the delegate of the Synod of that Church in the United States. He remained in Europe nine months, and returned with invigorated health to resume his Pastoral labours, which he continued to perform until prostrated by his last illness.

Dr. Black occupied, for many years, an important and influential position as a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Settled, at an early period, in a then thin and scattered community, he was the instrument of gathering together and organizing into societies, which afterwards grew into congregations, many Covenanters in western Pennsylvania, and of educating for the ministry, not a few of the youth of the church. Had he continued as he began, his name would have held a high place among her most laborious and successful builders. He failed, however, in the day of trial, and while, we believe, he did not cease to love most of her distinguishing principles, he was induced, perhaps, by strong personal attachments, to cast in his lot with those who forsook her testimony and her pale in the memorable secession of 1833. A large proportion of his congregation adhered to their profession, and his labours since that time have been in connexion with the new denomination then originated. On this painful subject, we could not say less, we will not say more. His departure is described in an obituary notice, which we have in part used, as being peaceful and even triumphant. He was in his eighty-second year, having been employed in his pulpit labours only about ten days before his death.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.—There are seventeen students in the Seminary. This is a larger class than *any* preceding one.

THE COVENANTER.

JANUARY, 1850.

THE DEACONS.*

It is not a little strange that discussion on this subject cannot be managed with the calmness that pervades the minds of Covenanters, in discussing other matters. Had the various questions relating to the Deacons and their office, been handled with calmness and patience, there can be little doubt but a happy issue of the controversy would have been obtained ere this time. We are so much accustomed to battle with enemies, that we cannot distinguish between the unavoidable push of a brother's shoulder, and the thrust of a hostile spear; but surely they should not be received with the same spirit, nor meet the same fierce resentment. Such, however, is often the state of public feeling, that it is difficult to keep calm if we touch public matters at all. How far the writer of this and accompanying articles, has succeeded, or may succeed, in preserving that brotherly love which he desires, belongs to others to judge. Should he fail in this respect, he has the least possible claim to forgiveness from his brethren; for it is not known to him that he has one personal enemy among those with whom he may differ in some views on this subject. He writes for friends, and hopes to be received as such.

In a former communication, a general view was given of the office of the Deacon—its distinction from other offices, its permanency, and the matters belonging to its functions—temporalities and no more—especially the support of the poor, and lastly, all the temporalities of a congregation. The proof of this last position is yet to be presented, after opening the way in the present communication. Some difficulty occurs in choosing terms: we will use indiscriminately the terms, church property—ecclesiastical goods—temporalities of the church, and other terms commonly used, believing that any of these phrases is sufficiently definite for all those who desire to understand, and hoping that none will intentionally pervert a phrase of known usage. The chief difficulty to encounter on this question, is the idea that it is *something new*. It falls not within the design of the present essay to meet this difficulty directly; we leave that to the gradual development of the subject, and to the historical knowledge of those who are the leaders of the people.

When we speak of intrusting *all* the temporalities to the deacons, we mean not to give them absolute control, but simply *administration*—management under the direction of the ruling officers, and for

*This is the second of a series on this subject published in the Reformed Presbyterian. They are from the pen of an esteemed minister of the church. As many of our readers do not see the Reformed Presbyterian, we transfer this excellent essay to our pages. Had we room, we would publish the first, and may yet.

the accomplishment of the ends designed by the donor: holding them accountable to the courts of the Lord's house, and to the people through these courts. In laying down and endeavouring to prove a few propositions on this subject, we must begin by anticipating an objection very likely to arise in the minds of many:—that allusion to the Old Testament is inadmissible. Hence, our first proposition will be directed to obviate all difficulty on that score.

PROP. I. *It is warrantable, and necessary to appeal to the Old Testament in investigating the duties of the Deacon's office, and settling all points in relation to the church's temporalities.* Because,

1. The church is built on the foundation of apostles and *prophets*, Eph. ii. 20. The church is the same that she was under the former dispensation. The *priesthood* is changed, and hence there is of necessity a change in the law by which it was regulated, Heb. vii. 12; but in all other respects, the church remains unaltered. Her doctrine, her morals, much, very much of her temporalities, are altogether independent of the change in the priesthood, and so remain as they were: on all these subjects we may, we must, appeal to the Old Testament, in connexion with the New.

2. New Testament officers are often designated by Old Testament names; and hence we are warranted to examine the ancient record to find the use of these names, Is. lxvi. 21. "And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord." Mat. xxiii. 34. "Wherefore, behold I send you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill." We appeal then to the Old Testament in order to settle the duties of the Gospel ministry, and the eldership; why may we not do the same in the diaconate? especially when we appeal almost exclusively to the Old Testament on a kindred subject, without the church—the duties of the civil ruler; many of which, are confessedly analogous to those of the deacons. He does outside the wall what they do inside. He is God's deacon, *circa sacra*; they attend to all things *in sacris*. He gives to the church; deacons as a part of her organization, receive and distribute. When we learn so much of the duties of the one from the Old Testament, why not follow up the analogy, and learn the duties of the other, in like things, from the same source?

3. The Westminster divines appealed to the Old Testament on all these subjects; see particularly the Form of Government, where they have referred to Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Nehemiah, 2d Chronicles, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. So did all the Reformed churches of those days.

4. The Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America refers to the Old Testament in relation to New Testament officers. See the same form of Government—a part of her standards. Indeed it is a special part of her testimony to honour the Old Testament by using it on all subjects as freely as the New. Every word of God is pure.

5. On some of the Church's temporalities we can scarce find a word in the New Testament. Where should we go but to the Old?

6. The Apostle Paul appeals to the Old Testament on ecclesiastical temporalities. 1 Cor. ix. 8—14; 2 Cor. viii. 15 and ix. 9; where he cites passages and argues at length, on different kinds of temporalities.

It is warrantable then and necessary, to appeal to the Old Testament,

in relation to Deacons and church property. Let us use freely every part of revealed truth which bears on the subject, while we re-examine the correctness of both the doctrine and the practice of the church of Scotland, in the first and second reformations. May the Lord, the Spirit, direct the writer and the reader, and lead all into the truth.

PROP. II. *The Church, as a Divinely organized society, has a right to hold property ; for,*

1. She needs property for various uses. Her members have bodies as well as souls; both are dedicated to the Lord, and recognised in her organization. Although she is chartered for spiritual purposes, the body of a believer is not therefore a spiritual body and beyond the need of earthly things. The body needs accommodations ecclesiastical, according to its kind, because it is the Lord's. Ordinances address the soul through the medium of the body. The church needs water for her initiatory rite; bread and wine for her Lord's table; tables, seats and vessels for enjoying the sign, as a means of obtaining the thing signified. Whether these accommodations be purchased, or borrowed for the occasion, affects not the right to hold and use them. Her Redeemer bought some of these accommodations, and borrowed others: congregations have often done the same. He had not where to lay his head in life, and had even to borrow a grave. She needs support for her ministers, both settled pastors and missionaries; the labourer has a right to his reward; 1 Cor. ix. 8; Phil. iv. 16. She needs provision for her poor; Deut. xiv. 29; 1 Tim. v. 16. She needs a place for her assemblies, whether that be on the sea-shore below high water mark, in a glen among the mountains, in a costly edifice, an upper room, or the street before the water-gate. Neh. viii. Haggai i. John xx. 19; Acts ii. 1, iv. 13, xx. 8. She needs a fund for travelling expenses. Acts, xv. 3; Rom. xv. 24. She needs a fund for theological education, 2 Kings iv. 38—44, and vi. 1—7. She needs assistance for her superannuated ministers, and weak congregations—"the poor have the gospel preached unto them." She needs a fund for printing and publishing, Acts xv. 23, xvi. 4. The cave of Machpelah, Rachel's grave, and Joseph's tomb, seem to indicate that she needs a place to bury her dead. Some of these things she needs so much, that it is hard to see how she could subsist without them; she *must* either own, beg or borrow, all of which infer her right to hold.

2. She is God's family on earth—the household of faith. Gal. vi. 10; Eph. ii. 19. It is the acknowledged right of a family to hold property; has God left his own family so far below all others, as not to have such a right? Shall a man be reprobated, that provides not for those of his own house, and the family of God be denied the necessary provision—things in a spiritual way needful for the body?

Were the church in any way incapacitated for holding property, there might be a question raised about her *right* to hold what she needs, and her provision might be lodged in the hand of a guardian, as in the case of minors and idiots. Let her be examined. Wherein lies her incapacity? Give her even the privilege of choosing her patron, and you will find her sane enough to reject such proposal with indignity. Let the Free Church of Scotland answer, on the subject of patronage; let a covenant remnant answer; let the ancient Reformation Church answer, on the subject of holding property, and they will utter one voice. She holds a charter from the King eternal; has officers duly

appointed; is served by angels, as a body corporate. Surely she is entitled to all the privileges and immunities of any legalized association. Popish and other tyrannical governments have treated her as incapacitated, as an idiot, till they have well nigh brought her to what they wished her to be. But the sons of Zion have defended, and will defend her right to hold her own goods: not while she lives would they intrust her house and garden to the hands of even an emperor. She needs property, and is capable of holding it; let her not resign her right.

3. The church always has held property. Abraham paid tithes. Jacob devoted the tenth. She obtained in the wilderness two stone tables of exquisite workmanship, a most magnificent tabernacle, altar and court, with a full set of vessels and clothes for service. Solomon built her a house. Property was conferred on her by kings and princes, as well as by private individuals, under the former dispensation, even to the widow's two mites. Under the present dispensation, the faithful have, from the beginning, sold lands and houses, and laid the prices of them at the feet of her officers. Who will charge her with dishonesty in receiving this? Yet she is most dishonest, if she have not the right to hold.

4. It is the duty of all men, especially believers, to give to the church. God has commanded, *Prov. iii. 9*, "Honour the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase." *Hag. i. 8*—"Go up to the mountains and bring wood, and build the house." *Mal. iii. 9, 10*—"Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house." *1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2*—"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 has prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." *2 Cor. viii. 7*—"See that ye abound in this grace also." Chapter ix. throughout.

5. The example of the early Christians, both enforces and illustrates the duty—*Acts ii. 45; iv. 34; vi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 4*.

6. Prophecy indicates that such giving will be continued and increased in the church's brightest days on earth—*Psalm lxxviii. 30; lxxii. 10; Is. lx. 6—9; Rev. xxi. 25*. All highly figurative, but not so as to exclude the idea of giving to the church whatever she needs. This giving infers the right to receive, and receiving infers the right to hold and use.

PROP. III. *Property lawfully given to the church, and received by her, is dedicated to God as really under the New Testament as the Old.*

True, it is not so sacred as the anointing oil, the ark of testimony, or tables of the covenant; but neither were all things devoted under that dispensation, so sacred as these were. The holiness of devoted things admitted of great variety of degrees, and may still yet be really devoted. Some of the meats, for example, were so holy as not to be eaten even by the priests; some were eaten by the priests only, and in the holy place; some were eaten by the priests and their families; and others, as the paschal lamb, were eaten by all who were ceremonially clean. Some things inferred death, even to touch them, by a common Israelite or Levite; others, if even destroyed, might be replaced, with adding a fifth part. We say nothing now about the degrees of sacredness attaching to devoted things, but simply that they

are *really* devoted. This will appear from the following considerations.

1. Many temporalities have the same uses that ever they had: provision for the poor, maintenance of the ministry, sacramental vessels and elements, places of assembly, travelling fund, &c. In short, all except what was peculiar to that priesthood, now changed. Such things were dedicated then—why not now?

2. Collections for the saints are made upon the Lord's day—1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Why attend to money matters during holy time, and during the solemn hours of public assembling, if the money be not dedicated? This cannot be put in the class of extraordinary works, whether of necessity or mercy; it is made a standing rule. This collection at least appears devoted.

3. The support of the ministry appears equally devoted. Paul compares the gospel with the altar and the temple, and argues from the analogy. 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. The support of the ministry is among the ordinances: 1 Cor. ix. 14. It is styled a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing to God—Phil. iv. 18—and is recognised by the church among *religious* ordinances. See Larger Catechism, quest. 108, where the "ministry," and "maintenance thereof," are put in the same connexion, and both put on the same footing with prayer and thanksgiving, giving and receiving sacraments, religious fasting, &c. If that Catechism were to be reconstructed, some of my best friends might suggest the change of ministerial support, from the second commandment to the fifth or eighth. It might stand in all the three, but the church has said that its most appropriate place is in the second commandment, and among religious ordinances. This must be added to the collection for the saints, as dedicated property; and so we might extend the argument, to include all ecclesiastical goods.

4. The sin of sacrilege implies that there is dedication; yet this is a sin under the New Testament as well as the Old. Mal. iii. 8; Rom. ii. 22. Are there any goods belonging to the church, which a person can embezzle, without sacrilege? The purpose for which any article was used, or the degree of sacredness attached to it, might heighten or lessen the crime; but still it is sacrilege. All the tithe was holy, although applied to different purposes; and men robbed God, both in tithes and offerings: Lev. xxvii. 30; xxxii. 33; Mal. iii. 8. Is it not so still? Let the case of Ananias and Sapphira answer. They were dealing with God, and by keeping back part of the price of the land, were guilty of sacrilege, and forfeited life. There was dedication, as far as the offerings of those days were concerned. Is it not so yet?

5. The general feeling of good people holds ecclesiastical property as devoted. The property of a congregation is not accounted to be mere joint stock, be it managed ever so like it. For 1. No man claims his share, or gets it, if he should claim, when he removes from one congregation to another, or when he leaves the communion of the church. 2. Every member is allowed the use of the property, whether he pay or not, so long as he retains his standing. 3. Those who formally dedicate their contributions, put their money into the common treasury; and it is all used in the same manner, for the same purposes, and by the same hands, as other contributions and subscriptions. 4. Should the property, in any emergency, be sold, no godly man would think of putting the price to any other than a sacred use. A late

writer* indignantly pronounces it *slander*, to charge any congregation in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as managing its finances in the way of a joint stock concern. Now in the one of two ways we must view the finances of a congregation, either as joint stock, or as dedicated to the Lord. The former is rejected by every devout mind; the latter must be admitted.

6. Prophecy holds forth the idea of dedication under the gospel. Is. xxiii. 18; Micah iv. 13.

7. *Men* are solemnly dedicated and set apart to the service of God, both soul and body, by ordination to the gospel ministry. Why should not property be so dedicated? And when so dedicated, may it not be used for all congregational, for all ecclesiastical purposes, according to the intent of the dedicator?

If the propositions already laid down be admitted, the next step is a very easy one—that *all ecclesiastical property should be under the hand of divinely appointed officers.*

R. H.

Foreign Correspondence.

London. — Its Streets. — The Thames. — St. Paul's. — Tower. — Rag Fair.

I have already, in one of my early communications, furnished the readers of the *Covenanter* with some of the results of my visit to this "Empire" city. I now return for the purpose of presenting a more general sketch of its external aspect, and its almost endless marvels.

Under the common name "London," are comprised—the City-proper, with the Tower Hamlets on the east, Westminster, &c., and other districts on the west and north, and Southwark, lying to the south of the Thames, the City-proper being an inconsiderable portion of the great mass: the whole stretching along both sides of the Thames, but chiefly on the north, a distance of nearly twelve miles, that is, including some windings; with an extreme breadth of some five or six miles. Its population—increasing at the rate of 100,000 a year, is now over 2,200,000.

I entered London at the west end, and was particularly struck with the fresh and youthful appearance of the entire district of Westminster. Nor does any portion of the city exhibit any such indications of antiquity or age, as the old town of Edinburgh, for example, or even a few streets of Manchester. In fact, the great fire of 1666 swept off the larger portion of the then existing city,—and the great suburbs are of comparatively recent erection. It has a fresh appearance; but besides this, there is nothing striking in the lines of streets, even in those inhabited by the nobility and gentry. The dwellings are, almost without exception, of brick, dingy and lead-coloured, three or four stories high—somewhat wider than those of our eastern cities, but with no attempt at architectural display. In some instances, more taste is displayed, but as the general rule, even the wealthiest are contented with ornamenting the interior of their dwellings, showing their good sense by refraining, in consideration of the smokiness and dampness of the atmosphere, from exterior display. Hence, in walking miles, you will

* Scriptural Deacon, pp. 13 and 14.

meet with little to attract attention, and indeed, with rare exceptions, the whole region lying to the west and north-west, so far as its streets and ordinary dwellings are concerned, possesses no attraction for the eye of the traveller. So far as regards the residences of its inhabitants, Edinburgh, with its old, craggy, toppling houses, or its tasteful, symmetrical ranges of elegant stone structures, which form the new town, awakens a far livelier interest. Nor is there any thing even in the older and more crowded parts of the city-proper, I refer to its buildings generally, to distinguish it in any sense from similar portions of nearly every provincial town of any magnitude.

I have said, there are exceptions. Occasionally, you pass in the more open streets an elegant mansion, surrounded by well-trimmed grounds, the abode of taste and luxury. And in some instances, even in the more crowded districts, an edifice occurs built of better material and greater pretensions. Of these, the mansion of the Duke of Northumberland, at Charing Cross, is the best example; a spacious edifice of stone, with fine gardens, looking like a palace. Indeed, that entire neighbourhood may be classed among the exceptions. Besides the many public buildings, some of them in good taste, here are the notorious club-houses, and fashionable coffee, gin, and gaming-houses, all elegant structures, furnished without regard to expense; and, whatever we may say of the uses of some of them, presenting most admirable specimens of architectural taste and skill.

I cannot say that I was at all overwhelmed with the size or bustle of this world's metropolis, seen from the top of St. Paul's, or rather from the Golden Gallery, one hundred feet below the ball. It seems, indeed, a large and ill-defined leviathan, melting away in all directions into the surrounding country; but, partly on account of the haziness of the atmosphere, it is scarcely ever clear—and partly on account of the uniformity, both of level and material, as seen from such a height, it does not strike the spectator—it did not me,—with any feeling even akin to wonder. One view of Edinburgh from the Carlton Hill, is worth more as a matter of taste, than a thousand of London from the top of St. Paul's. However, there is one portion of London which does surprise the stranger, at least the American, I refer to its parks—particularly Hyde Park, with Kensington Gardens in the west, and Regent's Park on the north—the former containing some three hundred acres, the latter about three hundred and sixty in the centre of their Parks, surrounded, as in Regent's Park, with flocks of sheep, you can scarcely believe that those distant chimneys which you see peering over the tops of the trees, belong to a great city. These parks are open to the public—and every afternoon at four o'clock, during the season, the former is filled with the carriages of the nobility and gentry, moving at a slow pace around its entire surface: the park itself dotted here and there with groups of pedestrians. I could not but regret that the example of London has not been followed in our cities. Health, comfort, and taste, would all be promoted by large public squares—not set off for the convenience and display of privileged orders, but for all who would desire to frequent them. I will not soon forget the magnificent parks of London, Regent's particularly.

Keeping still to generals, I came to the Thames. This river, as all know, runs through London, making a short turn to the north as it enters the west-end—the public offices, Hyde Park, &c., lying to the

west of it, turning again towards the east, and so passing off to the sea. It is a small stream, above the city, pure and limpid; at the city, as filthy as a puddle, and almost as disgusting, receiving as it does the contents of innumerable sewers, and churned by the wheels of innumerable steam-boats. However, the Thames abounds in interest. Its bridges, singular works of art, and thronged, particularly the old London Bridge, with crowds of vehicles and foot passengers. Its shores lined, on the west, with renowned edifices—the new Parliament houses—Somerset House, one of the most magnificent buildings in London—the Custom House—the Tower, with its gate and stairs renowned in history—and, farther down, the famous docks, with their immense warehouses and countless ships. Its channel—occupied below the old bridge by lines of vessels, lying in long rows in the middle of the stream, and almost covered, above and below, with the little, swift iron steamers carrying their living freight in all directions, or plying the more humble business of towing vessels and barges bearing the immeasurable traffic by which two millions of inhabitants get their daily bread. In my opinion, no point of view about the great metropolis makes so favourable an impression of its greatness as a stand on London Bridge, where *all* these are seen at once.

The first object sought for by the curious stranger is St. Paul's, whose lofty dome strikes the eye in whichever direction you enter. To describe such a structure is beyond my powers. A large, black mass, dotted and lined with gray and white patches, peculiar, so far as I know, to the older edifices of England—whether owing to the material or to the climate, I do not know—lifts itself high above you, as you ascend from the west, Ludgate Hill, on which it stands.* As you enter the northern door, you enter a vast rotunda, nearly three hundred feet in breadth, and more than two hundred high to the top of the dome, filled, on every hand, with sculptured monuments of the distinguished dead. From this rotunda, a large nave, separated by massive pillars from the aisles on either hand, stretches off some hundreds of feet, with a proportionate elevation, towards the west—on the south is the choir, the place designed for public worship, gorgeously fitted up, with the inconvenient, narrow, straight-backed pews, universal in these islands, and capable of containing, some six or eight hundred persons! A small audience, indeed, for so large a building.† The ascent of St. Paul's is no small undertaking. It is, of course, perfectly safe, at least as far as the Golden Gallery—the gallery around the top of the dome—but, to most persons, is not a little fatiguing: so much of the way being by flights of stairs carried up *between* the outer covering and the ceiling of the dome, and, consequently, dark and confined. However, there are always enough of visitors—citizens and strangers—willing to pay the cost, and encounter the fatigue, for what is, after all, a no very remarkable gratification. Upon the whole, I confess to some disappointment in St. Paul's: with

* There is no favourable point of view for seeing the exterior of St. Paul's. It is surrounded with buildings, except on the west, where you get a satisfactory view of the western portico. Were it situated in a large open space, the effect of the *total ensemble* would be incomparably greater. As it is, it is so large you cannot see it.

† This Cathedral was built in the reigns of Charles II. and James II., and chiefly under the influence of the latter. Hence, it is an exact fac-simile of Popish cathedrals in its general plan—so formed as to give effect to the processions of which the apostacy makes so much use in gulling and dazzling its votaries. However, in nearly all the great edifices of the kind, the space appropriated to religious services is very small. The greater part is for show.

the exception of the body of the Cathedral, I was hardly repaid for expenditure and trouble.

Next comes the Tower, which I visited the same day. It stands upon the border of the Thames, on a small elevation, about a mile below London Bridge. In visiting it, you pass over Tower Hill, of which history has so much to tell us as the place where state criminals were executed, lying to the west of the Tower, and now covered, with the exception of an open area before the Tower gate, with ordinary buildings. The Tower embraces an area of twelve acres, and is surrounded with a semi-circular moat, one hundred feet wide, now used as a parade ground by the garrison. You enter by a large and ancient gate, and under the guidance of a warder—our was an old peninsular soldier, wearing his medals—you go the prescribed rounds. He first conducts you to a large hall where, on either hand, are armed figures sitting upon horses, wearing the identical armour of a line of kings and distinguished warriors. One coat of chained armour dates as far back as the Crusades, and bears marks both of age and use. From this hall you are led to the White Tower, built nearly six hundred years ago by William the Conqueror, on the site of an old Roman station. It exhibits no marks of age. As you enter this, you find the wall to be nine feet in thickness, the door opening into a room crowded with memorials of the past—filled with emblems of human tyranny, guilt and suffering. Immediately before you is the block, on which not a few heads have fallen—among them, it is supposed, the head of Anne Boleyn. The dints are still there: each dint the uneffaced and fearful record of the blow of the executioner. It is of English oak, about two feet high, in the form of a pyramid, and hollowed out at top for the breast at one side, for the face on the other. Before it stands the axe—like a carpenter's broad-axe, but larger—its blade some twelve inches at the edge, thin, and tapering up to the handle, an elastic piece of oak, some two feet and a half long. The blade is now rusty, the last service that it performed having been the beheading of the notorious Lord Lovat in 1748. To the right of this, is the low, dark, narrow vault, in which was immured for twelve years, the distinguished Sir Walter Raleigh. Had it a tongue, what tales this tower could tell! What sufferings, what sighs, what disappointed hopes, have its walls witnessed! Even these very instruments—these pikes and swords, have each their history!

Leaving these sad apartments, we visited, and, at a respectful distance, had leave to contemplate the regalia of England: crowns, sceptres, and sword; valued at \$13,000,000. One of the crowns, that made for Anne Boleyn, seemed to us rather designed for the head of a growing child, so small is its circumference. With the exception of this, I regarded them with little interest; none—whatever the reason—compared with that with which I afterwards looked upon the regalia of Scotland. In the yard of the Tower is still pointed out the place—it is left unpaved—on which Anne Boleyn was beheaded; and on the outer edge, above the moat, a range of low, ancient buildings, in which state prisoners were confined, particularly before their execution. "There," said the warder, "is the room where Sir William Wallace, and there where Lady Jane Grey, was imprisoned." Passing downwards towards the outlet, we passed the Tower in which the princes were strangled, and at which spot they were buried, and, then, the

Tower, not now opened unless to receive the visits of royalty. By this gate, how many grand processions have entered, when this place was used as a palace—how many prisoners come and gone! We left the Tower—I visited it in company with Dr. Cunningham—regretting that our stay was so short. No place in England is so rich and varied in historical recollections.

I would, in this connexion, say something of those other curiosities in their way—the docks and the Tunnel—but time fails, and, besides, these are interesting only as monuments of what wealth, science, and indomitable perseverance, with high practical skill, can accomplish, and hence they take rank with any number of grand undertakings by which our age is characterized. We returned by the Old Jewry, and called in for a few moments to view the Rag-fair, where, every afternoon, are displayed for sale, in this heart of Jewry, the proceeds of the daily gatherings of hordes of itinerant Jews perambulating the streets from early morning, and picking up, sometimes honestly and sometimes otherwise, old clothes, hats, shoes, tins, books, furniture, &c., &c. Here their wares are displayed—some in their original filth, some partially cleansed—to be purchased, principally by other Jews, to furnish, I presume, their more fixed establishments. You pay a penny for entrance, and, taking good care of your pocket, mingle with the motley crowd. Here they are—old and young, male and female—with their unmistakable oval faces, dark eyes, arched noses, and bronze complexions, higgling over wares of which every decent house rids itself as soon as it can. Out of these, they make their livelihood, such as it is. Occasionally, you see one of quite respectable exterior, and, in a very few instances, you may light upon articles of a rather better quality, but taken together it well merits its name. This was another sad sight of a different kind. Here were Israelites; but how fallen! Truly, an astonishment, and a by-word. We could not forbear saying, “Can these dry bones live?” Their inbringing will be, in truth, “as life from the dead.”

J. M. W.

SKETCHES OF THE COVENANTERS.*

MANSE OF MUSQUODOBOIT, *September 27th, 1848.*

Mr. Editor,—We have had, some years ago, the history of the Secession Church, by Dr. McKerrow, and the history of the Relief Church, by Dr. Struthers. I would like to see a history of the Covenanters, by a chief minister of the party. They belong to an older family than either of those denominations. They claim a close alliance with the Reformation, and profess to be its fairest daughters, and the best visible church. At all events, they are a true branch of the apostolic church, and belong to the family of the Second Reformation. Their history would form a readable volume for our congregational libraries. Many of their ministers are the sterling gold of the sanctuary; and some of her people are the excellent ones of the earth. They are less known than some aspiring sects; but they are a shrewd, intelligent people; and in life, literature, and morals, they are equal to any other section of the

* We find this well-written sketch in the pages of the *Scottish Presbyterian*. Its author we take to be a minister—and a former member of the *Scottish Establishment*.—ED. COV.

Protestant family of the same extent. They are now making their way to the foreground of society; but I remember when they were a small, sequestered people. They worshipped in tents and tabernacles, and had but one religious building in Galloway and Nithsdale. They assembled often upon the mountain and the moor, and were called hill-men. I have attended divine service at the tent, when the fields were sprinkled with snow, and the voice of prayer and praise had a peculiar solemnity. My acquaintance with them does not go farther back than the period when the Rev. James Reid returned from America, and the last years of the four Johns, chief ministers of the party, namely, the Rev. John Thorburn, the Rev. John Curtis, Rev. John Fairley, and the Rev. John McMillan. I have often heard the old people in Nithsdale and Clydesdale speak with admiration and affection of the four Johns, as lovely examples of Christian character and impressive patterns of ministerial fidelity. They did much to stem the torrent of declining virtue, and promote the cause of truth and righteousness in a bad time. I met with a Mr. Waugh, thirty years ago, at Tatamagouche, from Annandale, who left the country when they were in the flower of their fame, and the old man regarded their ministry as the golden era of Cameronian history. I have heard Mr. McMillan preach, and had some knowledge of the elder Fairley. John Fairley fearlessly attacked the reigning follies of the age, and preached the gospel in a familiar but forcible style of eloquence. In his great field days, and in contending for the testimony of the martyrs, he was unsparing in the use of arrows, often broke a lance with the pope, and drove rusty nails into our venerable establishment, and lashed the Secession and the Relief for their declensions. The younger Fairley was a gentleman of a well-stored mind and polished manners, but he lacked the vehemence and pathos of his father. After the death of this vigorous old minister, the Rev. Thomas Henderson, of Kilmaccolm, took up his weapons, and attempted the same style of preaching; but it was the flashes of an expiring lamp, for noble irregularities of speech may be forgiven in original genius, which will not be tolerated in their several imitators. Henderson and Mason of Clydesdale were on the field at the same time. I have frequently heard both. Their style of preaching was different. Mr. Mason preached down sin and Satan, and preached up Christ and Him crucified. Henderson fearlessly denounced the vices of the age, and attempted to amend the manners of the world. Mr. Mason preached the pure doctrines of faith and the sublime precepts of Christianity. Mr. Henderson was perpetually clearing away the rubbish for the foundation, and often spent nearly as much time in picking out the weeds which spring up in the court of the temple, as in examining the symmetry and proportions of the stately building, or as in pointing out its beauty and stability to the audience.* Near the end of the last century, Reid, Thomson, and Rowatt, introduced a better style of preaching among the hill-men. They were popular preachers, and attracted great crowds to the tent in Galloway and Nithsdale. I have never seen such gatherings since in any part of the world, and I would go a long way to see such another assembly. On the morning of a high communion Sabbath, our flowing valleys were in motion; and for ten, or fifteen, or twenty miles, you might have seen

* We are satisfied that injustice is here done to Henderson. He was a faithful Covenanter, and an able man.—Ed. Cov.

pastoral groups streaming away to the hill of Zion; and the services were sometimes long and protracted; and before the last psalm would be sung—which was loud as the sound of many waters—the dew-drops were on their plaids, “and the sentinel stars had set their watch in the skies.” And although they were not all good Christians who mingled in such scenes, yet I would not exchange the fervour of hill-side piety for any thing I have seen in the noblest cathedral. The religion of many in our day consists in hearing sermons, and in outward observances; but their religion consisted in vigorous exertions, in humble dependence upon God, and in earnest prayer. Conversion in this country is often a matter of opinion, feeling, or fancy; but with them it was receiving the truth, and walking in the love of it. There was a remarkable harmony between their profession and their practice. This devotional spirit was deepened and strengthened by their frequent prayer-meetings, and the care with which they instructed their children on Sabbath evenings. Every religious family was a Sabbath school. I lately met with an old Cameronian lady near Cape Sable; I asked her what she thought of a Sabbath in Nova Scotia. She said she had never seen a Sabbath evening kept as it ought to be kept since she left her father’s house. I fear that much of this devotional spirit has fled from our people, and it is not likely to return unless the Divine Spirit is poured down from on high. The elder Rowatt was a very scriptural preacher, and had singular gifts in prayer. Thompson had a speculative mind, and often embarked in the controversies of the day. The Rev. James Reid was a good minister in the fullest sense of the expression, and at one time filled a large space in the public mind in Galloway. He was a well-balanced character, and had a combination of excellencies. His course was that of a stream which does not attract you by its brawling noise, but gains upon you by the purity of its waters, and the beauty of its banks. These ministers often censured public measures in church and state; but they lived in the stormy period of the war, when William Pitt ruled the nation, and Dr. Hill was the leader of the Moderates in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. But though not fierce in loyalty, they had no sympathy for radicalism and rebellion. Fifty years ago, I recollect of seeing one of their church members doing penance at Stonekirk, before the congregation, and was handsomely reproved by the Rev. James Reid, for frequenting reformed clubs, and keeping company with those who were enemies to the cross and the crown. Since that period, the party has risen in importance and usefulness. They have spread their tents in many parts of Scotland, have unfurled their banner in Upper Canada and the South Seas, and have taken a deep interest in the cause of missions. They are the staunch adherents of the Kirk and the Covenant, and have survived those ages of darkness and blood, when the minister’s home was the mountain and moor. Like oil upon the waters, they still remain a distinct party, and show little anxiety to unite with any other denomination. It is said, however, that they are beginning to relinquish some of their long-cherished prejudices, and they begin to feel, if they would improve society, they must join with other Christians in sending proper representatives, and not retard its improvement by withholding their influence.*

Christianity has already greatly elevated the tone of civil government.

* This is unfounded. A few wearing the name may be hankering after these things, but of the body this is utterly untrue.—ED. COV.

It has softened the spirit of despotism, mitigated the horrors of war, purified the civil code, and introduced a benevolent spirit into all the relations of life. It would be the true interest of nations, as well as families and individuals, to cultivate the plant of renown, and to regulate their movements by the precepts of Christianity. We must not bring our religion to our politics, but rather bring our politics to our religion. We have an immense mass of unsanctified talent on the floors of legislation, and all classes begin to feel heavily the curse of unrighteous rulers. We can hardly expect the blessing unless we have more integrity and Christianity in our national councils. Piety and virtue are the firmest supports of civil government. Righteousness exalts a nation, but depravity is the disgrace and downfall of any people. The name of M·Millan was a household word among the Cameronians for several generations; but it has now become extinct in the ministry, and their most brilliant vineyards have passed into the hands of the Symingtons, a family in Renfrewshire, of talent and acquirements, of high rank in literature, and favourably known as authors. But G——, and G——, and N——, have already nearly reached the same eminence, and shall soon share the same honours. The Rev. Thomas Neilson of Rothesay, is a second Guthrie, and by the force of character has compelled the whole population to unloose their purse-strings, throw off their congregational debt, and become the first free church in Scotland.

The king of shadows has drawn a deep and dark curtain over the Cameronian vineyard since I first saw it. It is wholly cultivated by a new class of labourers, and all its ministers have put off their priestly robes, and gone to the home of the departed. A feeling of loneliness steals over my mind, and I feel the tediousness of the wilderness, when I recollect that so many of my early fellow-travellers have crossed the Jordan, and been promoted to the service of the upper sanctuary, for which they were so much better prepared. We are in the wilderness—they have reached the Canaan above. We see only the dawn of the divine life—they enjoy its meridian splendour. Here we struggle with passions and corruptions, but their piety is refined to the brightest fire, and their devotion partakes of the character of heaven. Their ashes, too, mingle not with the red man, but repose among their own people. It is sweet to lay our bones in the bosom of our native land, for the flowers which we loved on earth shall brighten around our graves, and the trees whose gentle murmurs pleased the ear shall hang their shadows over our sleeping dust. But it is some consolation that the resurrection morning will dawn as early on our graves in the green woods of America as in North Britain, and the sun-burnt African and the fair European shall rise at the same time to meet his Saviour and Judge, and be welcomed to his kingdom.—Farewell.—I remain yours truly,

JOHN SPROTT.

[For the Covenanter.]

JOHN IV. 24.

“God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”—John iv. 24.

This is a statement that deeply concerns every child of God. Here are truths of the highest importance to every worshipper of God, matters which all should strive to understand, and which all should practise.

“*God is a Spirit.*” Some read this phrase thus: “*The Spirit is God,*” making it a direct statement of the divinity of the third person of the Godhead. But it is manifest, from the obvious design of the

passage, that it refers to the Godhead, and is a brief and comprehensive description of the Trinity as the sole object of worship. It characterizes his essence as *incorporeal*. God says by Moses, Deut. iv. 15, "Take ye, therefore, good heed unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire." He has no bodily parts—He is invisible and intangible; our senses can take no cognizance of his presence. His essence is simple and uncompounded, hence he is not subject to change. "Thou art the same," &c. He is immortal, hence it is said of him, "Thy years shall have no end." He is then a spirit, as he is an incorporeal, invisible, immortal, and unchangeable being. But all these attributes, except the last, are predicable of angels and the souls of men. He is, however, pre-eminently, an uncreated, infinite, and incomprehensible spirit. "Who by searching can find out God?—who can find out the Almighty to perfection?" Jehovah far transcends all other spirits, for he is omniscient and omnipotent, the author of all beings, the creator of all spirits.

This phrase is used here, not only as a designation of the nature of God, but it also has reference to his worship, as this is described in the latter part of the verse. Since God is a spirit, it is plainly evident that mere bodily service cannot be all that he requires, this alone cannot be acceptable. The worship rendered to him must, in some good degree, accord with his nature. He is the omnipresent spirit, and his worship cannot be confined, and ought not to be restricted to one or another place. "Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem," exclusively ought any to suppose that he can be worshipped. He is the heart-searching spirit, none can conceal from him their thoughts or the imaginations of their hearts, see Ps. cxxxix. 7—12. What awe should fill our souls when we appear before him!

"*And they that worship him must worship him in spirit.*" This clause intimates the manner in which this ineffably holy and infinite spirit should be adored. The devotions of men must, as we have said, accord with his nature and exalted character. Is he a spirit, a pure, incorporeal, and uncompounded essence? Is he the uncreated, omnipotent, infinite, and incomprehensible spirit? then should those who serve him employ their spiritual and immortal nature in all their acts of worship. The intellect, that by which we alone can know any thing of Jehovah, and when renewed understand his wondrous love in giving us gracious access to him, must be engaged in his service. How can mere physical exertions, the soulless utterance of formal prayer or praise, be pleasing to the eternal spirit? Man's nobler powers, all his intellectual faculties must be put in requisition, if he would render spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God.

But this is not all that is intended in this concise but comprehensive delineation of the mode in which we are to worship God. Man is worthless in himself, his noblest powers, his highest and most sincere intellectual efforts to honour and adore his Creator, are utterly unworthy of acceptance. Nay, it is impossible for man, in the natural working of his mind, to attain to proper conceptions of God. But God, in his infinite mercy, has provided a remedy for this, he sends his Holy Spirit who helps the infirmities of his people. We are in this clause directed to look to him as the only source of ability to serve God aright, and enjoined to come in his strength—in the exercise of those graces

which he implants. This view of the passage entirely accords with the teaching of Christ respecting the operation of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men. "Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." John xvi. 13. He will so purify the understanding, and invigorate all its powers, as that correct, exalted and ennobling thoughts of God will fill the soul—he will teach the worshipper what is truth respecting God, without which there can be no acceptable devotion—he will elevate the affections, and excite true emotions, and so fill the heart with a sense of the love of Christ that the soul shall be quickened in all services, and the divine Spirit honoured by pure and zealous worship. That it is the Holy Spirit by whom we are to worship God, is declared, Eph. ii. 18, "For through him (Christ,) we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." This last expression clearly illustrates what is designed by the phrase "must worship in spirit;" must draw near by the Holy Spirit, who alone can qualify the worshipper to appear acceptably before him who is "of purer eyes than to behold iniquity." I refer to only one other passage as unfolding the meaning of the clause under discussion, namely, 1 Cor. ii. 12—15. It is true that this passage applies emphatically to the ministers of Jesus Christ in their public and authorized exercise of the "ministry of reconciliation," but it is not to be applied to them exclusively. The Spirit is given to all that have been chosen in Christ, and they are all thus made to "know the things that are freely given them of God," and they are thus enabled to "worship God in spirit."

"*And in truth.*" In this clause we are taught the form and matter of worship. Indeed, the word *αληθεια* seems here to designate the *truth* as opposed to *types*, the *substance* as contradistinguished from the *shadow*—the reality and verity of New Testament worship, as contrasted with the ceremonial observances of the Old Testament dispensation. For though God may be, and he doubtless was, worshipped in truth, in those typical observances, yet the more spiritual and unincumbered services of this dispensation are more permanent, and better accord with the nature of God. This interpretation is corroborated both by the spirit and letter of the context. Christ is speaking to the Samaritan woman of the worship of God, in which both Jews and Gentiles should engage after the middle wall of partition should be broken down, and refers to the services which should be the medium of adoration after the Mosaic ritual should be abolished. So we find him saying, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." In this then we have a reference to the whole form of worship, authorized and appointed in the New Testament dispensation of the church; nay, we have, as in a germ, that which was afterwards developed and established by the apostles as the ministers of Christ. The worship of God must be in its form and matter such as he has appointed in his word. That this is taught in this phrase, appears from another part of the context. "Ye worship," says Christ to the Samaritan woman, "Ye worship ye know not what, we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews." View this in connexion, and as to the first clause, in contrast with the words now under discussion, and it will be clearly seen that the Samaritan worship was entirely vain, because it was not "in truth," or of

the appointment of God. The services of the Jews were true, because they were the injunctions of God. So all worship must now be enjoined by the same lawgiver. Whatever is not directly authorized or enjoined by the Head of the church, has no warrant in the worship of God—they are not in truth, for they have not a “Thus saith the Lord.”

R.

[For the Covenanter.]

CRITICISM ON LUKE VI. 1.

In Luke vi. 1, we have this expression: “*On the second Sabbath after the first.*” To explain this phrase, critics have laboured hard, but I think with little success. Will you permit me to offer a solution which satisfies myself?

The Greek word is *deuteroproton, the second first*. It is well known that the English were the last of the European nations to adopt the New Style. Between this and what is called the Old Style there are eleven days, so that the first of the month Old Style is the twelfth New Style. As the English government was tardy in adopting the New Style, the people were still more so; and when I was in Europe, contracts between masters and servants were made by the Old Style.

’Twas April, as the bumpkins say;

The legislature called it May.—COWPER.

This makes a first and *second-first* of May, or new May-day and old May-day.

The month Abib, the month of green ears, being the first of the Jewish year, the Jews were obliged to compute by solar time. Now, whether you say with Prideaux and others, that they computed by lunar months, and intercalated a month when the passover would have happened before the vernal equinox; or with Kepler and Usher, (with whom I rather agree,) that they reckoned by months of thirty days, and intercalated a certain number of days at the end of each year, it will come to the same thing. If they had an intercalary month, called one-Adar, then the first Sabbath of it was the *first-first* Sabbath of the year; the twelve months being previously finished, the year, in one sense, was expired. Then the first Sabbath of Nisan was the *second-first* Sabbath. Or, if they inserted intercalary days, then, if one of them was a Sabbath, it would be the *first-first* Sabbath; and the first Sabbath of Nisan would be the *second-first* Sabbath.

This, too, gives a satisfactory reason why Luke mentions the particular Sabbath—because then the wheat was not fully ripe, but in a state for being rubbed in the hands.

PRATENSIS.

DEVILISH MIRACLES.

It is not often we find any thing in congressional speeches, appropriate to our pages. The following extracts from a speech by Horace Mann, of Massachusetts, delivered last winter, is an exception. It is part of his argument in favour of emancipation in the District of Columbia, in which he depicts the rights that meet northern representatives; then of course what is true of the District, is true of all slave communities, as largely as those of Popish lands. He has spoken of the family, the public thoroughfares, the courts, and the churches, and adds:

We go from the courts and the churches to the schools. But no child in whose skin there is a shadow of a shade of African complex-

ion is to be found there. The channels are so cut, that all the sacred and healing waters of knowledge flow, not to him, but by him. Sir, of all the remorseless and wanton cruelties ever committed in this world of wickedness and wo, I hold that to be the most remorseless and wanton which shuts out from all the means of instruction a being whom God has endued with the capacities of knowledge and inspired with the divine desire *to know*. Strike blossom and beauty from the vernal season of the year, and leave it sombre and cheerless; annihilate the harmonies with which the birds of spring make vocal the field and the forest, and let exulting Nature become silent and desolate; dry up even those fountains of joy and gladness that flow unbidden from the heart of childhood, and let the radiant countenance of youth become dull and stony like that of age—do all this, if you will, but withhold your profane hand from those creative sources of knowledge which shall give ever-renewing and ever-increasing delight through all the circles of immortality, and which have the power to assimilate the finite creature more and more nearly to the infinite Creator. Sir, he who denies to children the acquisition of knowledge works devilish miracles. If a man destroys my power of hearing, it is precisely the same to me as though, leaving my faculty of hearing untouched, he had annihilated all the melodies and harmonies of the universe. If a man obliterates my power of vision, it is precisely the same to me as though he had blotted out the light of the sun, and flung a pall of darkness over all the beauties of the earth and the glories of the firmament. So, if a usurper of human rights takes away from a child the faculties for knowledge, or the means and opportunities to know, it is precisely the same to that child as though all the beauties and the wonders, all the magnificence and the glory, of the universe itself had been destroyed. To one who is permitted to know nothing of the charms and sublimities of science, all science is non-existent. To one who is permitted to know nothing of the historical past, all the past generations of men are a non-entity. To one whose mind is not made capacious of the future, and opened to receive it, all the great interests of futurity have less of reality than a dream. I say, therefore, in strict, literal, philosophical truth, that whoever denies knowledge to children works devilish miracles. Just so far as he disables and incapacitates them from knowing, he annihilates the objects of knowledge; he obliterates history; he destroys the countless materials in the natural world, that might, through the medium of the useful arts, be converted into human comforts and blessings; he suspends the sublime order and progression of nature, and blots out those wonderful relations of cause and effect that belong to her unchangeable laws. Nay, there is a sense in which such an impious destroyer of knowledge may be said to annihilate the Creator himself, for he does annihilate the capacity of forming a conception of that Creator, and thus prevents a soul that was created in the image of God, from ever receiving the image it was created to reflect. Such a destroyer of knowledge dims the highest moral splendour of the universe. God is more to me than a grand and solitary Being, though refulgent with infinite perfections. Contemplated as enthroned in the midst of His works, His spiritual offspring in all the worlds he has formed become a multiplying glass, reflecting back the Original in all the profusion and countlessness of infinity. But when the wickedness of man cuts off entire generations and whole races from the capacity of

reflecting back this radiant image of the Creator, then all that part of the universe where they dwell becomes black and revolting, and all that portion of the mirror of souls which was designed to reproduce and rekindle the glories of the Eternal, absorbs and quenches the rays which it should have caught and flamed with anew, and multiplied, and returned. And, still further, sir, I affirm, in words as true and literal as any that belong to geometry, that the man who withholds knowledge from a child, not only works diabolical miracles for the destruction of good, but for the creation of evil also. He who shuts out truth, by the same act opens the door to all the error that supplies its place. Ignorance breeds monsters to fill up all the vacuities of the soul that are unoccupied by the verities of knowledge. He who dethrones the idea of law, bids chaos welcome in its stead. Superstition is the mathematical complement of religious truth; and just so much less as the life of a human being is reclaimed to good, just so much more is it delivered over to evil. The man or the institution, therefore, that withholds knowledge from a child, or from a race of children, exercises the awful power of changing the world in which they are to live, just as much as though he should annihilate all that is most lovely and grand in this planet of ours, or transport the victim of his cruelty to some dark and frigid zone of the universe, where the sweets of knowledge are unknown, and the terrors of ignorance hold their undisputed and remorseless reign. Sir, the laws recorded in the statute books of the free states, providing the means of education, and wooing the children to receive the blessedness of true knowledge, are worthy to be inscribed as emblems and hieroglyphics upon the golden gates of heaven; but those laws which deform the statute books of the slave states of this Union, making it a penal offence to educate human beings, and dooming immortal souls to perpetual ignorance, would make the most appropriate adornment wherewith to embellish with inscription and bas-relief the pillars of the council-hall of pandemonium."

If we ask who performs these "devilish miracles," the reply is easy. See the following. They are extracts from papers in Georgia, where a warm controversy is now going on respecting the employment of slaves, as mechanics and particularly master mechanics. One writer affirms that inasmuch as it tends to cultivate their minds, it ought to be forbidden *by law*. The gist of his argument is summed up thus.

"It would seem that the ignorance of the slave is essential to his bondage—hence the law prohibiting him from being instructed in letters and penmanship. Enlighten any nation, and they will become free—keep them in ignorance, and they submit patiently to the rule of a master."

The editor describes this doctrine, and adds :

"The doctrine which we maintain on this subject, and which "Burke" so ably advocates, is the doctrine of Mr. Calhoun, *and it is the true Southern doctrine*. Every act either directly or indirectly, to educate the slave, to give him intelligence and to place him on an equality with white men, just to that extent endangers the institution of slavery. A distinguished statesman has said that "*nine-tenths* of the ideas which we obtain are derived from our business and social relations, and only one-tenth from books." We very properly exclude the negro from the acquisition of book knowledge. Why, then place him as a master

workman, in positions where he is compelled to think, and where he can so easily acquire information? Why exclude him from administering *drugs*, and yet allow him to have charge of workshops, where he can manufacture weapons of death at pleasure? Nothing but sheer cupidity could induce any thinking man to pursue such a policy. We are not in favour of restricting slave labour one iota farther than is necessary to protect and perpetuate the institution itself."

And yet this is the system that the churches are trying to bolster up, as not wrong *per se*, a system which can be maintained *only* by putting out the intellectual eyes and stupifying the minds of its victims!

REFORMATION VINDICATED.*

"With whatever degree of propriety, however, we may complain of the corruption of true doctrine, and the profanation of Christianity by the grossest vices, our accusers still deny that these were sufficient causes for disturbing the repose of the church. We confess that we are not so stupid as to have failed to perceive the great caution with which we ought to guard against public tumults; nor are we so iron-hearted as not to be touched, nay, deeply embarrassed, with the present turbulent condition of the church. But with what justice can these commotions be imputed to us, when we have had no hand in their excitement? Nay, what effrontery must they possess, to charge upon us the sin of disturbing the church, while they themselves are the sole authors of the tumult? It is the old story of the wolves complaining of the sheep. When in the commencement Luther brought out only a few of the grosser abuses, tolerable in no state of religion, he noted them so slightly and with such modesty, that he rather indicated his desire for their correction, than his determination to take upon himself the office of reformer. Forthwith the adverse party shouted 'to arms!' and as the contention increased and spread, our enemies pitched on this as a fine epitome of argument to put down truth by the fagots and the sword. When, therefore, our party challenged them to a friendly discussion, and aimed to compose the discord by calm measures, we found ourselves harassed by edicts of sanguinary cruelty, until the matter led to the present unhappy rupture.

"But this is no new calumny. What we are now compelled to hear is the old slander of the impious Ahab to Elijah, 'Thou art he that troubleth Israel,' and the holy prophet in his own words absolves us, 'I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house, *in that thou hast forsaken the commandments of the Lord*, and thou hast followed Baalim.' It is not just, therefore, to assail us with prejudice, because at this day also there has sprung up a vehement religious contest among Christians, unless men first take the liberty to condemn Elijah, with whom we make a common defence. He excuses his conduct with this apology alone, that he was contending for the vindication of God's glory, and the restitution of his pure worship; the

* This is taken from Calvin's Essay on the Necessity of the Reformation. Its principle applies to all reformations equally.—Ed.

charge of discord he hurled back on those who raised a tumult in order to resist the truth. But what more have we done, and what more are we now aiming to do, than to restore the worship of the One God to our midst, and the reign of simple truth in His Church? If our adversaries deny this, it would become them at least to convict us of impious doctrine, before they charge upon us as a crime the isolated fact of our disagreement from others. But, I ask, what was the task laid upon us? The only condition, on which peace could be purchased, was the silent betrayal of the verities of God. And yet it was not sufficient to be silent, except by our tacit consent we approved of impious doctrine, open blasphemies against God, and the vilest superstitions. What less then could we do, than in a distinct manner to bear witness, that we divorced ourselves from all consort with such impiety? This, then, in a simple and unvarnished way, as it was our duty, we have studied to do. As to the fact that the evil has grown to a hostile rupture, the guilt of the evil lies with them, who preferred to destroy every thing human and divine rather than give room for pious and sound doctrine; the tyranny which they have once secured in their grasp, they will retain at every cost.

“It ought to be for us a more than sufficient answer, that on our part, the hallowed truth of God stands unshaken, in the maintenance of which we endure so many conflicts; and our adversaries, in fighting with us, are carrying on a war *not so much against ourselves as against God*. But again: we have not descended of our own accord into this hot arena of strife, but have been dragged thither by the rashness of our enemies, and against our own choice. Whatever may be its issues, we are not obnoxious to their odium: for as it is not ours to temper the wants, so it is not ours to undertake their defence. But this is the old pretext, and of universal use in all ages. The impious always take occasion for a tumult from the preaching of the gospel; by degrees they shift the infamy of the consequences to the gospel itself, as if it gave rise to dissensions, a reason which their own depravity created and used: as in the primitive church it behoved the prophecy to be fulfilled, that Christ was to be to His own household a rock of offence, and a stumbling-stone, so it is no wonder if in our day also the prophecy be again verified. This fact also must be regarded as portentous, that the stone which the builders rejected, ought to have been the chief of the corner, and if this rejection happened to Christ in the beginning, let us not wonder then that the evil is perpetuated to this day. I call then upon your Majesty and Emperor, and upon our most noble princes, whenever this unhappy rupture of the church, and the other infinite evils that have sprung from this dissension, may occur to your thoughts, or be called up to your recollection by the art of eloquence, that you will take heed also that Christ himself was placed in the same state of contradiction, that as often as the gospel is preached it raises up the rage of men to its repetition. When the mailed legions meet in the onslaught, a din and crash must follow. This has ever been from the very first dawn of creation, and ever will be to its end, the condition of the gospel; the world receives its preachings amid violent contentions. It is the part of prudent men to observe the sources of these evils; and every one who examines will readily exonerate us from all blame. It becomes us as men to give that testimony to truth which we have given.

Alas, for the world, and we may say the church, if it seek to provoke Christ to a contest, rather than secure the peace which He offers! For beyond all question every one who will not endure His correction will be dashed in pieces.”

THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.—Ephesus.—The church of Ephesus, the first mentioned by St. John, still maintains its ecclesiastical superiority in giving a title to the Greek Archbishop, while the others have only bishops at their head, though it is low in statistical importance. The port of Ephesus is now choked up by a pestiferous morass, and lonely walls, tenanted only by the jackall, occupy the site of the once populous city. The village of Ayasalux stands about a mile from the ruins, and contains about forty scattered cottages, one only tenanted by a Christian. The mosque of the village contains only four granite columns, said to have belonged to the great temple of Diana, whose ruins are still visible near the port. The mosque is going to decay, like the Christian church, and every thing appears to be in the last stage of dissolution.

Smyrna, the most flourishing of the whole, is an increasing city. Its population, which twenty years ago was about 77,000, is now 130,000, and is rapidly increasing. There are five Greek, three Latin, and two Protestant churches. The Greeks have numerous schools, and the Latins a large college; but the Protestant schools have failed. The Greek church at Smyrna continues in a flourishing condition.

Pergamos is the most prosperous of the churches, after Smyrna. The population is 16,000, of whom 14,000 are Turks, and nearly all the rest Christians. The Christian Quarter contains two Greek churches and one Armenian. Close to the ancient church is a school.

Thyatira is still a flourishing town. It had been lost to the Christian world from the fall of Constantinople, under the name of Alkissar, until brought to light in the seventeenth century. The population is above 19,000, of whom 2000 are Greeks, and 1200 Armenians, each having a church; the former said to be on the site of the Apocalyptic church.

Sardis, the ancient capital of Cræsus, is now more desolate than even Ephesus. Scarcely a house remains. The melancholy Gyrcæan Lake, the swampy plain of the Hermus, and the thousand mounds forming the metropolis of the Lydian monarchs, among which rises conspicuously the famed tumulus of Alyattes, produce a scene of gloomy solemnity. Massive ruins of buildings still remain, the wall of which is made up of sculptured pieces of Corinthian and Ionic columns, that once formed portions of the ancient temples.

Philadelphia has a population of 10,000 Turks, and 3000 Greeks. It contains twenty-five churches, all small and mean, but containing fragments of ancient sepulchres. A massive ruin is pointed out as the church of the Apocalypse.

Laodicea, whose fate had been forgotten for centuries, was brought to light in the seventeenth century. It was and is a mass of desolate ruins.—*Church of England Magazine.*

CAUSES OF FASTING—SYNOD'S.

The following paragraphs of this paper were accidentally omitted in the published minutes. See foot-note.* ED. COV.

“4. *Our love of the brethren is weak.* Our nature is totally depraved. The natural state of the affections is consonant with the moral turpitude induced by original sin: proportioned to the strength of remaining corruption is the depravation of the affections. Owing, therefore, to the prevalence of indwelling sin, our love of the brethren is truly weak. The strong, mutual attachment among the members of the church—the unanimity in our councils—and the uniformity of our practice throughout our widely scattered congregations, so lately our pride

* This omission occurred in the office. The copy was sent down with the rest, and was, in some way, unaccountably overlooked by us.—W. S. YOUNG.

and glory, and so frequently the occasion of vain-glorious boasting, no longer exists. Instead of mutual confidence, distrust, suspicion, evil surmising, and evil speaking, are rife. The seeds of dissension, sown by the devil, grow luxuriantly; strife and debate prevail to some extent in every part of the church. Uniformity in what respects the order of the house of God and the manner of worship, we do not observe. Even the courts of God's house are often made the arena of angry controversy. So prevalent have our contentions and party spirit become, that the bonds of our ecclesiastical fellowship appear in danger of being sundered. Few of us are sufficiently desirous of following after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another. Humbled on account of these aggravated sins, let us pray, 'Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes I will now say, Peace be within thee.'

"5. *The influence of the Spirit of God is restrained, and the Divine blessing does not attend our efforts.* Our personal progress in sanctification is slow, our aspirations after holiness are feeble; and our efforts for advancing Christ's kingdom are in many instances signally unsuccessful. Our Testimony is exhibited without producing much effect, either on the nations of the earth, or the corrupt Protestant churches."

INFIDELITY RUN MAD.

A certain Henry C. Wright has, for a while past, been venting his blasphemies against the Bible, because it sanctions the death penalty. In the encounter with opponents, Mr. W. found it necessary to maintain his cause, to deny that God inflicts death at all—either by disease, by casualties, or by the hands of man. He has now gone a step further. He is about to abolish death! Hear him. We quote from the *Liberator*:—

"If death—as I have defined it—be a violation of natural law, it ought to be and will be abolished." . . . "Death, if it be a violation of natural law, is not of God; it has no more right to be in this world than has drunkenness or slavery; it is an enemy to God and man, and ought to be driven from the earth, and no longer be allowed, in the form of governments, churches, constitutions, statute laws, or Bibles, or of warriors, priests or politicians, or in any form, to terrify the hearts, crush the souls, and destroy the happiness of men, and array brother against brother in deadly hostility."

"I go, then, for the abolition of death, because (1) it brings only danger, and never safety, to life, liberty and property; by being necessarily destructive of all respect for the human person; (2) it is a violation of natural law, an outrage upon God and man. It can never bring protection to man, nor glory to God."

But how is this to be done. He knows:—

"How is death to be abolished? As are other crimes; that is, by searching out its causes and removing them, and by discovering the laws of health and life, and obeying them. Were the money and energy now devoted to inflicting death on men, given to searching out the causes of death and the laws of life, and to bringing men to obey them, how soon would this great scourge of the earth cease!"

Truly may he say, as he does in the first line of his article, "I may be thought a fool or madman for taking the above position:" and yet not so great a fool—in one sense—as may be imagined. This infidel

has gone *through* the opposition to the Bible on the ground of the death penalty. Still death has to be accounted for. If not of God, where is it from? He says of man, and must be got rid of. In other words: he prefers to *be* a fool and a madman, to being a believer in Divine revelation. Abolish death! Can folly find a lower depth?

J. Q. ADAMS—SLAVEHOLDERS, AND U. S. CONSTITUTION.

In his Diary for the year 1820, this eminent statesman thus truly speaks of slaveholders and slaves.

“The discussion of this Missouri question has betrayed the secret of their souls. In the abstract they admit that slavery is an evil. They disclaim all participation in the introduction of it, and cast it all upon the shoulders of our old grandam, Britain. But when probed to the quick upon it, they show at the bottom of their souls, pride and vain glory in their very condition of masterdom. They fancy themselves more generous and noble-hearted than the plain freemen who labour for subsistence. They look down upon the simplicity of a Yankee’s manners, because he has no habits of overbearing like theirs, and cannot treat negroes like dogs. It is among the evils of slavery, that it taints the very sources of moral principle. It establishes false estimates of virtue and vice, for what can be more false and heartless than this doctrine, which makes the first and holiest rights of humanity to depend upon the colour of the skin? It perverts human reason, and induces men endowed with logical powers to maintain that slavery is sanctioned by the Christian religion; that slaves are happy and contented in their condition; that between master and slave, there are ties of mutual attachment and affection; that the virtues of the master are refined and exalted by the degradation of the slave, while at the same time they vent execrations upon the slave trade, curse Britain for having given them slaves, burn at the stake negroes convicted of crimes, for the terror of the example, and writhe in agonies of fear at the very mention of human rights as applicable to men of colour.”

Few have used harder terms than he does, on the same page of his diary, respecting the base compromises of the Constitution.

“The impression produced upon my mind by the progress of this discussion is, that the bargain between freedom and slavery, contained in the Constitution of the United States, is *morally and politically vicious*, inconsistent with the principles upon which alone our Revolution can be justified; cruel and oppressive, by riveting the chains of slavery, by pledging the faith of freedom to maintain and perpetuate the tyranny of the master; and grossly unequal and impolitic, by admitting that slaves are at once enemies to be kept in subjection, property to be secured or restored to their owners, and persons not to be represented themselves, but for whom their masters are privileged with nearly a double share of representation. The consequence has been, that this slave representation has governed the Union. Benjamin, portioned above his brethren, has ravened as a wolf; in the morning he has devoured the prey, and at night he has divided the spoil. It would be no difficult matter to prove, by reviewing the history of the Union under this Constitution, that almost every thing which has contributed to the honour and welfare of the nation has been accomplished in despite of them, or forced upon them, and that every thing unpropitious and dishonourable, including the blunders and follies of their adversaries, may be traced to them.”

And yet, by a singular inconsistency in such a man, Mr. Adams continued to the last to swear the oaths to that very constitution! What a net and snare has that instrument been for the consciences of men!

SOCIAL COVENANTING.

The following is an extract of a report presented to the Presbytery of Newton, (O. S.) by D. X. Junkin, Chairman of a Committee "appointed to report upon the *scripturalness* and *expediency* of Church courts and members bearing united testimony against prevailing errors in doctrine and practice, and covenanting to use special means to remove them, with special reference to the subject of *temperance*." We publish it, not because it contains any thing new to our readers, but that they may see how far some Presbyterians seem prepared to go in the acknowledgment of the Divine institution of social covenanting.—Ed. Cov.

"The lawfulness of vows or solemn engagements to perform special services, is distinctly recognised both in the Old and the New Testaments. Laws for the regulation of vows, and for defining their obligations are laid down in Numbers xxx. and elsewhere; and whilst, of course, the subject matter of vows, under the new dispensation, must relate to New Testament duties; we not only have no *repeal* of the laws relating to them, but not the slightest intimation that such engagements to duty are less proper under the new, than under the old economy. Long after he had entered upon the duties of his apostleship, it is recorded of Paul that 'he made a vow:' and there is no intimation given that it was unlawful for him to make and to keep his vow. And if the individual believer may, upon occasion of due importance, voluntarily vow to perform a given service, or to pursue a given habit of life, with a view to promote God's glory and man's good, it cannot be unlawful for a *number* of believers to unite in such an engagement. Accordingly, it hath been held by the soundest theologians, that vows are of two kinds, *personal* and *social*: the former the act of an individual, personally covenanting with God to perform duty, ordinary or extraordinary; the other the joint concurrence of several individuals in a similar exercise. And social covenanting becomes national or ecclesiastical when the whole, or a majority of any nation or church, or of their representatives, concur in a special covenant of duties, as engrafted upon the covenant of grace. [See Jer. iv. 5.]

"That public national and church covenanting was authorized and practised under the old Testament economy, none will doubt who are familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures. And that it is warrantable under the New Testament, is proven from the fact, that Old Testament predictions of gospel times and duties contemplate social vows as forming part of the latter. Said the Lord by Isaiah xix. 21, 'The Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow unto the Lord and shall perform it.' And if it were the duty and the privilege of ancient believers thus to strengthen themselves in duty, and express their devotion to God, (as appears by many Scriptures—such as 2 Chron. xv. 12; xxxiv. 31, 32; Neh. ix. 38; x. &c.) it is not less the duty of believers under the gospel: for Christ 'came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to complete.'

"The lawfulness of social vows or public covenanting has been generally admitted in the Reformed Churches. 'The Protestant States and Princes in Germany, in A. D. 1531, bound themselves in this manner for the security of their religion and liberties. Almost all the national Synods of the Reformed Churches of France did, in their own name

and in the name of their constituents, vow to abide in the faith, and profession of the doctrine, worship, and discipline established amongst them: they having been expressly instructed by their constituents so to do; as appears particularly from the acts of the Synods held at Privas, Alet, Charenton, and Allanson.' And our glorious ancestry in Scotland entered repeatedly into solemn public covenants of adherence to their religion and liberties. In 1581, 1590, and 1698, they made and reiterated their Church and national engagement, solemnly and unitedly *vowing* to stand for 'Christ's crown and covenant.' A glorious vow—solemnly made, firmly maintained, and pregnant with the destinies of religion and civil liberty in all lands, and in all after time!"

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Hungary.—This unhappy country is now under iron rule. Many of her most eminent citizens have been hung—many more are in prison. We mistake if Austrian cruelty does not bring about a fearful reaction.

Germany.—In our last number we laid before our readers a sketch of recent movements in Germany on behalf of evangelical religion. We have, from the same pen, some additional information in regard to the number, activity, and public spirit of those concerned in them. It is contained in a speech delivered in the Wittemberg Assembly, by Wichern, on the subject of the *Home Mission*, now prosecuting with no little energy by the German churches. There must be a true revival in Germany. Rationalism is losing strength: Christianity is gaining.

"He spoke of *Bavaria*, where meetings of a hundred and a hundred and twenty pastors have embraced the cause of the Home Mission, and recommend it from the pulpit, while, under their direction, particular associations were operating at Erlangen, Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Munich;—of *Wurtemberg*, filled with Christian works, and, reckoning, for instance, in itself alone, twenty-four establishments for poor and deserted children; of *Baden*, a country in other respects sadly out of order, where, at the eve of the terrible revolution, *fifteen thousand* Christians assembled at an anniversary of Evangelical Missions; of *Rhenish Bavaria*, hitherto noted in Germany for the rationalism of its clergy, but from which, this year, a numerous pastoral conference was represented at Wittemberg; of the *Prussian provinces of the Rhine and Westphalia*, where, for a long time, Christianity has produced works in full activity, and where the general Synod, officially represented at Wittemberg by Mr. Ball, has sanctioned the Home Mission, and recommended it to its churches. These provinces, which have formed many charitable establishments, and the Evangelical Society of Elberfelds, reckon more than twenty Christian associations of *working-men*, all united in one central Union. *Hanover*, hitherto but little conspicuous for the revival of piety, furnishes its contingent of forces for this work. *Hamburg*, from which the impulse has been communicated, by means of *Rauhen-Haus*, reckons a society for each parish of that populous city. *Berlin* possesses ten of these, which enclose the whole city like a net. In the *Prussian province of Saxony*, all the prisoners of a central prison were seen associated under their pious overseer, for the purpose of founding, out of their paltry savings, an establishment for deserted children, 'in order,' said they, 'that they may not, like us, follow from their young years, the way to ruin.' *Pomerania*, which Wichern felicitously termed *our Wurtemberg of the North*, among its various operations, supports twelve houses for poor children. *Silesia*, peopled by poor weavers, and de-

cimated last year by famine, and the typhus, which it generated, a real Ireland in Germany, offers the sad sight of nine hundred orphans, whose parents fell beneath the fearful plague—four Christian houses have been opened there, for the reception of these children, and ten or twelve brethren, pupils of Rauhen-Haus, bestow on them their charitable cares.”

These are, mainly, benevolent operations; but, from their extent, we may infer the growth and energy of German orthodoxy.

Italy. 1. Religious Liberty.—Out of Rome, the restored powers act with some caution in replacing a strict watch upon the Bible and religious efforts. In Tuscany the Bible is still circulated, but it cannot be printed. The Free Church still exists; but the following, from the London Christian Times, shows that it is under close and attentive surveillance:

REV. MR. STEWART, minister of the Scotch Church there, was summoned before the Delegato Stordinario to give information regarding certain reports which had been made by the Bishop of Leghorn to the Government, respecting efforts made in that church to spread heresy. The charges were—for having allowed Drs. De Santis and Achilli, and Rev. M. Malan, Waldensian pastor, to preach in his church and to his people, in the Italian language; and it was intimated to him that the Government forbade any service in the Italian for the future: and for circulating Protestant works, and more particularly a book called “Amico del Peccatore,” and a sermon preached by Mr. Stewart at the opening of his church, translated into, and published in Italian. The book “Amico del Peccatore,” it was intimated, was absolutely prohibited; in consequence of which, a most earnest demand has arisen for it. The sermon was forbidden to be circulated any more.

2. Romanism—Condition and Prospects.—In common with most Protestants, we have indulged somewhat sanguine views respecting the decline of Popery in Italy. Some parties, well-informed, regard them as premature. One of them, who has been personally conversant with the Italian commotions, thus writes:

Unhappily, though the temporal power of the Pope is virtually broken, and the prestige of his individual spiritual authority fast fading away, the ecclesiastical system is but little affected by the deadly wound it has received. In fact, “the *body* of the beast,” (the clergy, whether beneficed, parochial, or monastic,—whether peripatetic or strictly cloistered,) seems at this moment endued with fresh vigour, and bestirs itself with gladiatorial energy for a mortal combat,—just as a snake, when *first* struck on the head, seems invested with centuple vivacity of evolution; every ring quivering, every scale becoming instinct with life and motion, as if each and all felt the imperious necessity of combined and strenuous effort to ward off impending destruction. The similitude holds true in another particular likewise; for as the merely “scorched snake” never dies of *that* wound, but, retiring to some safe retreat, casts in the trail the injured slough, and becomes only stronger and warier from the encounter, so naught is more coveted by the papal party here, than the security under the belief that its day of power is past, that liberalism has conquered, and that the nineteenth century having outgrown priestcraft, no repetition of the blow is needful, to render the fangless serpent innocuous. *Young Italy*, in the plenitude of its imagined mental emancipation, willingly leaves both stole and cowl in undisturbed possession of the vulgar mind and the female imagination; persuaded that they may be permitted to give picturesque effect to the dim cloister, or the long-drawn aisle and fretted vault, with as much safety as old armour in a baronial hall, which, though it may elicit a regretful sigh for the by-gone glories of chivalry

from the bosom of romantic eighteen, will never in these prosaic days produce a knight of the Sorrowful Countenance. But, in all this, the (generally speaking) infidel illuminati of Italy and Germany have, to use a *phrase populaire*, "reckoned without their host," and this the wily priesthood and *reactionary* politicians know full well, and not only secretly exult in, but most dexterously use to their own purposes.

"With a Machiavellan versatility and adaptation, which challenges our admiration even while exciting our disgust, the tonsured diplomatists make good their footing in every circle, and exercise a species of magical ubiquity, by means of a simple application of the every-day principle of the distribution of labour. The hierarchy, avowedly conservative, is on that ground regarded and treated as the firmest friend "of kings and of all in authority." "They, therefore, are in kings' courts." The inferior clergy are permitted to be democratical. They mix with the liberals; learn their plans; share in their counsels, (of course divulging both, whenever the interests of the church, in other words the commands of their superiors require it,) though occasionally left to prove their devotion to the cause of freedom (to which, it may be, they are really well inclined,) by fighting and falling in its defence.

"Besides her regular troops, (the parochial and benediced clergy) Rome possesses a large and most effective guerilla force in the monks, more especially the self-denied, bare-footed Franciscans and Carmelites. These, together with the proscribed and nominally banished Jesuits, (who, however, have only cast their intermediate redemptorist slough, and in the garb of secular priests perambulate the country by hundreds,) furnish ready and able instruments for bolstering up the Church and State alliance in the minds of the peasantry. Ready to read mass at every shrine, and dispense absolution at any confessional, they mingle with the people, combat any doubts which may have arisen, or been sown in their minds, confirming every superstitious hope, and deepening every superstitious fear, by the most impudent proffers of *indulgences*, and by the circulation of cheap and popularly written legends of departed saints, recitals of pretended modern miracles, &c. &c., rendered attractive and impressive by pictorial illustrations.

Still, we do not altogether abandon our former views. Popery may be strong in the more remote and rural districts—and it is with them that this writer is most familiar—but it has lost its hold, irretrievably, among a large proportion of the more central, and particularly upon the more intelligent classes.

There is nothing new—no political changes. The Pope has not yet returned to the Vatican.

England.—The only item of interest respecting England, is the report that the Evangelical party in the Established Church, alarmed by the decision in the case of Mr. Gorham, declaring that baptismal regeneration is an essential doctrine of the Church, are about organizing themselves for the purpose of meeting the emergency that threatens them. Names of great weight are mentioned in this connexion. We cannot anticipate any very important results from any such step. This party, while it embraces many excellent men, has not given evidence, in modern times, of possessing that kind of public spirit which is so characteristic of their northern neighbours—a disposition to make large personal sacrifices on public grounds.

Ireland.—The London Times furnishes the following statement respecting the social condition of Ireland:

"The main symptom of the present state of Ireland is the utter antagonism

of ranks and classes. The discord which first existed between Papist and Protestant, or Orangeman and Ribandman, has now become the discord between landlord and tenant, between the poor and the rich,—between those who have and those who have not. There is now in progress a war—determined, obstinate, and not unfrequently sanguinary, between property and want. Rent is no longer evaded, but pillaged by the tenant. All the securities which the law has provided for its payment have become a nullity and a mockery. Armed and multitudinous force vanquishes the law, and secret deliberation gives additional support to force. Where there is not a detachment of soldiers ready to assist in the collection of rent the marauding tenants triumph, and the landlord is plundered without redress. Already blood has been shed in a vain attempt to vindicate the rights of property, and while we write most probably a fresh outrage has been followed by fresh carnage. A few weeks more, such as the last six days have been in some of the Irish counties, and the idea of property will have been extirpated, the ties of civil society irreparably broken, and a pest worse than any physical malady perpetuated therein.

“This is not the worst part of the crime or its consequences. It is not only perpetuated by the ignorant and the uneducated, but it is tolerated, encouraged, and defended by men of knowledge and education. It is hailed by patriots as the retributive war of the oppressed against the oppressor; of the injured and plundered serf against his domineering and extortionate master. In the remembrance of old wrongs and old neglect are buried the suggestions of conscience and the dictates of law. Some landlords were cruel, and others indifferent; therefore all landlords should be robbed; such is the language with which Irish patriotism addresses the most inflammable minds in Europe. The lesson is not lost. The spark falls on the gunpowder, as it was meant that it should. While men of learned ease write and advise, the men of land are beggared, and with them all whose subsistence depends upon the purveyance of elegant luxuries or necessary comforts. Trade is hampered, commerce dulled, and the thousand arms which put the industry of cities in motion are paralyzed by a brutal violence which wants the dignity of revenge and the courage of war.”

The facts here given are true,—the comments we cannot admit. We would sanction no crime; but, surely, if the products of the soil will not keep the tenant *and* pay rent—the tenant, who has done the labour, has the first claim. “The husbandman that laboureth is first partaker of the fruits.” This law is reversed in Ireland,—the landlord comes in first, and gets the best share. However, a process is going on which will gradually consume the landlords themselves, beginning with the smaller first. We take from the Londonderry Standard some statistics, showing the rapid diminution of the farming population, and the strong tendency, just now, in the larger to absorb all the smaller. It is from published documents:

“From the table relating to the province of Leinster, we learn that the decrease in the number of holdings, not exceeding an acre, as compared with 1847, was 3,794; the decrease in the number of holdings above one and not exceeding five acres, was 4,026; in holdings of five and not exceeding fifteen acres, 2,546; in those of fifteen to thirty acres, 791; making a total reduction in the number of holdings in this province of 10,617; to meet this, there is an increase in the holdings above thirty acres of 540.

“In Munster the decrease in the holdings under thirty acres was 18,819; the increase in those over thirty acres, 1,399. In Ulster the reductions in the small farms were in about equal proportions with the above-mentioned provinces—they amounted to 15,102; the increased number of large farms, 1,134. There is a point in the Ulster return which is worth mentioning, as

it is not to be found in any of the three other provinces—an increase in the number of farms, of from fifteen to thirty acres, of 762.

“Connaught—unhappy Connaught!—is shown to have passed through a fearful ordeal, as we shall presently see, not only by the extensive suppression of farms, but by the frightful scarcity of food to which this state paper refers. We shall in the first instance proceed with this synoptical sketch of the changes in the number of small farmers. There were, in 1847, 35,634 holders of from one to five acres; in the following year the number was reduced by 9,703. In 1847 there were 76,707 holders of from five to fifteen acres, whose numbers fell off by 12,891 in 1848; and in those of from fifteen to thirty acres there was a reduction of 2,121; making a total decrease in the small tenantry of Connaught of 26,598. To meet this apparent universal abandonment of the soil of this province there was an increase in the large farms of 597.”

So far as regards the *really* small farms, consolidation is not to be regretted. In the mean time, indeed, there is much misery connected with these changes. In the end, they will do good. But, look at the process. The large are becoming larger; and so it is among the estates. Is it any wonder that men are driven to madness, when ejections are going on by the thousand every year? The religious condition of a large part of Ireland is most deplorable; but the social state is equally at war with right, and the fundamental laws of national prosperity and personal thrift.

The Nestorian Mission.—The truth is making some progress among the Nestorians. Some sixty men, from the Jacobite and Nestorian churches, meet regularly to confer on matters of a religious nature, and it is hoped some of them are truly converted. The Jacobite Bishop Behnam wishes the American missionaries to come among his people, and offers to preach himself whatever they desire him.

Greece.—Dr. King is re-established at Athens, and writes he has found a new object of labour, having been much occupied in conversing with Italian refugees from Rome, and has sold them many copies of the Bible and New Testament. Several have expressed their full conviction that Romanism is not the religion of the Bible. One applies for five hundred or a thousand copies of the Bible for distribution among his Greek brethren.

Madagascar.—This large island—it contains 4,000,000 of inhabitants—has been the scene, for some years past, of not a few interesting events. Missions were established. They were successful. Persecution arose—some were martyred: others banished: the missions were broken up. The bloody queen is dead. The son is a Christian. Still, the prospect is not very bright. The following gives a summary of the past, and holds out no very cheering prospect for the future. It is from the columns of the Puritan Recorder.

“Newspaper intelligence reports the death of the Queen of Madagascar, the ruthless persecutor of the Christians, and bloody oppressor of the people over whom she had usurped dominion. Her restoration of the cruel, idolatrous customs of her people was accompanied by the most fanatical persecution of the missionaries and the Christians; the schools shut up, all education forbidden, the missionaries were banished, their property seized; and while she robbed them of all they possessed, she, with demoniac craft, levied a tax upon her subjects, falsely alleging that *it was to pay the foreigners*; thus cre-

ating in the minds of the people, so far as she was able, a hatred of them and their mission. The importance of this island in relation to Africa, with her teeming millions of unevangelized souls, can scarcely be overrated. And for unhappy Madagascar, visited with the light of the gospel, and then dragged back into idolatry and ignorance, prayer should be made by the Church continually. The son of the late Queen is understood to have learned Christ. Whether in the present divided and embarrassed state of that country he may be permitted to ascend the throne of his father, seems a fearful uncertainty; and whether he possesses strength of principle and firmness of character sufficient to brave the difficulties of his position as a Christian prince, is also a matter of deep solicitude. But the Lord reigneth. Other dangers to the progress of the gospel in that island are also presenting themselves. The French nation are, in the view of many active spirits among them, the rightful 'protectors' of Madagascar. The British, by the cession of Mauritius to them, with which Madagascar was associated as an appendage when Mauritius was ceded to Britain, and by subsequent treaties of friendship and alliance, have, in the judgment of many, a better right to be the 'protectors' of Madagascar; although they will probably not assert that claim any further, it may be, than to prevent, if possible, the seizure of the island by the French, and to preserve it as an independent power."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A PLEA for the Revival of the Deacon's Office: specially addressed to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. By the Rev. Thos. Watters, Newtownards: 18mo., pp. 44, 1849.

The deacon's office is attracting attention. In this essay, Mr. Watters dwells chiefly upon the functions of the diaconate, as they respect the care of "the poor." Without giving our sanction to every expression, we quote the following. It shows what his views are of the committee system, and, of course, of the extent of the deacon's office:

"It were a profitable, though at the same time, a melancholy task, to ascertain the time when, and the reasons why, this office was suffered to lapse. Certain we are it should be found to have been at a period marked by a waning faith and love waxing cold; for it is ever in such conditions principle gives way to expediency. It is beyond controversy that the Word of God furnishes as clear warrant for the office, as it does for that of a ruling eldership distinct from the pastorate. Why, then, was it permitted to lapse? Simply because the spirit on which the office depends for its existence and maintenance, had become languid and sickly unto death. Its discontinuance was an obvious relief, and a worldly policy soon discovered pretences by which the backsliding Church might be reconciled to those apocryphal expedients by which it has been long superseded. Managing committees were appointed, without a shadow of license from the Word of God, or the Standards, and to them was committed the administration of all matters merely financial; while, if any funds existed for the benefit of the poor, these were assigned to the elders for distribution—a function altogether extrinsic to the bearings of their commission. And what have been the consequences of our delinquency in this matter? This, among many of a like detrimental tendency, that the eldership, instead of continuing to discharge the purely spiritual ministry to which they were ordained, slunk down into a sphere of service vastly inferior to that defined in the Word of God for the deacon. . . . Well, waiving the right of the session, may not the duty be sufficiently discharged by our managing committees? Where, I ask in reply, is our authority for appointing these committees? Are they not, as we have stated already, the creation of a worldly expediency which crept in to supply the place of principle? and we the pas-

tors have been guilty of countenancing, if not introducing, the anomaly. There may be cases, indeed, where a condition of things has grown out of long usage such that these Committees could not be presently dispensed with; but, with these exceptions, we should take immediate steps to relieve the truly worthy and respectable brethren who compose them, of the false position in which they have been placed, by having them duly ordained to the deacon's office."

Among the benefits to be expected from the revival of this office, he insists upon its influence in awakening a more enlarged and active benevolence:

"Such, then, is the love of God; always a *giving, self-denying, self-sacrificing* affection. But where is the scope for its exercise in our Church? You reply, perhaps, in the maintenance of the great work of missions. And how, I ask, does it fare with the funds for supporting these blessed enterprises? Are they not straitened to the verge of insolvency? And so, we predict, they will continue to be till the deacon's office become again an integral part of our Church's organization. Our people will never exhibit any thing like an adequate measure of liberality toward the support of schemes for converting the souls of distant heathens and Jews, till they have first learned duly to sympathize with, and minister to, the afflicted, the bereaved, and the destitute among their own membership at home. We are very confident that the revival of the Deacon's office will be found mightily to conduce to the enlargement of a liberal spirit toward every Christian and charitable object. Situated as we are, at present, there is no channel *ever open* for the outflow of God's love from the hearts of His people in the forms of active beneficence; and therefore the affection is languid, and requires to be artfully solicited when we make our quarterly appeal to it for so much as barely suffices to keep the life in our sickly Missions. Would our churches need to be importuned in order to procure contributions toward the discharge of that first and highest of the relative duties—the duty of providing that the gospel of salvation be preached to every creature that is under heaven—if the love of God were properly exercised in their membership? Certainly not. Calls on behalf of such objects would be cordially welcomed and bountifully responded to."

A SCRIPTURAL VIEW of Woman's Rights and Duties in all the important Relations of Life. By Elizabeth Wilson. 12mo., pp. 376. Philadelphia: 1849.

The subject treated in this book is unquestionably important; but we cannot commend the doctrines inculcated respecting it in this volume. Mrs. W. maintains that women have not only equal personal and social rights with men, but that they are alike eligible to *all* offices in church and in state; and that in the family relation there is no conjugal authority. This is plainly contrary to the teaching of Scripture; and it is only by what we are compelled to call sophistry, that Scripture can be made to teach any such principle. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord." Col. iii. 18. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife." Eph. v. 22, 23. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence: for Adam was first formed, and then Eve." 1 Tim. ii. 12, 13. True, God "called *their* name Adam." Why? Because woman was represented in man. If there are any laws unjust towards women, let them be repealed; but the best advice women can give to one another, is not to be discontented with the position assigned her by her Maker, but, in the language of Paul to Titus, "that they may be sober, to love

their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, keepers at home, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed." Tit. ii. 4, 5.

CORRECTION.

"In the published report of the Treasurer of the Theological Seminary, there is an error which materially alters the indebtedness of the church. It appears thus in the report:

'Leaving a balance due Rev. T. Sproull, . . .	\$177,18
The true account stands thus:	
Balance due Rev. T. Sproull, at Synod of 1847. See	
Ref. Pres., Vol. 11, p. 138,	\$388,08
Paid him March 28, 1849, by late Treasurer, . . .	11,00
	<hr/>
Balance due him,	\$377,08

The attention of the Clerk of Synod was some time since directed to this error."

The above we find in the last number of the Reformed Presbyterian. The only intimation we recollect to have had on this subject was—if we do not mistake—the day after the adjournment of Synod, when Mr. Sproull mentioned it, adding that he would look into it when he returned home. This is the last we ever heard of it. We published the report as we got it. It was not our business to correct it.—Ed. Cov.

DAY OF FASTING, &c.—The first Thursday of February is appointed by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, to be observed as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer, by all the congregations under its jurisdiction.

EDITOR'S NOTICE.—Correspondents will please address the Editor at Belle Centre, Logan county, Ohio, until further advice.

NEW YORK PRESBYTERY.—In our notice of the late meeting, we omitted to say that the report of the Committee on the Presbyterial Mission Fund was *adopted*. We should also have mentioned that, agreeably to order of Presbytery, we furnished for the Reformed Presbyterian a copy of the resolutions, also adding an outline of the entire proceedings.

The Covenanter.—A Correction.—We ask pardon of our friend of the Covenanter, for having mistaken the action of his Synod in reference to the declinature of Mr. Neil. We have only to say, that in representing his name as having been struck from the roll of Synod in consequence of his declinature, we thought we were giving the facts of the case. How the impression was made upon our mind we cannot tell, but such an impression we had, and hope to be excused from making a statement which we have discovered by an examination their published minutes do not warrant. Will the editor be so kind as to insert this correction?—Ed. of *Evan. Rep.*

THE COVENANTER.

FEBRUARY, 1850.

THE DEACONS.

Phil. i. 1.—“with the Bishops and Deacons.”

We commend the following essay to the special attention of our readers. It is the third of the series on the subject of Deacons, the second of which we published in our last. The reasoning is, we think, unanswerable; and is presented with such clearness and cogency, that it cannot fail to carry conviction to any unprejudiced mind.—ED. COV.

PROPOSITION IV. *All the ecclesiastical property should be under the hand of divinely appointed officers.* This will appear from the following considerations.

1. Such property was under the hands of the Priests and Levites under the Old Testament dispensation. Abraham gave tithes to Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God. Gen. xiv. 20; Heb. vii. 5. The Tabernacle and its furniture were under the care of the Priests and Levites. Numb. iii. and iv. chaps. The chambers and treasuries in the days of David were under the same charge. 1 Chron. ix. 26, and xxvi. 20, 28. They continued so in the days of Solomon. 2 Chron. viii. 14, 15. In the days of Hezekiah. 2 Chron. xxxi. 12, 13. “Cononiah the Levite,” and Shimei his brother, with ten others. “Kore the Levite,” with six others, “to distribute to their brethren,” verses 14, 21. In the days of Nehemiah, Levites were set over the business of the house of God. Chap. xi. 22. The *outward business* is specified, verse 16. “And Shabbethai and Jozabad, of the chief of the Levites, had the oversight of the outward business of the house of God.” Chap. xiii. 13. “And I made treasurers over the treasuries, Shelemiah the Priest, and Zadok the Scribe; and of the Levites, Pedaiah; and next to them was Hanan the son of Zaccur, the son of Mattaniah; for they were counted faithful, and their office was to distribute unto their brethren.”

2. The early converts in the New Testament Church put their contributions under like control. Acts iv. 34, 35. “Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessed of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles’ feet; and distribution was made to every man according as he had need.” The case of Joses, a Levite, mentioned in the 36th and 37th verses, affords a clear illustration, of both the change of priesthood and the retaining of the old principle, that ecclesiastical property should be under the hand of ecclesiastical officers; for Joses the Levite claims no official privileges in the Christian church, but sells his patrimony and lays the price at the feet of the apostles. Ananias and Sapphira laid the *part* which they contributed at the feet

of the apostles. Chap. v. 2. The disciples at Antioch, where they were first called Christians, sent their contributions to the elders, by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Those who were to carry the contributions from Corinth, must be commissioned by Paul, even though he were going along with them. 1 Cor. xvi. 3. "Whomsoever ye shall appoint by your letters, them *will I send* to bring your liberality to Jerusalem." On another occasion we find Paul duly commissioning Titus and another brother in the gospel, to Corinth from Macedonia, to solicit money and to have all ready against his coming. 2 Cor. viii. 16, 19, and xii. 18.

3. When distribution became burdensome to the apostles, seven men were elected and ordained, for the express purpose of serving tables, and set over that business.

4. The officers of divine appointment are sufficient to manage all ecclesiastical concerns. If Ministers, Elders, and Deacons, be possessed of the qualifications required by the Head of the church, they will be suitable and trustworthy; there is then no need of others. When the fiscal affairs of a congregation require more attention than the ruling Elders can conveniently afford, Deacons can be as easily chosen as Trustees, or any other non-commissioned officers.

5. Ordained officers are allowed by both sides, in the present controversy, to manage a large portion of the church's funds: those belonging to the poor—to superannuated ministers—to missions, foreign and domestic—travelling expenses—professors' salaries—expenses of sacraments—contributions to one congregation from another. Now, when so many of these funds are actually managed by ordained officers, it is natural to ask, "Why not the whole?" Is not the provision of a gospel minister as sacred as that of an orphan boy or Grecian widow? Is not the salary of a settled Pastor, as that of a missionary? Is not the support of a minister as much the concern of church officers, while he is ministering at the altar, as when he becomes superannuated? All seem to belong to the church organic, and should be under the same kind of management.

6. It is admitted that all divine ordinances should be attended to by ordained officers; it has already been shown that the maintenance of the ministry belongs to this department: yet this is one of the affairs most strenuously claimed for the unordained officers.

7. We have no account in Scripture of any fiscal agency to manage church property other than her ordained officers. Civil rulers contributed and directed a national support to be given to her, and under God directed her officers how to use it; but the distribution and use of it we find always in the hand of ecclesiastical officers, divinely appointed and formally ordained. It is dangerous to introduce a new element into the affairs of the church, even in "the outward business of the house of God."

V. *"The business which is ordinarily transacted by congregational Trustees, ought to be intrusted to Deacons."*

This proposition is announced in the words of Synod's decision in 1847, against which a number of brethren entered their dissent. See Reformed Presbyterian, vol. ix. p. 134, and Covenanter, vol. ii. p. 385. With that decision the writer is fully agreed, however he may differ with some of his brethren in relation to some of the steps by which it was arrived at. He judged that he had light enough to vote on that subject, even if he knew no more about Trustees, but that they do church

business; for even the outward business of the house of God should be managed by ordained officers. Neither does he account it *new* legislation; he finds such legislation in the records of the church for more than 3000 years; in the records of the Christian church for more than 1800 years; in the Covenanting church for nearly 300 years; provision made for it in the Testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian church for 40 years, and the subject in overture before Synod for nearly 11 years previous. The same principle is also fairly exhibited in the action of Synod 1821, p. 115. He accounts it no invasion of the people's rights to tell them what they ought to do. Nor does he know one line in the Westminster Confession of Faith, to which it is contrary. The action of Synod appears warranted by the following:

1. There is no warrant in Scripture for unordained officers managing any of the church's affairs: what is not warranted in Scripture ought to be discarded.

2. The "seven" whose election and ordination we have in the 6th chapter of Acts, were set over all the property known to belong to the church at the time.

Much has been *said* about these seven and their business. 1. That they were Ministers of the Gospel. 2. That they were ruling Elders. 3. That there was some church property not put into their hands. 4. That they had no charge but what belonged to the poor. None of all these *sayings* has been proved. Episcopalians, and those who adopt their views, have presented as strong arguments for the first of these sayings, as any known to us have advanced for the others. As we write only for brethren, we pass all extraneous matter and observe on the argument in hand: 1. We find but one stock, indeed one common fund, belonging to the church at this time. Acts ii. 44; iv. 34, 35. 2. This was laid at the apostles' feet. Acts iv. 34, 37. 3. This business was more than the apostles could manage consistently with their higher employments. Acts vi. 1, 2. 4. The "seven" were set over the same business. Acts vi. 3, 4. This one stock is all any has yet shown as belonging to the church; the apostles neither retained a part of it, nor transferred any part of it to any others than the "seven." It follows that the deacons are the proper persons to attend to all the financial concerns of the church.

3. The Deacons and the poor are never so associated in the Scriptures, as to exclude other concerns. The only passage we know of, that is drawn on for that purpose, is Acts vi. 1, where mention is made of Grecian widows. We are free to admit that they were poor, very poor; for it matters not to the argument whether they were poor or rich, if they had a claim on church property, and the Deacons were to attend to them. This does not exclude others from participating in the same care, and sharing the same fund. According to all fair interpretation, others are necessarily implied as sharers. 1. *Hebrew widows*, if any there were; for no Scripture or reason can be shown that the church should provide for Grecians and not for Hebrews equally needy. 2. Poor orphans, families, *men*, as well as widows. Have not all Christ's poor an equal claim? Matt. xxv. 35; James i. 27; Acts iv. 35—"distribution was made to every *man*," as well as to the widows. 3. Poor Parthians, Medes, Elamites—poor of every nation had, and have an equal claim with Grecian widows, for "distribution was made to every man according as he had need." Matt. xxv. 40, and Col. iii. 11, go to

establish the same position. 4. Apostles, Evangelists, and others having need, in consequence of their devotion to the public service of the church, for "distribution was made to every man *according as he had need.*" The Lord had ordained long before, that they that minister at the altar, should live of the altar. 5. The footsteps of the Covenant flock have marked the track already pointed out. The Church of Scotland, our mother, under the banner of her *National Covenant and Solemn League*, provided that the Deacons and not Collectors, should attend to all her fiscal concerns. See her books of Discipline, first and second, and Acts of Assembly. The footsteps of such a flock are worth following. Yes, the King of Zion commands us to follow them in all doubtful matters; and they ought to be regarded here and followed, until we can show from the Word that they are wrong.

The claim here made is one of high obligation on those who acknowledge the descending obligations of these Covenants. The discipline of the church of Scotland is an integral part of both; and this is a part of her discipline not yet repealed. Of late there has been much discussion in relation to the second Book of Discipline. On this question we offer the following remarks: 1. It was sworn to in the National Covenant, and must stand or fall with that Covenant. Not that we suppose the word "discipline" in that Covenant means simply the second book and no more; no, "discipline" there evidently means her whole system of government, and the persons engaging to join themselves to the Kirk of Scotland, in her discipline, engaged to maintain her system, and to render a practical submission to her administrations, according to that system. Now the question is, What place did the second book occupy in that system? We answer, it was the main document in which the system was exhibited. And if we deny that the Covenanter is bound to the second book, it will be very hard to tell what he is bound to, by the National Covenant. 2. The same book is embraced in the Solemn League. The first engagement of that instrument is, "That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the Reformed Religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies." Now this covenant was sworn before any other document was agreed on by the Westminster Assembly; the second book being still the principal document in which the discipline and government of the Church of Scotland were to be found. 3. The Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in adopting the *Directory for Public Worship*, recognises the validity of her books of discipline and acts of Assemblies up to that time, and provides, in adopting the new directory, "that this shall be no prejudice to the order and practice of this Kirk, in such particulars as are appointed by the books of discipline, and acts of General Assemblies, and are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory." By this proviso, the Church of Scotland fully recognises the obligation of her own ancient discipline, except where it is altered in the new document; and thus, while certain articles are repealed by the admission of a document ordering otherwise, the "books of discipline" are not repealed. Seven days after passing this act, she recognises the obligation of her books of discipline and Acts of Assembly and National Covenant. See her act adopting the Westminster *Form of Government*. And afterwards in adopting the *Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the*

distinctly recognises the obligation of her own received doctrine, worship, discipline, and government. 4. The Westminster documents as adopted by the Church of Scotland, are the *rule ruling* on all subjects of which they treat; and the books of discipline and Acts of General Assemblies are the rule on all subjects embraced in them and omitted in the Westminster standards. 5. The management of the church's temporalities is one of those subjects treated of in the books of discipline and Acts of Assembly and not embraced in any of the Westminster standards, beyond the concerns of the poor. And if we would not recede from a more pointed testimony to one confessedly more loose and general on that point, we must abide by the books of discipline and Acts of General Assemblies. If standards be worth any thing at all, we must abide by them, at least till they are set aside by other arrangements, and these other arrangements must be in accordance with the supreme law, otherwise they will not set aside the obligation of the old.

5. The standards of the Reformed Presbyterian Church nowhere restrict the duties of Deacons to the care of the poor. The Testimony recognises temporalities without distinction. See Chap. xxiii. Sec. 3. The Form of Government mentions the special care of the poor, and says nothing about any other fiscal matter. The National Covenant and Solemn League bind to the discipline of the mother church, as said before. Where, in all the standards, is the restriction made? Now, when the Covenant deeds of the church, once required the Deacons to attend to all the fiscal affairs of the church, and this requisition is neither morally wrong, nor repealed by after deeds, it follows that we should return to the old landmarks, and intrust the same affairs still to the Deacons.

6. All arguments used to show that the power of the Deacons should be restricted to the care of the poor, tend to the abolishing of the Deacon's office, and involve other dangerous errors. This argument will be developed more appropriately in answering objections to the views here presented. We only observe here, in illustration, two facts known to the members of the church generally: first, that the church has been almost totally divested of Deacons, while she professes to hold their office perpetual; secondly, that some of her members have advocated episcopal views of Scripture, and have received too much countenance from brethren.

VI. *Those who devote of their substance to the Lord for the use of his church, have a right to bestow it either for general purposes or for that specific object which they judge most for his glory.*

1. The right of property is given by the Lord, and must be recognised by man. In the exercise of this right the donor can give a direction to the gift while it is yet in his own power.

2. The church has no power of taxation, and cannot authoritatively determine how much any one shall give, or for what purpose. She may teach them the duty of giving, and point out what objects are worthy of their support, and which of them needs most at any particular time; but the contribution of the individual must be a free-will offering, and of course he may give it what direction seems best to him, in the exercise of an enlightened and sanctified judgment.

3. The Scriptures recognise giving for specific objects: for building the Tabernacle, Ex. xxv. 1, 8; for furnishing that Tabernacle—the princes offered, Numb. vii. chap. for repairing the temple, 2 Kings xii.

1, 14; the wood-offering, Neh. x. 34; for the brethren in Judea, Acts xi. 29; for the poor saints at Jerusalem, Rom. xv. 20; for Paul's necessity, Phil. iv. 16.

4. The Scriptures likewise recognise giving for general purposes, and leave the appropriation with the officers. There was a general treasury, designated the treasury of the Lord, Josh. vi. 19. In the days of Nehemiah there was a contribution for general purposes, as well as special, Neh. x. 32—"the third part of a shekel for the service of the house of our God." Verse 33—"for all the work of the house of our God." The contributions recorded Acts ii. and iv. were for general purposes: "as every man had need."

VII. *There should be separate funds in the church; though all should be under ordained officers.*

1. The Scriptures warrant this arrangement. For current expenses we have the atonement money, Ex. xxx. 16; for the support of the Levites, the tithe was appointed, Numb. xviii. 24; the tenth of the tithe was for the Priests, Numb. xviii. 25. In 2 Kings xii. chapter, we have two funds, and a demand for a third; one for the edifice, vs. 11, 14; one for the Priests, v. 16; and one needed to furnish the house when it should be builded, v. 13. The passages cited in the last particular, establish still further this position.

2. By this arrangement the people know what demands there are for their contributions, and which of all the objects presented needs most their support.

3. Officers and Courts can more easily show their faithfulness, in making their reports; and the donors understand that their contributions are properly distributed.

VIII. *Those who have the management of the affairs may not take from one fund and put to another, till all the designs of the first are accomplished.* For—1. This would defeat the intention of the donor, which would not be acting honestly. 2. It would make men abhor the offering of the Lord, as in the days of Eli's sons. 3. They did not make needful articles of furniture, in the days of Joash and Jehoiada, out of the contributions for building the house; nor did they take the sin money or trespass money for building the house or for its furniture. 2 Kings xii. 13, 16.

IX. *When one fund overflows, or all the ends of it are accomplished, the overplus may be appropriated by the rulers to another that is lacking.*

1. Being devoted it is not expected to be returned to the owners, and need not remain unemployed. 2. All the funds belong to the treasury of the Lord, and it is still in His service, although employed in another part of that service. 3. If *equality* be desirable among the churches, as taught in 2 Cor. viii. 13, 15, it is equally desirable among the funds of a particular church or congregation. 4. When the service of God was restored in the days of Joash and Jehoiada, there was such a disposition made of the funds. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12, 13—"and they set the house of God in his state and strengthened it. And when they had finished it, they brought the rest of the money before the King and Jehoiada, whereof were made vessels for the house of the Lord."

X. *The Deacons being administrative officers, should, when called, render account to the session, of all moneys passing through their hands.* This principle is fully recognised in the transactions already

referred to in 2 Kings xii. 15, as also in a like transaction in the days of Josiah, chap. xxii. 7, although in neither instance was the account required by the rulers, so great was the confidence placed in the administrators. The propriety of this arrangement will appear from the following considerations:

1. The session has the power of ordination, and by consequence of future jurisdiction. 2. The ruling power in all communities must have a general supervision of its concerns; and the Deacons are helps to the governments. 3. It is not in accordance with the principles of Presbyterian government, that the officers should be judged by the people; yet the people have a right to know that all the affairs are conducted properly; the only way that this can be accomplished, is by accounts rendered publicly to the rulers, and open for the inspection of the people; who, if they find any thing out of order, may not rectify it, but apply to the ruling officers to have it rectified.

XI. It belongs not to the Courts of the Lord's house, to take the property which is now ordinarily managed by trustees, or other unordained officers, and commit it to the Deacons: for—

1. Such property is not formally devoted; some of it no doubt is, and most or all of it is intended to be used as devoted; but the idea of devoting, according to the Scriptures, is lost sight of, by putting it into the hands of officers neither recognised by the Head of the church, nor by her courts. 2. Such property has not been put by the donors under the direction of the courts, and so, much of what has been said before about transferring money from one fund to another, will apply in this particular. 3. No power can render that property as dedicated to the Lord, other than the power that is in actual possession of it, the people.*

XII. It is the province and duty of Ministers and Courts to teach the people their duty in this respect.

1. The finances of the church are often of great importance to her, and their management is a matter of interest to every member. 2. There is much said about the church's goods in the Scriptures. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." 3. Believers are as ready to sin in relation to these matters as any other, and should be warned. Were there not sin among us in relation to these matters, there would not be so much diversity of views and of practice. The honour of God is concerned in these matters, and the prosperity of his people. Prov. iii. 9. All should know in what way they can honour him best, and enjoy his blessing most fully.

The writer has endeavoured in the foregoing remarks to point out the way that appears to him to be taught in the Scriptures. Any inaccuracy in facts or quotations, or any fallacy in reasoning, will be candidly acknowledged when pointed out by any of his brethren, in a temperate, brotherly style. Future articles, if spared, will be directed to meeting some plausible objections to the views here presented.

R. H.

* This is true. The placing of funds in the hands of trustees is extra-ecclesiastical. Of course it is not put, and perhaps does not profess to be put, under the Head of the Church. Consequently, it does not belong to Church Courts to transfer it. But they should teach the people, as in the following paragraph, what is their duty, and call upon them in the name of the Head of the Church to do it.—Ed. Cov.

Foreign Correspondence.

London—Westminster Abbey—Houses of Parliament—British Museum—Aristocracy—Smithfield.

I saw no building in Britain that so impressed me as Westminster Abbey. It is in the west, near the Thames, and nearly opposite Westminster Hall and the Parliament Houses. You enter it, at the eastern end, by a small door, and find yourself in the Poet's Corner. There you may read, on tablets and monuments—some very plain, others ornamented—most of the great names of English literature. You pay sixpence; and when a company of at least six or eight is made up, you set out to view, under the guidance of an attendant, to whom the whole is, of course, familiar, the celebrated chapels that occupy the eastern portion of the edifice. In all, there are tombs—the tombs of kings, queens, dukes, duchesses, &c. &c., some of them many centuries old, each with an effigy as large as life—some of orange, some of marble, and some of alabaster. Here are buried the entire line of England's kings and queens, with a few exceptions, since Edward the Confessor, by whom the Abbey was first erected. His tomb is in this chapel, and occupies a central position—the others being disposed in a semi-circle around it. It has almost crumbled to pieces. The inscriptions are gone, and the whole presents the appearance of a rough erection of smooth, but undressed stones. Near this are the tombs of the Edwards, of Richard I., of the elder Henrys, and their queens,—among them I regarded with interest that of Philippa, the wife of Edward III. In the same chapel is the tomb of Aymer de Valence, a distinguished Crusader. Here is also the coronation chair—a very plain armed chair, made of oak, straight backs, and arms, not unlike the old-fashioned big arm-chairs to be seen in country kitchens. Under the seat is the “throne of state,” brought from Scone, in Scotland, upon which the kings of Scotland were, in old times, crowned. I think it is a block of sandstone—I did not examine it very closely—some two feet square, and half a foot thick. In what particular part or property its virtue resides, I could not see. In another chapel are the tombs of bloody Mary and of Elizabeth. They are under the same canopy—and upon each a figure beautifully wrought, one of them of alabaster.

All these things, and many more, you see—hastily, and if disposed to reflect, with wonder, with sadness, and with humility,—and then you emerge into the Abbey itself, and are filled, even after seeing St. Paul's, with the highest admiration. It is three hundred and seventy-five feet long, two hundred feet wide, (the nave and aisles seventy-five wide,) and one hundred and one high. Imagine such a nave—separated by massive columns from the side-aisles, and terminated by a corridor, which nearly fills the space between the large towers at the western extremity of the building. Throughout the nave, at the foot of the columns, and along the walls, as well as in the transept—or in the arms of the cross—are sepulchral monuments of the great. Just at the cross itself is a reading-desk, and some plain benches for, probably, five or six hundred people. There prayers are read every Sabbath morning, and a sermon preached or read every Sabbath.

No part of the Abbey is seen with more interest than Henry VII.'s chapel. It is attached to the east end of the Abbey, and is not quite on a line with the main building. You ascend some steps, and enter through folding doors of brass, of great size, and most elaborate and

skilful workmanship. Before you is the tomb of the founder,—above you the roof of marble, wrought with the utmost skill and taste, appearing like network or embroidery; on the two sides of the nave are the stalls of the Knights of St. John, and before each their banners, some very old, bearing their insignia, and in the side-aisles memorials of the dead; on the south, royal vaults; in the north, the bones of the murdered princes. This chapel is regarded by architects and connoisseurs as a gem of art, occupying the first place, and rivalled only by Roslin and Melrose, in Scotland. It is a beautiful edifice, certainly; forming a fine contrast with the overpowering grandeur of the Abbey itself.

To the north of this Abbey, and but a few hundred feet distant, is St. Margaret's Chapel, in which the Assembly of Divines held their sessions. It is a small building, and has nothing remarkable in its outward appearance. It was undergoing some repairs, and there was no admission at the time of my visit.

While in the neighbourhood, I may notice the Parliament, which I visited three times during my stay in London, having, through the kindness and attention of Mr. George Thomson, member for Tower Hamlets, every facility of access.* I spent two evenings in the House of Commons. On one of these the House was occupied with the Roman Catholic Relief Bill,—on the other with the West India, or Sugar question. I had, of course, a pretty favourable opportunity both of seeing and hearing some of the leading politicians of both parties. As speakers, they are not at all remarkable. The best I heard was John Bright, the Quaker, from Manchester, who did not hesitate to pain the ears of his aristocratic auditory by speaking of his "trade." Of the rest, some were good, others passable, others intolerable. One fact struck me very forcibly and favourably in regard to the matter of their speeches—they scarcely refer to theories,—they deal almost altogether in facts, and deductions from facts. The House of Commons is a very disorderly body. There is a great deal of talking, quite loud talking, while business is going on,—and speakers are hissed and applauded, sometimes as vociferously as they could be at a backwoods' town-meeting. They sit at night, commencing at four in the afternoon, and continuing until after midnight. About seven the House becomes quite thin: the members have gone to dinner: about nine they return: some of them to take part, and some—as I can bear witness—to stretch themselves out upon the benches, and take a nap.

The House of Lords is an orderly assemblage. I heard them discussing some changes in the Scottish law of entail. This brought up the northern peers, and gave me the opportunity of hearing the Dukes of Buccleugh, Montrose, and Argyle. The two former are no speakers at all,—and, unless they have more sense than is indicated by their appearance, they are no credit to the principle of hereditary legislative power. Argyle is a man of another stamp. He is a small man—sandy-

* There are two galleries to the House of Commons—the people's and the speaker's. The latter occupies the end of the hall, opposite the speaker's chair, and is a very convenient place for seeing and hearing; the former is back of this, and still higher. The speaker's will hold about forty persons—the other, perhaps, twice that number. To enter the people's gallery, you must go early—take your stand near the door, and walk in as soon as it is opened. When it is full, the door is closed; and none can enter until one leaves, when the next in order takes his place. To the speaker's gallery, he only gives admission, on application. I was put on his list, and had, of course, a good place.

haired—well-proportioned, with a high and remarkably well-formed forehead, very affable in his address, and a good speaker. He is quite young—but twenty-three at that time—and has only been a short time in the House. At college he was distinguished as a student, and is now aiming at literary and legislative distinction. I need hardly say that I observed him with no little interest. As to the English Lords, I saw nothing remarkable about the most of them, except the want of any thing striking. The Marquis of Lansdown is a fine-looking man,—so is Lord Stanley. Lord Ellenborough, late Governor-General of India, would be noticed any where. The bulk of the rest—except Lord Brougham, who looks like a pretty high-living, carelessly-dressed farmer—and a few others, are only common-looking men. They address each other very politely. Indeed, a considerable portion of some of their speeches was made up of apologies and reiterations of “the noble Duke,” “the noble Lord,” &c. &c. In short, the Lords are far from being an august body. They would compare very badly, in the same apartment, with the Senate of the United States. A visit or two breaks the charm with which distance and elevation usually invest dignities like these. I only add, that to an American, the wigs worn by the speakers of both houses—by the clerks, and the Attorney-General, as they are by the judges of the courts, and barristers, are merely ridiculous. That a sensible people like the English, should retain these ill-looking and inconvenient appendages to legislative and judicial dignity, is not easy to account for,—and especially, when we remember that they cover their coachmen and footmen with these same, or at least equally good-looking or ill-looking wigs.

London abounds in places of public resort for combined instruction and recreation. Of these I visited the British Museum more than once, and with growing interest. Indeed, it was a matter of regret that my stay was too short to allow me sufficient time for a more thorough survey of this wonderful depository of the works of nature and of art. The admission is free, except two days of the week—and in good weather the spacious rooms are always well filled. As you enter, you see in the court yard some of the relics of the ancient Britons—a boat, and some implements of warfare. In the building itself, you see the spoils of Nineveh, of Egypt, of Asia Minor, of Greece, of Tuscany, of Rome. Here are the Elgin marbles, the marbles of Lycia, hundreds of Etruscan vases, and other antiquities. The animal and mineral kingdoms are here spread out before you. Among other objects I single out the remains of the gigantic reptiles, now extinct, the Megalotherium, and others of the same general character. Room after room is filled with these collections, until you become almost lost and bewildered. In part of the same building is the Library, an immense collection, which, I regret to say, I did not visit. I deferred it until it was too late.

I have spoken of the Parks as admirably adapted for public resort. Every afternoon, as I have mentioned, at four o'clock, the gentry drive in Hyde Park; on Tuesday and Friday they extend their ride to Kensington Gardens, and there walk for a couple of hours. As I wished to see every thing visible about the great metropolis, I wended my way on Tuesday afternoon to Kensington Gardens. There they were by the hundred—well-dressed and lively, but nothing more. It may be that the higher classes in England are better developed, physically, than in other countries, but I confess, it did not so strike me. At least, the dif-

ference was not by any means great. The ladies retain their fresh looks, but this is owing to the climate. As to the men—I may be prejudiced—but I saw no evidence of greater physical powers than the same sex in the new world. And certainly, among the lower classes, there is, in London, a marked deficiency. The streets abound with a population, on which hardship and privation have set their unmistakeable marks.

I should have mentioned Smithfield, the martyr ground of England. It is a large open area, some five or six hundred feet in diameter, nearly circular, about a quarter of a mile north-west of St. Paul's, and, of course, almost in the centre of the city. The stakes were set up in the centre of this area, and there were Rogers and his fellows martyred. At present, and for centuries past, Smithfield is the great cattle market of London. The buildings around it give evidence of antiquity.—J. M. W.

[For the Covenanter.]

REVIEW OF "AN INQUIRY AS TO WHAT IS OUR STANDARD OF ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT," BY T. S., TOGETHER WITH SOME OTHER NOTICES, BY THE SAME.

The main points at issue between T. S. and us have been evaded, while minor matters, comparatively trivial, have been elaborated; new questions raised, never in dispute with us, or in our church, and we charged with errors as far from our mind and from our essays, as he supposes them from the truth. That controversy among brethren should be managed in such a way, is to be lamented. Into any such course we design never to be drawn. We desire rather, by grace, to be kept from exposing our common mother.

We shall confine this introductory to some of the palpable misstatements of our brother—we do not say designed. They are in their nature hurtful to truth and peace, and should be corrected. We, therefore, ask brother T. S. to reconsider the following, and we trust he will, as a candid man, retract.

First. We are charged, (Pp. 76—83, Ref. Pres., vol. xiii.) with an attempt to change the standards by substituting the 2d Book of Discipline for the Form of Government, and with the "*design* of falling back from the attainments of the second reformation to the point reached at the first." Now, unless he means to make his readers believe the trustee was an attainment of the second reformation over the first, he either means nothing, or he means to misrepresent. For he knows the trustee is the present issue, and that all the labour about attachment to the Westminster attainments is to establish the favourite system; and, moreover, he knows the trustee was no part of the reformation, *first* or *second!* What does he mean by the alarm-cry of changing, substituting, falling back? Let him answer or retract.

Second. He charges somebody (P. 77,) with "the modern invention of the deacons distributing under the direction of the congregation." From him we have the very first notice of such invention. T. S. is its author; for what use, is for him to say. The alarm, in the same sentence, about the "*monstrosity*" of a deacon's court, or consistory, will be understood. Its effect on those for whom designed will not be lost. Has T. S. forgotten the adjustment of the consistory question by Synod? Does he not know that all dangerous power claimed for consistory has been condemned, to the professed satisfaction of the brother

and of his party, and this too by deacon men? Why then make differences where all have agreed?

Third. "One of the Committee," *alias* T. S., (Ref. Pres., Sept. No., p. 209,) misrepresents *greatly*, or we are mistaken *greatly*. He says, "They are greatly deceived, who think that the question now agitating the church is, whether congregations shall manage their finances by trustees, or in some other way." Does this statement of brother T. S. fairly represent the question agitated and argued by C. B. M'Kee in his "Anti-Deacon?" Does it fairly represent A. Dodds and J. Nightingale? Does it fairly represent brother Crozier on the head of his civil capacity *circa sacra* doctrine?—his strictures on the resolutions of the Miami congregation? Does it fairly represent the dissent of eighteen members of Synod, 1847, from the following resolution of Synod: "That the business that is ordinarily transacted by congregational trustees, ought to be intrusted to deacons?" This, the eighteen say, "is new legislation—an invasion of the people's rights—contrary to the Confession of Faith," &c. "Deceived about the question agitating the church!" The deaf and blind may—none else. Does not Synod say deacons ought to manage the finances of the congregation? Do not the dissenters say trustees should? This not *the question* agitating? Yes, and fiercely, by men who *say* it is not "worth the expenditure of a breath or a penful of ink!" Does this statement fairly represent T. S. himself! (Ref. Pres., Feb. No., 1848, p. 363.) There he labours to find the place of the trustee—"a substitute for the civil magistrate in the matter of supporting the church." There he opposes the Synod, and defends the eighteen dissenters. And all know the question was whether deacons or trustees shall "*do what is usually done by trustees.*" Synod affirms—T. S., with the dissenters, denies. But why deny this issue? T. S. well knows it is a miserably bad one in the face of all the standards of all Presbyterian churches, and the practice of the reformation church of Scotland. Hence, new questions must be raised, misrepresenting entirely *the* question now agitating our church. To some of these we shall now attend.

Fourth misrepresentation. (Ref. Pres., Sept. No., 1849, p. 209.) "Not so, however, with regard to the question whether the church has power to enact laws about things indifferent, and enforce them on the consciences of the people." What is designed by this, we cannot say. Perhaps T. S. means the support of the ministry; for he does not inform us whether this is an indifferent thing. If he so holds, then he and the Bible, as also the subordinate standards, are at issue. If he does not mean this, let him mean what he may, he charges falsely. He knows neither the Synod nor any deacon-man has ever maintained this popish abomination. Every intelligent Covenanter abhors the doctrine. Why then has our brother, in his own name—in the name of the "petitioners and many others with them," sent abroad against the Synod and his brethren such a false imputation—one that must work prejudice, alienation, and schism in the church?

Fifth misrepresentation. "Not so with regard to the question whether church courts have the power to annul the acts of a congregation choosing its own agents to do its own business, and appoint others in their stead." We are free to say, we know no one of the majority of Synod holding such an affirmative; and we are sure, Synod never passed an act warranting such an inference. Congregations have their

own business, and may do it in their own way and by their own agents, and no power on earth may interfere. Why moot the silly question? What has it to do with the question really agitating the church? Where have congregations more freedom than where there are deacons? No where. And now we challenge T. S. to a comparison and examination. Who denies to congregations the right of free and frequent meetings? The right of calling pastors—the right of fixing salaries—the right of making all contributions, subscriptions, collections, donations, all appropriations, gifts, dedications, &c., whatsoever?

Sixth misrepresentation. “Not so with regard to the question whether secular functions shall be assigned to ecclesiastical officers, and secular courts organized, unknown to the standards of the church, foreign to the spirituality of the church, and subversive of the first principles of presbyterianism.” That Synod or deacon-men assign to ecclesiastical officers secular functions—or maintain that secular courts should be organized in the church, is simply a false statement, without cause or provocation. This is the more insidious and injurious, as it is evidently designed to call up that talismanic ghost called *consistory*, long since disowned by Synod, as charged by the anti-deacon party upon the friends of the deacon. We must here appeal to the action of Synod on this subject. In 1845, the following was passed:

“*Resolved*, That said covenanted uniformity does not recognise as of divine right, a consistory of ministers, elders, and deacons having authority to enact, govern, and control the church, either in her spiritual or temporal concerns, or as having *any authority or power whatever*, except for consultation and advice for the well-ordering of the temporal affairs of the congregation.”

This resolution was the result of legislation sought by the anti-deacon party, and passed by deacon men. In 1847, anti-deacon men asked to know the meaning of the resolution—deacon men replied, they being the majority, as follows:

“They wish information in regard to a consistory of minister, elders, and deacons, meeting for consultation and advice. They meet together, not as an ecclesiastical court, but to consult with and advise one another, in relation to the discharge of their own official duties. The decisions of consistory are not designed to affect the action of the congregation, or of individuals, but only that of its own members.”

Now, after all this, when anti-deacon men find fault as they do, we are inclined to think they do not in heart believe the Westminster Form on this subject; especially, as they do not practise, or give others peace who do practise, according to the Form. We know men by their fruits. Do they believe it to be “*requisite*” that deacons should be in “*each particular congregation*,” and that *all* the officers should meet together “*for the well-ordering of the affairs of the congregation?*” No. They believe no such thing. If they do, why not practise? The Bible says, and we believe, “their faith is dead.” Men who neither believe nor exemplify the standards, of necessity, find it convenient to charge falsely their brethren who believe, and endeavour to reduce them to practice.

Seventh misrepresentation. “Not so with regard to the question whether the *new element* of the direct accountability of the officers to the people shall become a part of our ecclesiastical system.” This misrepresentation, to say the least of it, is passing strange; coming, especially, from a party professing so much concern for the people’s rights.

We have taxed our imagination to invent a meaning or design; and unless T. S. refers to the views and practice of those advocating the deacon, in regard to full reports of all financial transactions made to the people, at least annually, we know not what he means. And now we ask him—does a report of all the doings of the deacons, or consistory, involve this charge?—direct accountability to the people? If so, does not the publishing of the minutes of Synod and Presbyteries involve the same? We hold that the people have a right to a full and faithful report of all the deeds of all their officers, temporal and spiritual. Do T. S. and his party really maintain the contrary?—and will he be candid enough to avow it? Will brother T. S. tell us what he means by “*direct accountability*?” No, indeed, that would spoil all! This charge looks very ungraceful on the same page with one just a little above, namely, that “church courts have the power to annul the acts of a congregation.” We must have a very pliant faith, if we believe as charged in both. If courts can “*annul*,” as charged, they need feel little concern about their “*direct accountability to the people!*”

Eighth misrepresentation. “Not so with regard to the question whether to provide for the temporal support of the church shall be denied to the civil ruler, and to the people in their civil capacity when he neglects it.” Whether this charge is made through ignorance, or from some worse cause, we have no desire to judge. But this we do say—T. S. ought to know there is no such question in dispute in our church. Who, in the name of truth and Christian candour, in the covenanted church denies the right of the civil ruler, and of the people in their civil capacity, to provide temporal support to the church? Not one deacon man. The charge is a wholesale fabrication. Let the truth be told. The magistrate and the people both are in their places to furnish temporal support in the church. Exodus xxv. 1—7, Isa. xlix. 23. Kings are bound to *bring presents*—all in their places are bound to *give* to the church temporal support, as the Lord prospers them. In this, all agree. The question at issue lies behind all this, and T. S. knows it. When kings or people *give offerings, gifts, or tithes* to the church, then the things *given to the church* are church goods—“*patrimony of the kirk*.” Now, who shall “*intromit*” with church goods?—that is the question. Not who may or ought to *give* to the church. The anti-deacon party say the civil officer, or “*his substitute*,” should “*intromit*” with the support in question. The Synod says the deacon should manage all *the things given* or dedicated to the church. So said John Calvin, and all presbyterian reformers from his day till now. On the other side of *this* question, bishops, prelates, kings, and lordly courts, with modern anti-deacon men, stand arrayed. There is nothing new under the sun, let men hard-pressed endeavour to shift the question as they may, and make false issues as they must, and, moreover, the time has come when men who make such false charges must be held responsible.

Ninth misrepresentation. “Not so with regard to the question whether the Form of Church Government shall not remain entire as the standard of the church in ecclesiastical government; whether it shall be altered in letter or spirit by acts of Synod, or superseded by any other document not named in the terms of communion.” This compound charge contains three false ones: false, if applied to Synod;

false, if applied to us. We have maintained, and do still maintain, that the Form shall remain *entire* as a standard—that it shall not be altered—that it shall not be superseded. Dare T. S. and his party say so in good faith, in practice? Let us see. 1. The Form says, Conf., p. 572, the perpetual office of the deacon is proved from Acts vi. 1. This is denied, Anti-deacon, p. 14. 2. The Form says the seven men ordained, Acts vi. 1, were deacons. This is denied, Anti-deacon, p. 15, says they were evangelists. 3. The Form says deacons are proved to be distinct officers, from Phil. i. 1. This is denied, Anti-deacon, pp. 18, 19. 4. The Form says that, beside the officers of pastor and elder “of a single congregation,” “a particular congregation,” “*it is likewise requisite there be*” deacons. This is denied by Anti-deacon, p. 33, in these words: “*The office of deacons, beside the offices of pastor and ruling elder, is superfluous.*” See also, over the signature C, Jan. No. Ref. Presb., 1850. 5. The “Directory for Public Worship” is charged with error, namely, “provision is made for the admission of *sponsors.*” “Reformers never admitted this, and they never will, while they continue faithful to their testimony.” Anti-deacon, p. 39. The Directory affirms Bible truth. Which party denies? That with which T. S. identifies! Other parts of the “Directory” are held up to ridicule by Anti-deacon;” as “under the head of marriage,” and in “the directions for family worship.” We maintain and believe all to be true and defensible. Do T. S. and his party? Now, let it be remembered, this same author of “Anti-deacon” was the selected favourite of T. S. in 1847, when the New York Charter question was before Synod. C. B. M’Kee and an elder of T. S. were by him placed on the committee; C. B. M’Kee, chairman, known to be opposed to the deacon, and to be favourable to the trustee charter system.

And, moreover, can T. S. be sincere when professing so strong attachment to the attainments of the second reformation, and when he charges his brethren with the desire of “altering, superseding,” &c.? His professions and charges will have little weight with honest men, so long as he tells us our covenant fathers would or should have gone into the revolution church, had she only adopted the Form of Church Government! Nothing but the Form between the “Society people” and the “*Erastian establishment*” of William and Mary! Oh! tell it not in Gath! when we indorse what T. S. has written, (Ref. Presb., Oct. 1849, p. 222,) we shall leave the Covenanted church, and return to the Establishment whence we came. Still, in charity, we cannot persuade ourselves that our good brother means what he writes. He writes too much at random. But,

Tenth. He charges us falsely, Ref. Pres., Oct. 1849, p. 220, foot note. There we, with another brother, are charged with misquoting the old Scottish Testimony in a case in which faithful quoting would have been “fatal to the whole argument taken from the extract.” He says, “This is professedly taken from the Old Scottish Testimony.” Not quite what we professed. We wrote in these words, (Cov., vol. iv. p. 257,) “p. 57, edit. 1832.” From this edition of 1832 we made all our quotations. What right had our brother, knowing this, to judge us by the edition of 1762, from which he quotes? For he says, “On examining our copy, an *old edition,*” &c. Now the truth is, the Form of Church Government, as quoted by T. S., is expunged in the edition of 1832. And knowing this, why did our good brother hold us up as

quoting rashly? This whole matter is characteristic of the hasty, rash, and injurious writing of T. S. Now, we ask brother T. S., only be candid enough to acknowledge that the expunging of the "sum of saving knowledge," and the "Form," as in the edition of 1832, is fatal to his argument. The Scottish Synod saw plainly, the sum of saving knowledge and the Form, in the connexions referred to, were not in the proper "*category*"—therefore expunged. Will T. S. expunge?

Eleventh. In Ref. Pres., vol. xiii., p. 218, head of the page, we are misrepresented. Eleven lines are there presented as a quotation, from whence we are not told—all as if found in the same place, and in the same connexion; yet, in truth, taken from *three* different pages, and from *four* different connexions—from pages 259, 260, and 261. The *first* part of the extract taken from a little above the middle of p. 259, and in connexion with our definition of the meaning of the phrase in our terms of communion—"For substance." The *second* part of the quotation is taken from near the bottom of the same page, and in a connexion entirely different, namely: "Whether the officers of a congregation or the people are to transact this affair"—the calling of a minister. The *third* is from p. 260, and in a connexion as far different from the *second*, to which it is yoked, as *one* differs from *three*; and so makes me to say, *first*, what I do not say; and, *second*, what is not true. In the *second*, I am speaking of calling a minister. In the *third*, I am speaking, *first*, in *general*, of "electing all the officers of a congregation," and *second*, *particularly* of the Form, as "defining and settling the rights of the people, and *powers* of their officers"—*all* their officers—even elders and deacons, *these latter particularly*. Then I say, as quoted by T. S., "They (the people,) never submitted to the repeal of the clear, and pointed, and particular Discipline," &c. For example, the Church of Scotland never repealed the detailed statement of the powers and duties of the elder, with the design of limiting to the brief statement of the Form. The elders have always claimed, and the people expected of them, more duties and powers exercised than are stated in the Form. But by this garbling process I am made to say of the "*calling of ministers*," what I say of the *powers*, also, of ministers, elders, and deacons, which "*powers*" are not defined in the Form as in the Discipline. Thus, in the *fourth*, a sentence is taken from p. 261, and in connexion with "the *duties* and extent of the *powers* of the ruling elder." And even this short appendage is so *mis-pointed* as to read both bad grammar and bad sense. But the garbling answers the end, namely, of charging upon us with quoting the words of our testimony in application to the Form, as if evasive, as we have been falsely charged; while we quoted in application to the fair inference drawn from the position and arguments of Anti-deacon men who maintain the repeal of the Discipline in the adoption of the Form.

We might proceed in our notice of misstatements—we have not noticed the half of them. Let all *these* and all *such* be withdrawn. Let the question at issue in the church be fairly and candidly stated. Let all who are misled go back to 1838, when the opposition to the extent of the power of the deacon, beyond the poor, *first* in the history of presbyterianism made its appearance. Then let them trace down that history till the present. Let not men divert from this issue, and blindfold by saying that the consistory is a "new element of debate." Consistory was in the Geneva church, the French reformed

church, the Holland churches, and the Scottish reformed church in their better days—yes, more than two centuries ago. And more—consistory has been in our church in America for nearly forty years, without debate, till recently. In 1838, this was not the question. It is not now, but as forced forward in front as a kind of covered way, or as an alarm sign hung out.

We ask not consistory, at least as charged upon us by our brethren. We ask not that any congregation, against its wish, be hurried forward to have deacons. We ask no new legislation on the subject of the deacon, or the extent of his power—we need none. Only let agitators cease to oppose the Discipline and Government of the church of Scotland, not otherwise appointed in the Westminster Form, but still *rule*—still *good authority*, as conceded by T. S., and the church will be at rest, as before the present agitations, induced by an offensive attack upon the extent of the power of the deacon, as long settled by the reformation church of Scotland, and all the presbyterian churches, even to the present day. We ask *not one* of the six things charged on us, Ref. Pres., vol. xiii., p. 209. There we are placed on the affirmative of grave questions, against our principles and our practice. But we do ask our brethren to tell the simple truth—not to hold up questions as disputed, about which there is no dispute—not to wrest our words, and make out of them disputes, and hold them up before our enemies as in fierce agitation, when there are no such controversies among us. In one word—we ask all to stand aloof from all questions forced upon us for party purposes, and which are not in dispute, and adhere to *the question*, and *the only one*, out of which all others, as merely subordinate, have grown, namely: Whether deacons, according to the long established discipline and practice of the church of Scotland, or *trustees*, shall manage the temporalities of the church. And let not even this question be pushed to the rending of the church; only let the declaratory statement of the doctrine on the subject remain as settled by Synod, and by the sister Synods, and let the people, in the mean time, be instructed in meekness and faithfulness.

And now, for the final test in this matter now agitating our Zion—Who are pushing unduly this question to the hurt of her peace and unity? Who are pushing division in congregations and in Synod on this head? Who are asking elective affinity divisions in congregations? Where has any deacon minority in any anti-deacon congregation sought a separate organization? Where have the prudent arrangements of any congregation of their temporalities—arrangements which have for their object peace, without compromising principle or conscience on either side, been attacked, as in the case of the attack upon the peaceful resolutions of the Miami congregation? Let church-renders answer—let recorded facts and votes answer. Who have been standing in the breach for years, seeking compromise, and striving against rending congregations on this deacon question? What party, in Synod, for six years past, has been seeking legislation on this question? Not deacon men, but anti-deacon men. Let these facts be known—they will soon be known.

J. B. J.

We hope our readers will give the following article, which we take from a late number of the Princeton Review, a careful perusal. Although of considerable length, it will amply repay the labour of reading it. The subject is one of great importance, and far less understood than it ought to be.—ED.

THE APOSTLESHIP A TEMPORARY OFFICE.

In a former number* an attempt was made to prove that the highest permanent office in the church is that of Presbyter, by showing that the primitive Presbyters exercised the highest ministerial functions. In opposition to this doctrine, some allege the superiority and perpetuity of the Apostolic office. If this office was superior to that of Presbyter, and if it was designed to be perpetual, it follows of course that no church authority can rightfully be exercised, except by those who have succeeded the Apostles in the powers which belonged to them as such, and as distinguished from the Elders of the Church. Let it be observed, however, that in order to justify this conclusion, two things must be made out. If the Apostles were not an order of church officers, distinct from and superior to the Presbyters or Elders, the strongest proof that the office was perpetual only proves that that of Elder was designed to be perpetual, which all admit. If, on the other hand, the Apostolic office was a temporary one, it matters not how far it may have been superior to that held by Presbyters, who still remain, in that case, the highest permanent office-bearers in the Christian Church. In order then to the decision of the controversy, two distinct questions are to be determined. 1. Were the Apostles superior to Presbyters? 2. Was their office, as distinct from that of Presbyter, designed to be perpetual? By some Presbyterian writers both these questions have been answered in the negative, while all Episcopalians, who assert the *jus divinum* of prelatical episcopacy, answer both affirmatively. In the remainder of the present argument, the first point will be yielded to the adverse party; that is to say, it will be granted that the Apostles were church-officers superior to Presbyters or Elders. At the same time an attempt will be made to prove, exclusively from Scripture, that the Apostolic office was merely a temporary one.

I. The first argument in favour of this proposition is, that the continuance of the office is no where expressly stated.

To this it might be answered, that an office being once created, its continuance must be presumed, without an explicit declaration to the contrary.

The general principle is not denied; but in this case there are peculiar circumstances which afford strong ground for a contrary presumption.

1. The original Apostles are uniformly spoken of as constituting a distinct and well-defined body of men, not only in the gospel-history, but in the latest books of the New Testament. "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before by the APOSTLES of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time who should walk after their own ungodly lusts." (Jude vi. 17, 18.) This mode of expression seems to intimate, that "the Apostles" belonged to a preceding period, and that most of them were actually gone. Jude would hardly have expressed himself in this way, if the title had already been extended to a multitude of others. "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy APOSTLES AND PROPHETS; for God hath avenged you on her." (Rev. xviii. 20.) Can there be any doubt that this apostrophe is addressed to the original Apostles? And would John have so described them if the name, in his day, had been rightfully assumed by many others, equal and equally "supreme" in power? That he was not familiar with any such extension of the name, may also be inferred from Rev. xxi. 14, where he speaks of "the twelve apostles."

It may be urged, however, that the case of Paul destroys the force of the presumption drawn from the mention of the Apostles as a limited number; for he was a thirteenth, and if one might be added, why not more?

This objection would be valid, but for one consideration, which converts the case of Paul into a strong corroboration of the doctrine against which it is alleged. That case is every where referred to and described as an anomalous exception. He speaks of himself as the least of the Apostles, (1 Cor. xv. 9,) and not only as morally unworthy to be called one, but as almost too late to be an Apostle, as one born out of due time, (1 Cor. xv. 8,) while at the same time he asserts his equality with the rest as to official rank and power. Now if the Apostolic office was intended to be regu-

* See Bib. Rep. Vol. xxi. p. 116.

larly continued, and if many others were to be brought into it, and invested with its "supreme powers," even during Paul's life-time, and by his agency, how was he like one born out of due time? Or how could he call himself the least of the Apostles? Can any degree of humility make it consistent with his truth and candour, to pronounce himself inferior, as an Apostle, to Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Silas, Junias, and Andronicus, who were all officially his equals on the supposition which we are opposing? Since, then, the case of Paul is represented by himself as an anomaly, it serves, as a sole exception, to confirm the general statement that the Apostles are referred to as a limited body, not to be increased. This is the first ground of presumption that the office of Apostle, as distinguished from all others was intended to be temporary.

2. A second is, that some of the Apostolic powers are acknowledged by both parties in this controversy to have been temporary. The presumption, therefore, is, that all the rest were temporary likewise, except so far as the continuance of any can be clearly shown from Scripture. Now it is not and cannot be denied, that some of them were thus continued, and that for this very purpose the offices of Presbyter and Deacon now exist. But this very fact adds greatly to the strength of the presumption, that the apostolic office was a temporary one. For if the cessation of some of the apostolic powers make it *a priori* probable that all the rest ceased likewise, how much more does the acknowledged transfer of some of the remaining powers to distinct church-officers, continued in existence for that very purpose, make it *a priori* probable, that all the apostolic powers, which did not thus cease, were thus transferred.

3. The power exercised by the Apostles was a general ambulatory power, not confined to particular districts. This was exactly suited to the incipient condition of the church, but could not supersede the necessity of permanent and local officers, after the planting of particular churches. Now the elders and deacons, of whom we read in the New Testament, are the elders and deacons of particular churches, after whose appointment the irregular supervision of the Apostles might be expected to cease, as being no longer needed. On the hypothesis, that the apostles were commissioned merely to plant the church in various countries, and ordain permanent officers who should exercise such of the apostolical powers as were necessary for the continued existence of the church, while all the others ceased;—on this hypothesis the course of things could hardly have been different from that which is recorded. This, then, affords a third ground of presumption that the supposition is coincident with fact.

4. A fourth ground is, that the apostolic functions which all admit to have been subsequently exercised by Presbyters, are precisely those which, in their own nature, are the most important, namely, the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. However important the powers of ordination and discipline may be, they derive their importance from the others. The end of discipline is to preserve purity and exclude the unworthy from the peculiar privileges of the church. The end of ordination is to secure a valid administration of the word and sacraments. If the Head of the Church had left this ministration to any one who chose to perform it, without special ordination to an office, whatever inconveniences might have attended that arrangement, it could not have impaired the intrinsic value of the word and sacraments. But if, on the other hand, there were no word and sacraments, ordination would be useless. And the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of government or discipline. These then (ordination and discipline) are subsidiary functions which derive their value from the relation they sustain to others. Now if the office of a Christian Presbyter had been invested with powers of a subordinate nature, that is, such as derive their value from their being necessary to the exercise of others, it might have been alleged, with some degree of plausibility, that the Apostolic office was designed to be perpetual for the sake of those functions which were not bestowed on Presbyters, but which were essential to the being of the church. But when we find that the lower office was invested with those powers which possess a necessary and intrinsic value, this, to say the least, adds strength to the presumption that the Apostolic office, which was thus succeeded by another order, in its most important functions, was intended to be temporary.

5. On the supposition, that some apostolic powers were neither shared by Presbyters nor discontinued, there is no means of determining what these reserved powers were. For if it be said that all which were not extended to Presbyters were thus reserved, this, in the first place, presupposes the decision of the question whether Presbyters ordained and governed; and, in the next place, supposing that they did not, the successors of the Apostles must, according to this rule, possess the power of working miracles, which certainly belonged to the original apostles. If it be said that this

was a temporary gift of an extraordinary nature, then the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost was also temporary. But this our opponents are unwilling to admit. There is, in fact, no unity among Episcopalians, as to the precise powers which have been continued in their Bishops as successors of the Apostles. Some confine their claims to ordination. Some add discipline, as rightfully belonging only to the Bishop. Others add the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost. This last is inseparable from the gift of miracles. Whenever the effects of the gift of the Holy Ghost, conferred by the Apostles, are described, they are of a miraculous nature. The power of bestowing the more inward and spiritual influences of the Holy Ghost, is not only never claimed, but is expressly disclaimed. The Church of Rome is therefore more consistent than the advocates of High Church Episcopacy, in claiming not only the power of conferring the Holy Ghost, but also its inseparable adjunct, that of working miracles. Our present design, however, is not to disprove the possession of this power, but to show the want of harmony among those who maintain that certain apostolic powers are continued in the church, by means of ministers distinct from and superior to Presbyters. And the design of showing this is to illustrate the impossibility of drawing any line between the powers which ceased or were transferred to Presbyters, and those which are alleged to have been continued in the apostolic office. And the use which we propose to make of this impossibility is simply to strengthen the presumption which has been already raised in favour of the doctrine that the Apostolic office, as distinct from that of Elder, and superior to it, was a temporary one.

The grounds of the presumption, then, are (1) that the twelve apostles are referred to in the New Testament, as a well known body of men, limited in number, and not to be increased, except in the extraordinary case of Paul, which he himself describes as a remarkable exception—(2) that some of the powers exercised by the original apostles are no longer in existence—(3) that some, which still exist, are exercised by Presbyters, and were so exercised in apostolic times—(4) that those which are thus exercised by Presbyters are in themselves the most essential to the existence of the church—(5) that the office of Presbyter has been continued in the church for the very purpose of succeeding the apostles in these functions, and with a view to permanent action within fixed local bounds—(6) that the advocates for the perpetuity of the apostolic office are not agreed among themselves as to the powers which now belong to it, and that this want of agreement arises from the silence of Scripture, and the impossibility of fixing any principle, by which a line may be drawn between the powers which are thus continued and those which have ceased or been transferred to Presbyters.

Waiving the positive conclusions which might not unreasonably be deduced from these premises, we shall merely insist upon their furnishing a strong presumption, that the apostolic office was intended to be temporary, bearing the same relation to the permanent ministry that a constituent assembly or convention bears to the legislative body which succeeds it. We say there is presumptive proof of this, so strong that it can only be countervailed by positive evidence from Scripture. The facts, which have been stated as the grounds of this presumption, may be clearly proved from Scripture. It is not too much to ask, then, that if another fact is to be added to the list, namely, that some of the apostolic powers were neither discontinued nor transferred to Presbyters, and that for the exercise of these reserved powers the apostolic office was itself continued, some explicit declaration of the fact may be adduced to countervail the strong adverse presumption. And this brings us back to our first position, that THE CONTINUANCE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE, IN ADDITION TO THOSE WHICH RELIEVED IT OF ITS MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS, IS NO WHERE EXPLICITLY ASSERTED IN THE SCRIPTURES. As the presumptions are so strong against the supposition of a permanent apostleship, the very silence of the scriptures might be urged as a decisive proof. It cannot be indeed, however, that the force of this negative argument would be destroyed by proving that the scriptures *indirectly* recognise the apostolic office as perpetual. This leads us to another view of the subject.

II. A second argument in favour of the proposition, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, is that the name Apostle, in its strict and proper sense, is not applied, in the New Testament, to any persons who were not of the original thirteen.

The passages, in which such an application of the title is alleged, are the following. 1. "But the multitude of the city was divided, and part held with the Jews, and part with THE APOSTLES,"—[meaning Paul and Barnabas]—"which when THE APOSTLES, Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes," &c. (Acts xiv. 4, 14.)—2. "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among THE APOSTLES, who also were in Christ before me," (Rom. xvi. 7.)—3. "Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother

and companion in labour and fellow-soldier, but your messenger (*αποστολον*), and he that ministers to my wants," (Phil. ii. 25.)—4. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers (*αποστολοι*) of the churches, and the glory of Christ," (2 Cor. viii. 23.)—5. "Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus unto the church of the Thessalonians," (1 Thess. i. 1.) compared with "Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome as the Apostles of Christ," (1 Thess. ii. 6.)—From these texts it is inferred by some that Barnabas, Andronicus, Junias, Epaphroditus, Silas, Timothy, and certain brethren who accompanied Titus to Corinth, were Apostles, in the same sense in which Paul was an Apostle; and from this the obvious conclusion has been drawn, that the Apostolic office was intended to be permanent.

It might well be made a question whether the strong antecedent probability that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, could be wholly set aside by the application of the title in five places, however clear the application might be, and however obvious the sense in which the word was used. The advocates of this interpretation themselves protest against all objections to their system which are founded on the scriptural use of the word *Bishop*, which they own to be convertible with *Presbyter*. They have no right, therefore, to make that of the word *Apostle* the foundation of a perfectly exclusive system. If the *lawfulness* of a superior order were the point in question, incidental proofs of this kind ought to have due weight; but when attempts are made to prove that the continuance of the Apostolic order, as distinct from that of Presbyters, is essential to the being of a church, and that in the face of such presumptions to the contrary as have been stated, a sober reasoner would have good cause to hesitate before receiving, as conclusive evidence, the application of the name in a few cases, even if the proposed interpretation of the passages referred to were undoubtedly correct.

But this is very far from being certain. Of the five texts cited, there are two, in which the very application of the title is at least very doubtful. 1. In the first epistle to the Thessalonians, the word *αποστολοι* is not in juxtaposition or apparent connexion with the names of Timothy and Silas, but separated from them by fourteen intervening verses. It is not even alleged, that the joining of other names with Paul's, in the beginning of a letter, makes it necessary to refer the whole of its contents to all the persons thus included in the title; because, after such a joint address, he often uses the first person singular. Nor is it, on the other hand, alleged, that the use of the plural *we* requires such a reference; because that mode of speech is so habitual with Paul, that it may almost be regarded as one of his characteristic idioms; and, as if to guard against such a construction, he says, near the conclusion of this very passage, "Wherefore we would have come unto you, EVEN I PAUL, once and again." (1 Thess. ii. 18.) This explanation is, at least, sufficient to outweigh the argument derived from the plural form *αποστολοι*, which is, no doubt, strictly inapplicable to a single person, but not when preceded, as in this case, by a particle denoting resemblance or comparison. Though Paul could not call himself "the Apostles of Christ," he could assert his right to do a thing "as the apostles of Christ." He could disclaim having sought glory of them or of others, when he might have been burdensome as the apostles of Christ collectively had a right to be. This construction of the sentence is, to say the least, as natural as that which makes the plural form in chap. ii. 6, refer to Timothy and Silas, who are mentioned only in the title (i. 1.) and neither there nor elsewhere as apostles.

But even granting that this is a more probable explanation of the plural form, which is a mere gratuitous concession, it would not follow necessarily that Timothy and Titus were Apostles in the sense contended for; because another supposition is still open to us, namely, that *αποστολοι* is here used in another sense. For which is it easier to believe, that Silas and Timothy were as much Apostles as Paul himself, but nowhere called so except here by implication and remote allusion—or that when he calls them by that term, he uses it in a wider sense, than when it is employed to designate our Lord's immediate followers? We are willing that this question should be answered without any reference to the reasons, hereafter to be stated, for believing that the word *apostle* is employed in a plurality of meanings. Even if there were no other reason for attaching to it a double sense, this case would be just as good a reason for supposing one, as it is for supposing Silas to have been an Apostle, in the absence of all proof from any other quarter. The one argument is this: Paul says, "we the apostles of Christ," and as Silas and Timothy are mentioned with him in the title of the epistle, they must be included; they were therefore Apostles, in the same

sense in which Paul was one. The other argument is this: the Apostles were a limited number, and Paul elsewhere speaks of his addition to it as an extraordinary thing; but Silas and Timothy, though often mentioned, are no where else called Apostles; therefore, when Paul so calls them, he uses the title in a wider sense. If these two arguments be only *equal* in conclusive force, they balance one another, and the passage cannot be employed as proof, that these two persons were "supreme Apostles." This is the case, be it observed, on the supposition that the *αποστολοι* in ch. ii. 6, refers to all the men named in chap. i. 1. But we have already seen that this reference is doubtful, and that a different construction is, at least, as plausible. The adverse argument, then, rests on two assumptions; (1) that *αποστολοι* in ch. ii. 6, refers to Timothy and Silas, as well as Paul; (2) that it must be taken in its strict and highest sense; whereas it is at least as probable that it does not refer to them, and that if it does, it does not denote Apostles in the strict sense. To say the least, then, after every concession, this passage is too doubtful to be made the basis of an argument to prove, in opposition to such strong presumptions, that the office of Apostle was continued.

(To be continued.)

SCOTTISH SYNOD—ELDERS AND DEACONS.

The following report was presented at the last meeting of the Scottish Synod, but its consideration was postponed until next meeting. It is somewhat confused; and in the statement respecting the bearing of the standards of the Reformed Church on deacon's duties, &c., decidedly wrong. However, if we can gather the opinion of the committee, they do not differ with us at all as to the extent of the deacon's office. In regard to the relation of the deacons and their duties to the other officers of the congregation, they have, evidently, no very clear ideas. As they discuss the subject, and become more familiar with its history, their views will grow in accuracy and perspicuity.—ED. COV.

I.—THE ELDERSHIP. On the mode of the ordination of Elders, your committee have to report that they are of opinion that in the matter of ordination, the imposition of hands is not absolutely necessary to the validity of the act. 2d. That the imposition of the hands of Ruling Elders in ordination, is questionable. 3d. That it is inexpedient to determine whether the ordination of ruling elders and deacons be accompanied with the imposition of hands on the part of the officiating minister or ministers; but that this matter be dealt with according to particular views and circumstances.

II.—THE DEACONSHIP. In terms of the appointment, your committee have endeavoured "to investigate the whole subject of the Deaconship, viz. the origin and end of the Deacon's office—whether in all circumstances it is an essential part of the Church's organization; whether the managers of the temporalities in our congregations serve the ends of the diaconate; what are the duties common and peculiar to Elders and Deacons; and what are the relations of Deacons to the Church courts, and to whom they are immediately responsible.

1. The origin and end of the Deacon's office. The committee are of opinion that it is of divine origin, and, judging from the occasion, instituted more immediately to minister to the wants of the indigent, though not exclusively; but to attend to the temporalities of the Church generally, and relieve the apostles from secular duties, and allow them to devote themselves more immediately to spiritual matters.

2. Whether in all circumstances the office of the Deacon is an essential part of the Church's organization? The committee are not prepared unqualifiedly to answer in the affirmative; and the more especially so long as the duties of the diaconate are substantially performed between the Elders and the Managers.

3. Whether the Managers of the temporalities in our congregations serve the ends of Deacons? Here they are of opinion, that in some measure they answer the ends of Deacons, and yet they submit for your consideration, whether on the whole Deacons are not necessary to the more perfect, formal, and perhaps efficient organization of the Church?

4. What are the duties common and peculiar to Elders and Deacons? Your committee had no difficulty in determining that there are certain duties that *cannot* be shared in common, and that belong strictly and *exclusively* to the Session, such as the government and discipline of the Church, and the charge of the spiritualities of the house of God. They found some difficulty, however, in determining in certain cases what duties are common, and what are not, inasmuch as these cases raise the question whether the office of the Elder does not include that of the Deacon; or, at least the question, whether the Elders, as well as the apostles, were relieved from the burdensome and inexpedient duties of the temporalities of the Church. Acts vi. 1—4, 11, 29, 30. In this case they would venture to suggest for your consideration—1st. Whether there are not certain things *fit* and *expedient* to be committed to the Elders and Deacons jointly and in common, such as serving at the communion table, the church door treasury, and allocating money to the poor, and general missionary and benevolent objects. 2d. Whether there are not certain things *fit* and *expedient* to be committed to the Deacons, such as the charge of the Church's property, providing for the temporal support of the public ordinances, and the collection, distribution, and disbursement of money generally.

5. What are the relations of Deacons to the Church Courts, and to whom are they more immediately responsible? Three different answers may be given to this question, and three different plans proposed. According to the first, the Deacons are associated with the teaching and ruling Elders, in distributing to the necessities of the poor, and regarded more immediately as the servants and assistants of the Session, and responsible to it; and their office is purely ministerial and subordinate. According to the second, there is a co-ordinate court, separate from the Session, called the Deacon's Court, consisting of the Minister, Elders, and Deacons, and more immediately responsible to the Courts of Review, but also obligated annually to give an account to the people, and receive suggestions. According to the third plan, Managers are transmuted into Deacons by ordination, subject to re-election or not, once in the three or seven years, and regarded more immediately as the servants of the people, and responsible to them, though ultimately to the Church Courts, and subject to their supervision.

The comparative merits of these different schemes crave the patient consideration of Synod. The first seems, on the whole, to embody the spirit of the subordinate standards of the Church of Scotland, and the views of some more eminent Scottish Reformers, and is perhaps the best adapted to the wants of an *endowed* church. The second has been thought by some better adapted to the wants of an unendowed church, with a common fund, inasmuch as provision is required to be made for the church as well as the poor. The third plan has been thought by others best adapted to an unendowed church, without a common fund, and calculated to relieve the pastor from secular duties, disagreeable collisions, secularizing tendencies, easier wrought, and more likely to escape difficulties respecting jurisdictions, and to remove the idea of a co-ordinate servants' court.

Possibly the third plan, with the modifications suggested under the fourth topic, together with the eligibility of Elders of business habits to co-operate with Deacons in small congregations, where there is a paucity of qualified persons for the office of the Deacon, may be found the most eligible plan and approximate nearest the general principles of Bible polity.

Should the office of the Deacon be formally revived throughout the Church, your committee would suggest the propriety of having a few regulations respecting the duties, relations, and jurisdictions of Elders and Deacons for their guidance; of giving instructions whether the Deacon elect should be examined as to the faith, or only proven by public edict, or both; and whether the same questions in the formula put to the Elders at their ordination, ought to be put to Deacons, or whether any other questions may be necessary.

“RECEIVED BY THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.”

A respected father has lately given a new interpretation to these words of our third term of communion. He says:

“It is not in the active form, expressive of the modifying action of that church in her own prior ecclesiastical state; not as *they received them*, but as they, the documents themselves, *were received*; in other words, it refers not to the qualifying circumstances, or prior state of the church of Scotland in receiving them, but to the condition of the documents when received or adopted.”

Now—1. We confess to not understanding this distinction altogether. 2. If no more was meant than that the documents are adopted, then the matter could have been settled by the term “Westminster;” or it could have been much better settled by saying that they were “received as prepared at Westminster.” 3. If this interpretation be correct, why publish the adopting acts in connexion with these documents? 4. These acts do expressly modify the documents, and refer to the previous constitution of the Scottish church. 5. Our apprehension is not the same with this father’s in reference to the view taken of this clause by the church heretofore; this is the *new* view. All will wonder what it means, and then ask, Is it possible? We never heard of this before. 6. Even if his interpretation were correct, how does he meet the fact that the 2d Book of Discipline was regarded as binding *after* the adoption of these documents, and was even mentioned among her standards? 7. The mention of the sum of saving knowledge in the title page, is of no moment. Who made that title page? 8. We are sorry to see in this article—(1.) An attempt to charge upon us a design to set aside the Form of Church Government. Nothing is more unfounded. We cannot conceive how such an idea could originate. Cast aside the Westminster Form! Why, we are constantly urging it! We argue from it. The thought has never entered our minds, and Mr. Chrystie should retract this. It is an unfounded and most hurtful misrepresentation. Even if the original documents were unaccompanied with a proviso which was never fulfilled, subsequent acts and practice have repaired it. (2.) Does the writer apply the text (Rom. xvi. 17, 18) to us? If so, we repel the imputation. We teach the old doctrine—we seek the old paths. Old, not in Scotland only, but even in this country,—In our Testimony and in the practice of the church.

THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN.

We find the following *editorial* introduction to an article in the January number of the Reformed Presbyterian, on the use of fermented wine in the Lord's Supper:

"We cheerfully give place to the following article, hoping that, coming from the quarter it does, it may tend to check the introduction of another element of discord into our church. We know that the view opposed by the respected author is held, and has been publicly advanced, by more than one of the esteemed brethren who have been active in introducing, and urgent in pressing some of the subjects, the agitation of which has so greatly marred the peace of our Zion, alienated the affections of brethren, and weakened the mutual confidence that formerly prevailed. We dread the addition of other topics of controversy to those already existing, believing that the fruits will be bitter.—*Ed.*"

On the article itself, to which this is an introduction, we make no remark, except that we agree in its conclusion, viz. that fermented wine may be lawfully used in the Lord's Supper. But, we ask the Editor, how he can justify himself, and whether he thinks he will stand justified before the church, in making such insinuations as are contained in the above paragraph? Does he believe what he insinuates, that the advocates of the office of the deacon are lying in wait with another controversy, as soon as the present one is settled? If he does, he is of easy faith, indeed,—if not still worse. And again, we ask him, are there not suspicions enough abroad, without adding—uselessly, gratuitously, and without the least foundation—to their number? Is this the way to make peace? Is this to seek the good of the church?—or is it the scattering of firebrands, arrows, and death? We hope that for the sake of the church, if not for his own sake, he will forbear such insinuations. If the respected author of the article had known in what aspect it was to be ushered into the world, we think it would hardly have seen the light.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Turkey and Russia.—The peace between these powers has not been broken. The Hungarian fugitives are, however, to please Russia, detained in a kind of captivity,—while this latter power has fixed her grasp more firmly upon the northern provinces of Turkey—Wallachia and Moldavia—thus advancing a little nearer the cherished object of her ambition—the possession of Constantinople.

Prussia.—The relations of Church and State in Prussia are in great confusion. One party favours the entire separation of the State, not only from the Church, but from the Christian religion; another, itself subdivided into various sections, adheres to the principles of a Christian State. To the latter party, belong the great body of Evangelical Christians. This question lately occupied the Chamber of Commons, giving rise to earnest and protracted discussion, which issued in the adoption of the following:

"The Christian faith is made the foundation of those institutions of the State which stand in connexion with the exercise of religion, without prejudice to the freedom guaranteed to other creeds by Article 11."

This article displaces religious matters from the *general* framework of the government, and puts them under one Department only—that of the Minister of Instruction and Public Worship. The political affairs of

Prussia are also in an unfavourable state. Austria has entered her protest against the scheme of German unity formed by Prussia; and is even said to have gone so far as to threaten a forcible opposition, should Prussia push on to place herself at the head of the German Confederation. This dispute is regarded with anxiety by the other European powers.

Rome.—The Pope has not yet returned to the Vatican. He is still at Portici. Why, we cannot tell. The way is open. The city is in the hands of his professed friends and allies. He has been invited by a deputation from the corporation, commons, and clergy. Still, he refuses to leave his retreat. It may be that he has little confidence in his French protectors. It may be that he is reluctant to enter again upon the rough work of politics among a dissatisfied, a conquered people. It may be he fears the arm of the secret assassin. If he do not soon resume his seat, some new phase of European politics may finally confirm his banishment, and put an end to his ghostly dominion. The Pope and his Cardinals are aware of this. In the language of a foreign correspondent of one of our journals :

“ They have a presentiment of their fate, and they mean to die nobly, and be buried in their priestly robes. One of my friends, L. Abbe Leone, informs me that he had met an English Cardinal, or the brother of one, Acton, who argued that ‘ nothing could save the world from ruin : that Popery, and Royalty, and Aristocracy, were doomed to perish by the hands of Anarchy; and that concessions to the furious spirit of innovation could not save them. All that they could possibly hope for, was to postpone their present existence for a few short years—ten years, at most : and that concession would only curtail the limits of this fatal period. In consequence of this conviction, he affirmed that the Sacred College of Cardinals would make no concessions to the devastating monster. They were resolved to die nobly, and leave the world in their real character of chiefs and leaders of the traditional unity of Catholicity.’ ‘ This being so,’ this writer adds, ‘ the task of history will be rendered easy. There will be no confusion of persons and institutions. The old world and its leading spirits will disappear together, when their fate is sealed; and the new heavens and the new earth, the new bodies and the new minds of religious, and political, and social institutions, will descend together from the clouds of Providential order, prophesied by heavenly seers years ago.’ ”

France.—French affairs are becoming, every day, more complicated. One fact, however, is certain: the Royalists—both Orleanists and Legitimists—are gaining fresh courage. It is possible that they are over sanguine. The President is not with them,—and, if compelled to take decided ground, will probably unite his fortunes with the Socialists. An intelligent looker-on says:

“ The Royalist majority is very large in the Chamber, and apparently most confident, not only of impunity, but of success. The provincial papers speak, however, of the rapid progress of republican opinions in the country; and the jurymen acquit in almost every case where matters of opinion alone are concerned. The elements of *civil war* are spreading far and wide, and seem to be increasing daily in intensity as well as in extent.”

The foreign policy of France is in an equally dubious position. She has conquered the Romans, but will not hand them entirely over to the tender mercies of infuriated ecclesiastics. She defends Turkey against the insulting demands of the Autocrat, and yet refuses the Hungarian refugees a footing upon her soil. The truth is, the arm of power is broken in France. She is neither one thing nor another, politically; nor will she be, until one or other of those hostile elements conquers

all the rest at the point of the sword. In the mean time, Popery rises. Thus says the correspondent of the Presbyterian :

“In the midst of our great political anticipations, religious affairs follow the same course, which I indicated to you in my preceding letters, and run more and more in that direction. The influence of the Roman Catholic clergy continues to increase. A decree of the President of the Republic has just decided that there shall no longer be required of candidates for the degree of *Bachelor of Literature, certificates of study*, proving that they have studied in the establishments for instruction *supported by the State*. This measure, good in itself, might have been understood to be for the interests of liberty; but M. Parrieu, the new minister of Public Instruction, has taken care to make it understood, that its chief design is to give liberty to the colleges supported *by the Roman clergy*, to send their pupils to the colleges of the State.”

The growing power of Popery is seen abroad, as in the iniquitous and infamous assault upon the Sandwich Islands; and, at home, in the persecutions directed against the Protestant preachers. The same writer describes one of them, and presents facts which demonstrate a disposition in the French authorities to revive the system of petty and harassing persecutions which signalized some of the closing years of Louis Philippe's reign. He says:

“Mr. Pilatte has just undergone a new condemnation on account of the meetings which he held in one of the most populous quarters of Paris. As these had at first been condemned, as presenting the characters of a *club*, and not of a *religious meeting*, Mr. Pilatte had taken care, this time, to introduce religious singing and prayer, in order to establish undeniably their religious character: for the new law promulgated by the Constitution of 1848, more liberal than the preceding, expressly stipulates, that the provisions of the law against clubs, “are not applicable to meetings having for their object the exercise of any worship whatsoever.” Notwithstanding this precaution, Mr. Pilatte was condemned a second time, first in the correctional police court; next, by a superior court, called the *Appellate Court*, to which he had appealed, and from which he has just appealed to the supreme court, called the *Court of Cassation*. It is to be feared that the Court of Cassation may confirm the sentence of the Appellate Court.”

Still, there are some encouraging symptoms. He adds: “There is another symptom. In a circular issued by the leaders of the Peace Congress in England, we find the following:

“Meanwhile, at the side of recrudescence of Roman Catholicism, there are observable, in its bosom, some feeble germs of interior reform. Inferior clergy try to free themselves from the heavy yoke of the bishops. I told you, some years ago, of the efforts made in this direction, by two priests, (who were brothers,) of the name of Allignol, in the south. An Abbé named Chantôme, has just exposed himself to the displeasure of his bishop, by announcing his intention to publish a journal, the tendency of which is doubted by the episcopate. Thus far Chantôme stands firm, notwithstanding the dissatisfaction of his bishop. Will he persevere to the end? or, like the brothers Allignol, will he yield? The future will inform us. Be it as it may, all these attempts reveal the presence of an interior leaven, which sooner or later, (to use a homely comparison,) cannot fail to raise the dough.

“As a people, our French neighbours have not the Bible in their own language. Let us give it to them, and the blessing of the Most High will rest yet more and more upon our peace enterprise. Respecting this proposition, several estimable members of the Roman Catholic Church have been freely consulted; and, amongst them, a French gentleman resident in this town, who has excellent opportunities of ascertaining the state of feeling in France. The

latter is convinced that our present will be acceptable; and he also believes that Catholic agents may be found as distributors of the gift, which will greatly tend to disarm prejudice.' ”

The circular then recommends the dissemination of a version which, though differing but little from that used by the Protestants, has received the sanction of an Archbishop of Paris, and which, from that circumstance, was more likely to be acceptable to the Roman Catholics, and proceeds:

“It remains open for consideration whether the proposed gift of three thousand or five thousand New Testaments shall be presented to the respectable citizens of Paris, or to its hospitals and prisons, (if agreeable to the governors and conductors of those institutions,) or to the workmen in the densely populated suburbs of St. Antoine, St. Denis, and St. Martin, teaching them—as we trust the Testament will do—never again to rise in bloody insurrection. However this may be decided, we think the result will be equally beneficial; and that if the Holy Scriptures can be scattered throughout Paris, by willing hands and loving hearts, no possible impediment will be permitted to stay their progress; and that those who have been the happy means of disseminating them, may indeed ‘thank God, and take courage.’ ”

Switzerland.—This republic is not free from danger. The great despotic powers have united in the determination to compel the Cantons to drive out of their territories the unsuccessful revolutionists of other countries; and will leave no effort untried, short of provoking a general European war, to accomplish their object. In the mean time, internal dissension is favouring their views. This is twofold—first, in each Canton—except a few of the Popish Cantons—there are two parties, bitterly hostile, the Aristocrats and the Republicans; and again, a new attempt is making to revive the Sonderbund, or League of the Popish Cantons against the Federal government. In the language of a late writer:

“Next to France, Switzerland deranges the combinations of the constitutional sovereigns by the grace of God, with the despotic sovereigns also by the grace of God. Switzerland is a republic, recognised even in the old European equilibrium. The Democratic movement has not been arrested in Switzerland. Quite the contrary. At the same time that the Sonderbund is reinforced with all the Bourgeoisie interests, almost as the Catholic and Legitimist re-action in France is reinforced with all the interests of the same kind, the Democratic-Socialist party has gained ground in the Cantons formerly called Liberal. The elections of Geneva have just furnished a new confirmation of the Democratic tendencies of Switzerland. These elections, complicated by the presence of numerous German and French refugees, have anew directed the public attention to the Helvetic Confederation. The fate of Switzerland has been decided for a long time. It will suffer partition on the first opportunity; and there would be a good occasion, were it not for the French Republic. This is why you see every effort now directed against the Republic in France, even at the price of a Napoleonic Empire, or a decennial Presidency at first, in order to go further soon.”

Nearly every thing depends upon the position and action of France. If she is resolute, and supports Switzerland, the great powers will hardly risk a general war; if she fails, Switzerland falls.

Ireland.—The only important items we notice in Irish affairs, are—1. The re-organization of schemes of hostility to English rule; and, 2. The formal, distinct, and unconditional condemnation of the Queen’s Colleges by the Popish bishops in a late meeting—their condemnation according, in every particular, with the Pope’s rescript. When will the

British government be convinced that Popery will accept of no boon but a formal and complete acknowledgment of its entire claims and ascendancy? Its consistency puts to shame the truckling and compromising spirit of that passive Protestantism which now controls the administration.

[For the Covenanter.]

OBITUARY OF REV. ROBERT WALLACE.

Mr. Wallace was born in the year 1772, in the parish of Loughgilly, county of Armagh, Ireland. His parents were intelligent and very exemplary members of the Anti-Burgher Secession Church. Letters, and essays upon various subjects, written by his father, show that he was a man of superior knowledge and piety. The children were well instructed in gospel truth, and also in the peculiar principles of the church in which they had been baptized. At the age of nineteen, the subject of this notice acknowledged his baptismal obligations, and publicly devoted himself to the service of Jesus Christ. Soon after this his attention was turned to the lawfulness of taking the regium donum, or king's bounty—a question which was then much agitated in the church. The examination of this subject led Mr. Wallace to study carefully and prayerfully the whole doctrine of civil government. He searched the Scriptures, and read such books as the Cloud of Witnesses, Hind Let Loose, the writings of Thorburn and Fairley, &c. Displeased with the subserviency of the Secession Church to the British crown, and disgusted with the low and truckling measures it employed to screen the royal power, and possessing a vigorous and independent mind and an ardent desire to know the truth, the issue could not be doubtful. He soon saw that the absurd and debasing doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, for conscience' sake, to the existing immoral and Erastian government of Great Britain, had no place in the Word of God, and received no countenance from the faithful witnesses of Jesus. He therefore immediately left the Secession, and united himself with the Reformed Presbyterian Church.* Having now made himself acquainted with the whole system of covenanted uniformity, cherishing an ardent love for the truth, and an earnest desire for the advancement of Reformation principles, he resolved to devote himself to God in the gospel of his Son. Circumstanced as he was, however, some time passed before he was able to enter upon studies preparatory to the work upon which his heart was set. Through many difficulties and discouragements, at length he prosecuted his preparatory studies, and in the year 1820, he was graduated in the University of Glasgow. In the spring of the next year he emigrated with his family, consisting then of his wife and four children, to this country, and completed his theological studies in Philadelphia, under Dr. Wylie. In the spring of 1814, he, with Messrs. Lusk, Gill, and Robinson, was licensed to preach the gospel; and in the fall of the same year he was ordained, and settled in the congregation of Utica, Ohio.

As the congregation was small, and could take only a part of his time, Mr. Wallace employed himself extensively in missionary labours. His field of labour was the great and growing West. The labour which he performed, and the toil and privations which he endured, were very great. The country was then thinly populated—the roads bad—few

* Congregation of Ballylane.

bridges over creeks and rivers—and his journeys long and frequent. In the day the drought consumed him, and the frost by night. Covenanters were then few and far scattered, mostly of the poorer class, and suffering all the difficulties attending a first settlement in the “backwoods.” They were very anxious for preaching, but the support of the gospel often proved no part of the calculation. Still, Mr. W. endured hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. With little prospect of temporal support or comfort, he laboured for the conversion of sinners and the enlargement of the church, enjoying satisfaction in the conscientiousness of doing the will of his Master, and looking for his reward in a better country, even a heavenly. He never complained. He was always contented and cheerful. He knew how to suffer need.

His labours were not in vain in the Lord. He was eminently successful in winning souls. He sought out individuals and families in different and far distant parts of the country, who were favourably inclined to hear the truth; and in his affable and friendly manner, and by the seriousness and spirituality of his conversation, he won their confidence, taught them the way of God more perfectly, and brought them into the church. These individuals and families he organized into religious societies; and some of these societies, under his fostering care and occasional waterings, grew into flourishing congregations.* The congregation of Salt Creek is one of these. Here there were only two families belonging to the Reformed Presbyterian Church when Mr. Wallace first visited that place. Under his occasional ministrations their number soon increased, until they formed three distinct societies. These societies united in 1822, and gave him a unanimous call to become their pastor. This call he accepted; and having demitted the charge of the Utica congregation, he was settled among them.

Although his extensive travelling was considerably diminished by his new settlement—having the charge of a growing and widely extended congregation—yet he continued occasionally to water the several societies and congregations which he had planted, and which still regarded him as their spiritual father. Thus, though naturally of a feeble constitution, he performed, for many years, in some respects, the double duties of the settled pastor and the missionary. The care of several churches was upon him. His own congregation continued to increase in numbers, until it became one of the largest in the church. He laboured, and others have entered into his labours.

With some interruptions, on account of ill health and his growing infirmities, he continued to discharge pastoral duties until about eight months before his death, when he received a fall from his horse on going to preach one Sabbath morning, (the horse falling upon ice,) which gave his system so severe a shock that he was never able to preach again. He declined gradually until the 19th of July last, 10 o'clock, P. M.; when, like a shock of corn fully ripe, he was gathered unto his fathers.

During his last illness he suffered little—was able, most of the time, until near his last, to sit in his chair a part of the day. The graces of the full-grown, afflicted Christian, were exemplified in him. His soul was like a weaned child. Disengaged from all worldly affairs, his conversation was in heaven. The Word of God was his comfort in his

* There were no Covenanters in the bounds of Brush Creek, Muskingum, and Tomika and Wills' Creek congregations, when Mr. W. first preached in those places. At Jonathan's Creek there was one.

affliction. The precious promises and abundant consolations which he had long dispensed to others, were now the comfort and joy of his own soul. He often expressed his entire confidence in the sure, well-ordered, and everlasting covenant, which he said God had made with him. He spent much of his time in pious meditation and ejaculatory prayer. To the numerous friends who visited him, his conversation was edifying and refreshing. The members of his congregation and neighbours manifested much kindness and respect to him in his affliction. The only regret that he appeared to feel, was that he was prevented from attending upon the public ordinances of the house of God, and that he was kept so long in the world, when, he said, he was of no use to the church. He desired to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better. Having finished his work, he looked for his rest and reward. Like dying Jacob, he waited for the salvation of God. As he lived so he died, resigned to the will of his heavenly Father, trusting in the merits of his Redeemer, and rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God. To him to live was Christ, and to die was gain. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them." "Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth: for the faithful fail from among the children of men."

Mr. Wallace's character possessed many excellent traits. Generosity—detesting every thing bordering upon meanness—firmness and cheerfulness—zeal and discretion—boldness and meekness—tender-heartedness and ardent and lasting friendship, were prominent and well combined.

He was a practical Covenanter. He believed and preached the duty of covenanting with God, and he exemplified the principle in his own conduct. Among his papers are found several covenant engagements, entered into and renewed, with confession of sins, in different successive periods of his life.

His preaching was characterized by plainness, boldness, and spiritual fervency. He communicated his ideas in a clear, perspicuous, and impressive manner. All his hearers could easily understand him. His speech and his preaching were not in the enticing words of man's wisdom. While the critic might have censured his rhetoric, the devout hearer was pleased and edified. He did not revive old errors, which the people had never heard of, for the purpose of confuting them. Upon abstract theories and philosophical notions he seldom entered. He never speculated. He knew nothing but Christ, and him crucified. The entire depravity of human nature—the riches of divine grace—the perfection of the atonement—the exaltation and universal dominion of the Mediator—the excellency of God's law—the obligations of all men and nations to obey it—the prevailing sins of the times, and of this nation—prevalent errors—Divine Providence—the nature and exercises of saving faith—the privileges of the saints—the consolations of the afflicted believer—the scriptural purity of the church in her doctrine, worship, and order—the vanity of the world—the happiness of heaven, and the glories of Immanuel—these are the subjects on which he chiefly dwelt in his public ministrations.

Another feature by which his preaching was distinguished, was boldness in declaring the truth. He did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God. He did not consult public opinion to know what he might

say without giving offence. Preferring the favour of God to the applause of men, he declared the truth plainly and boldly, fearless alike of friends and foes. Opposition only served to arouse his zeal, and to excite him to renewed and more vigorous attacks upon the enemies of truth. In strange places, his preaching was often followed by excitement and agitation. As is common to every faithful and successful minister, some of his friends, who thought themselves more prudent than he, blamed his conduct as unwise and rash, and advised him to be cautious. For his manly and fearless exhibition of the doctrines of the church on civil government, and his open and faithful exposure and condemnation of slavery, and other national sins, he was sometimes threatened with mobocratic violence and civil prosecution. But none of these things moved him, neither did he count his life dear unto himself, that he might finish his testimony with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus. His faithfulness often made him many enemies; still, those who became acquainted with him, however they disliked his principles, mostly respected him. Hence he was designated by some of them "*the honest preacher.*" His long, uniform, ardent, and persevering opposition to slavery in this country, led some of its friends, who did not understand the history of the Anti-Slavery movement, to charge him with being the author of it—an honour which every minister does not enjoy.

His discourses were characterized by spiritual fervency. That rare and indispensable element in good preaching, which the French call *onction*, was exemplified in his ministrations. His preaching was not mere declamation. Out of the abundance of his heart his mouth spake. It was evident to his hearers that he felt the influence of the doctrines which he preached. There was a solemnity, an impressiveness, and persuasiveness in his appearance and manner, which gave him an influence over his audience, such as the flippant orator, however fluent, can never command. From the heart he spoke to the heart. Hence the remarkable success that attended his labours. In sacramental services he excelled.

Mr. Wallace seemed to have two objects constantly in view—the advancement of the church's testimony, and the maintenance of peace among her members; and in promoting both these he was eminently successful. He loved the truth and peace.

During the time of the New Light defection, not a member of his congregation left the church, although some of them were strongly tempted. And, a few years since, in the midst of the controversy about deacons, he introduced that class of officers, appointed to attend to the temporal concerns of the church, into his congregation, without opposition.

"Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." "They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

THE COVENANTER.

MARCH, 1850.

THE MONSTROUS GOVERNMENT OF SLAVERY.*

“A tree is known by its fruits.” A government is good, when true religion, moral order, and labour, prosper among the citizens generally. It is well organized and well administered. The prevalence of heresy and idolatry is unequivocal evidence that the government is either badly constituted or badly conducted. The civil constitution of the commonwealth of Israel was perfect; for God was its author. When good men filled the offices of state, the people were religious, prosperous, and happy. It was the reverse, when the wicked bare rule. After the declaration of independence, by the tribes, in the reign of Rehoboam, the administration and the constitution were both bad. They never had one good king from Jeroboam, the first king, to Hoshea, the last. During their whole national existence, irreligion, gross idolatry, and shameful immorality, increased, till God destroyed their existence as a commonwealth. These are scriptural facts, that teach all ages. Let us apply them: and—

I. The fruits of the United States' slaveholding government have been bad. A nation, indeed, may be bad, and its government bad, and yet, like a bad man, it may, for a time, become opulent. The tabernacles of those who “rob God” and man, “prosper for a season.” It has been so in our country. Were human beings, like beasts that perish, made merely to eat and die, the U. S. government might be good for white men. The fruits of the government have been bad for immortal moral agents.

1. Since the organization of the government, under the old Articles of Confederation, a period of seventy-five years, *immorality has been steadily on the increase*. This deplorable result has been mainly owing to negro slavery. The slaveholders, spending their time in idleness, waste it in gaming, horse-racing, drinking, and harlotry. There have been exceptions. But there have been comparatively few southern planters not addicted to one or other of those vices, and many to all of them.

The seat of the general government is in the midst of a slaveholding and slavetrading population. The house of representatives, the senate, the president's cabinet, the bureaus, and the U. S. court, breathe a polluted atmosphere. The District of Columbia swarms with black and white harlots. Harlotry there is not thought dishonourable; gambling has been practised even in the president's house. The Sabbath is openly and-grossly profaned at Washington. Profane swearing is there a com-

* Introductory, by Jas. R. Willson, at the opening of the Sessions of the Theological Seminary, Geneva Hall, 1st Monday of November, 1849.

mon, unrebuked vice. Northern men, reputable for moral deportment at home, when they repair to the capital, as public functionaries, often, perhaps generally, fall victims to the temptations about the court. There are, indeed, happily, illustrious exceptions, such as Benjamin F. Butler, Judge M'Lean, Harmer Denny, the late Governor Findlay, Mr. Frelinghuysen, and others. Streams of moral pollution issue from the seat of the national government, and overflow the nation—north, south, east, and west. The commonwealth now groans under the pressure of its most damning influence.

Every species of immorality prevails. All the efforts of the most enlightened and best people in the land to arrest the progress of intemperance, have failed in a great measure. Every presidential canvass does harm to this good cause, which four years of effort cannot repair. The tide of intemperance rolls back upon us in frightful surges.

Sabbath desecration, after the example of the government in the transportation of Sabbath mails, military parades and music in the army and navy, and the transaction of business by committees of congress, has become a most crying national sin. All efforts to reform this evil have proved unavailing.

Our cities are sinks of adulterous pollution. At a monthly meeting of the Protestant clergy in Cincinnati, on the first Monday of February, 1848, a committee reported that there were, in the city, four thousand known harlots. The population of the city proper was estimated at eighty thousand. Some members of the meeting thought, as the report gave one harlot for every twenty persons, there must be an exaggeration. The Rev. Mr. Bushnell, a very respectable clergyman, who had been ten years the city missionary, said that his duties had furnished him with ample means of information, and he had no doubt that there were six thousand of these degraded women in the city. More money is expended in these houses of infamy, and on the theatres and bar-rooms that feed them, than on all the churches and schools of Cincinnati.

It hardly admits of a doubt, that if a recognisance were made of other commercial cities, they would all be found as bad as the metropolis of Ohio, and probably most of them worse. There are more houses of harlotry in the capitals of Ohio and Pennsylvania than churches. It is so in other state capitals. Washington city, however, in this monstrous debasement, is worse than all.

2. *The growth of Protestant errors.* Socinianism was not known in the United States at the organization of the government. Now, that blasphemous heresy has possession of Harvard University at Boston. In that institution there are thirty-three professors, most of whom, if not all, are either Arian or Socinian, denying the divinity of our Saviour, and of course the whole doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in the God-head. They all reject the truth of Christ's atoning sacrifice for sin.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church excinded, a few years ago, five hundred ministers, whom they charged with semi-Arminian errors. At the formation of the government, all the ministers of that body were believed to be, and, so far as known, were orthodox. Semi-Pelagianism, seventy-five years ago, was hardly known in New England; but it is now the creed of almost all the Congregational churches of the six Northern States. In 1774, there were few Baptists and Methodists. Now they have each ten denominations, and hundreds of thousands of members.

Popery was almost unknown amongst us at the declaration of independence. Now these victims of ignorance, idolatry, and superstition, are estimated at one million five hundred thousand. It is not by numbers alone, or chiefly, that they harm the commonwealth. Their grossly immoral deportment spreads its blighting contagion through the whole mass of our population. Their statuary, their splendid paintings, their music, and the rich costume of their ministering priesthood, attract to their polluted altars, on the Lord's day, thousands of young and thoughtless Protestants. Printers and booksellers, who profess to dislike popish idolatry, fill religious books, otherwise good, with pictures, even of Christ. The Bible itself does not escape this desecration. The doctrinal errors of the Romanists leaven extensively most of the Protestant bodies. All these evils grow in magnitude and power every year, under the protection of the government.

3. *Negro slavery yearly multiplies its victims, and increases its power, in the nation.* Seventy-five years ago it was almost wholly confined to six states, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Now, it has fifteen states. It has established itself in nine new commonwealths. From less than four hundred thousand, it has grown to three millions; more, by five hundred thousand, than the whole population of the thirteen colonies, when we became an independent republic. But few of all these oppressed people have access to any saving knowledge of the plan of redemption. Hundreds of thousands of them are scarcely elevated above the beasts that perish, except that they have human souls and bodies. All this great and swelling host of slaves are held by one hundred and thirteen thousand white men. These, nearly all, and most of their families, live in idleness—one hundred and thirteen thousand drones in society. One free white man performs as much labour as two slaves. So that there are one million five hundred thousand of the coloured population, who may be set down as mere consumers. We have, then, two million seven hundred and fifty thousand of people who live on the labour of others. The citizens of the free states, compelled to work for the support of these idlers, oppose slavery, and the press labours to unfold the enormity of this evil. The slaveholders are irritated, and there is a rapidly growing alienation between the northern and southern sections of the confederacy. The two elements of liberty and slavery, especially when both are in the extreme, as they are here, cannot live in harmony. The collisions of the factions are violent, engendering the worst passions, uprooting the foundations of religion and morality. The storms of the republic are like "the strivings of the four winds on the great sea." While this tempest rages, thousands of the distressed and down-trodden African race sink, without any relief, into the realms of wo. Poor children of Africa, how hapless is your most wretched fate, under the cruel government of this guilty nation!

Can the tree be good which yields thus an exuberant crop of bitter, poisonous fruits? Happy they who have not planted it, and by whom it is not watered.

II. The government that produces these evil fruits, is badly administered.

1. *Its whole administration favours slavery.* Foreign commerce greatly prospered in the hands of northern merchants soon after the inauguration of the first president, 1788. The French revolution, the

wreck of European despotisms, and especially the war between the continent of Europe and England, were very favourable to our commerce. The supplies requisite for great armies, constantly in the field, opened an extensive market; and made high prices for American produce, requiring more vessels for its exportation. Farmers were furnished with the means of purchasing goods of foreign manufacture. The imports became large. This also gave an additional impulse to the shipping interest. In the mercy of God to our young republic, the kingdoms of the old world were desolated by frightful wars to make us rich.

The jealousy of slaveholders, who administered the government, was awakened by the unexampled prosperity of the northern states. They opposed the building of a navy, that had become necessary for the protection of our commerce, on account of the depredations to which it was exposed by the hostile nations of Europe. The first president, although a slaveholder, and the second, a northern freeman, had commenced the erection of forts on the sea-board, for the protection of the maritime cities. A fortification had been erected on the south end of Manhattan Island, on which New York is built. The third president ordered this to be demolished. He and his cabinet procured from Congress the passage of a law, imposing an embargo, by which our commerce was crippled. Very small gun-boats were built for the harbours of the commercial cities, as a little concession to the north.

These ruinous measures compelled the merchants to withdraw their capital from the ocean, and vest it in manufacturing establishments, which, through the enterprise of northern freemen, grew up with unexampled rapidity. Thus God, who rules the nations, brings good out of evil. The envious policy of slavery was overruled for the accomplishment of all the great profits derived from our factories.

From the first, the nation collected revenues for defraying the expenses of the government, not by direct taxes, but by imposts on commerce collected in custom-houses. This secured protection to our infant factories. Southern politicians would have prostrated the factories, as they saw them prosper; for they have generally had power to do what they would, except as restrained by an overruling providence. For a period of at least twenty-three years, they have contended against the protection of the manufacturing interest by a tariff. On the 30th of June, 1842, our factories were brought to the verge of ruin, and would have been annihilated, had not the wants of the government saved them from utter destruction.

In both these courses of policy—the war on commerce, and that on home manufacture—slavery gave the impulse. Sin is always, in the end, its own punishment. Slavery cannot navigate ships—slaves cannot work to advantage in factories. The disabilities under which the slaveholding interest labours, being deprived, in the retributive justice of God, from the profits of two great sources of wealth, together with their millions of idlers and spendthrifts, reduce them to the estate of comparative decrepitude. Their lands are soon worn out, their houses soon begin to fall into ruin, their debts accumulate without hope of liquidation, their children grow up without education, and their people live without churches. All this they unwisely charge on the north. The government insanely cherishes the viper which poisons the fountains of life in the commonwealth.

Care has been taken, too, as there are two senators from each state,

that for every free state admitted into the Union, there shall be, at the same time, one with slaves. There are now fifteen free states, and fifteen slave, making it impossible, if the slavery senators hold together, to pass any law tending to emancipation.

The majority of the "president's" cabinets have almost always been slaveholders. The present cabinet is composed of *five slaveholders*, and three freemen. Slavery has the army, the navy, the judiciary, the foreign relations, and the president. The free states have the treasury, the post-office, and the home department.

The great majority of the bureaus, the officers of the army and navy, and those on the civil list, the ambassadors to foreign states, and the consuls, have always been and are from the slave states. Slaveholders have occupied the presidential chair almost exclusively. There have been but four northern presidents. One of them, like Menahem in Israel, reigned but "one full month;" and each of the others but four years. There have been eight slaveholding presidents, who have administered the government forty-nine years. Their whole weight, without one exception, has been put into the scale of oppression. No northern president has ever rebuked slavery. The stronghold of this enormous national sin against God, and crime against the rights of man, has been the cabinet of the United States, and a meanly crouching national legislature.

The door was long closed by the house of representatives and the senate against even the reception of petitions adverse to slavery. Thus slavery is truly and emphatically a sin, involving the guilt of the whole nation—of all the voting community.

2. *The administration of the government has had a respect to property only.* Civil magistracy is ordained of God, and put into the hand of the Lord Jesus Christ for the preservation of moral order among men, to promote the intellectual and moral improvement of nations, and to subserve the cultivation of the souls of the citizens for glory and blessedness in another and better country—to do all this as subsidiary to the spiritual and heavenly functions of the church. It is shown above, that even in respect of the right of property, three millions of people are wronged out of their own by wresting from them the whole proceeds of their labour, and bestowing it on idle, immoral, haughty, and cruel lords. It is not then strange that a government perverted to so base ends, should take no care to execute the law of the Lord.

It is true that chaplains are appointed in the army and navy: midshipmen and the cadets in the military school at West Point are taught some science by the U. S. government. But, what then? The character of the chaplains, and the manner of their appointment, render it impossible that they should promote the eternal welfare or present happy culture of sailors or soldiers. While the government, in theory, professes to know no religion, to acknowledge no God, it assumes, in its administration, a function peculiar to the wants of Christ's house, by appointing those who profess to be ministers of religion to their places of labour, and governs them entirely in the discharge of ecclesiastical functions. It is an Erastian usurpation of power over church officers, to which the government has no more right, than it has to bind the chains of bondage on the slave. The kind of men who exercise this usurped power makes it impossible that they could desire to appoint learned, faithful, and godly chaplains. As respects the privilege of

cadets and midshipmen, it is merely to fit them for the protection of property. No more. Indeed, it is ever to be deplored that all our academies, colleges, and most of our common schools, aim at no higher object. This, however, so far from justifying the national government, is to be regarded as a bitter fruit of its corruption.

Read the messages of presidents and governors, the laws, resolutions, and speeches of legislatures, and what are they all?—money, money, nothing but money. A stranger from another planet would not suspect from them all, that Americans have souls to be saved or damned. It is, indeed, well, that there are chaplains appointed by Congress and by some state legislatures, to pray in the halls of legislation, and that there is some show of respect to religion, and attention to education in the army and navy. But it is deeply to be lamented, and we should all be humbled to the dust in sackcloth and ashes, that a republic, a great majority of whose citizens are descended from a Christian and covenanted ancestry, should have nationally divested itself of all but a few fragments, wearing a mere semblance of Christianity. “How has the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed!” All these evils are the more aggravated, as it is done in a nation where there are twenty thousand churches, and millions of Bibles and other good books, and on which Messiah, the Prince of the kings of the earth, has expended so abundantly his goodness in all temporal good things.

(To be continued.)

[For the Covenanter.]

REVIEW OF AN ARTICLE BY REV. JAMES CHRYSTIE—
REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN, VOL. XIII., p. 313.

This essay has for its professed object the vindication of the very grave theory that the obligation of the Westminster standards is valid and binding in the Reformed Presbyterian Church. A vindication much needed, certainly! It is prefaced by the equally important information that “controversy is *eminently diffusive*.” The whole essay is an indubitable proof of this great truth. And, moreover, it is a living illustration of the equally grave truth that “controversy spreads like fire—hurtful to the sight, and destructive in its progress.”

We are informed, too, that “the Deacon question was very indefinite in its form from the beginning.” Whether the writer means from the apostles’ times, or only since 1838, we cannot say. He says, also: “It has brought up some new issues.” This we very clearly saw before we had read half of his essay. There is certainly a perspicuity and precision in his argument, that leaves the reader inexcusable if he do not perceive at once the meaning of the writer. We are faithfully warned of the danger of these new issues. I presume, he means we should avoid them. He says: “They are calculated to disturb the very foundations of our ecclesiastical order.” We have no doubt of this truth. They may more disturb our order than the apparition “brought up” by the witch of Endor disturbed the king of Israel, and may be equally ominous. It may so disturb many that they may hardly know where they stand, or indeed whether they stand at all. Such a spectre, coming up these times, may turn many a strong head.

The essay gives some historical reminiscences. We now remember, that not long since, there was a dispute of some interest, about the mean-

ing of the phrase in our terms of communion, in these words—"as they were received by the Church of Scotland." The article does more than call up what our memory had dropped; it gives a piece of information entirely new—information as surprising as novel. Some question "whether ever the Church of Scotland received" the Westminster formulas at all! Still we are assured that "the *founders* of our church in this country" admitted the fact, and "acted upon it time out of mind." This is accounted for from the circumstance that our forefathers, "the founders of our church" were contiguous to the very time and events"—"and the fact itself has been handed down as a matter *incapable* of either *question* or *dispute*." Yet Rev. James Chrystie informs those for whose enlightening he writes, that this fact, "*incapable of question or dispute*," has been both questioned and disputed!

He tells us: "If I am right in my perception, (and why make this a matter of hypothesis?) it appears to be questioned—1st, whether the Church of Scotland ever received them at all; and, 2d, whether the manner in which she received them, (he should have said, in which 'they were received,') has been so understood in our church as to direct us to a knowledge and observance of all the obligations it involves." Both these questions are gravely considered in a brief view of facts before the writer in each case. "Facts?" Yes, these furnish the only safe light, in which, in this age of "*questions*" and "*disputes*," we should view things. Just here, however, the writer seems to lose sight of facts in view of an important matter. He says: "It seems that the same questions have relation also to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Catechisms—Larger and Shorter." Not quite, Father Chrystie. The phrase—"as they were received by the Church of Scotland"—is not "*named*" in the terms of communion in this connexion. Therefore, according to your own faith, and the faith of your party, we are not bound to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms, "*as they were received by the Church of Scotland*." The terms don't say we are. Still, *you* may receive them *as you* best like. *We* will—if you peaceably permit us—receive them *as the Church of Scotland received them*, even though the "*as*," &c., in question, and Confession, and Catechisms, too, had been *not* "*named*" in our terms of communion. However, as this was never settled by the "founders of our church in this country," we need not "*question*" or "*dispute*" about a matter to which we are not bound in our terms of ecclesiastical communion. So we all hold to the Confession and Catechisms somehow, it is little matter whether we hold *as* Seceders, *as* Associate Reformed, *as* General Assembly, or *as* Old Covenanters did before the founding of our new church in America, or *as* this new church now begins to hold, or *as* the Church of Scotland,—since our terms don't "*name*" how!

But, seriously, how the writer calls in the "formula of questions" in connexion with and as settling our obligations, and standards, &c., we really are at a loss to comprehend. Have he and his friends not told us that we may not go beyond what is "*expressly named* in the terms?" Perhaps he wrote his essay for the clergy—at all events, for the ministers, elders, and deacons, who are bound to the formula of questions,—this paragraph, at least, is for officers—the rest of the laboured essay for the common people!

Having prefaced the work, made his introduction, and defined his position, he then gravely repeats the question, and proceeds to the argu-

ment. He says: "1. Did the Church of Scotland ever receive them at all?" Beyond dispute, this is *a* question, for Rev. James Chrystie asks it; it must be so. But the difficulty follows. He says: "I know not on what grounds this fact is questioned." This he should have known before his attack; he may miss the ground entirely; so far he has grievously missed it. More,—his opponents have never yet taken "ground" on this question. Nor is this all,—he is as ignorant of the main thing—the fact of this "question" as of the ground. He *don't* know the fact to exist—he don't know that any rational being on earth, or under the earth, questions "this fact." As well might men question the existence of Paris, London, or the Westminster Assembly. And as well might father Chrystie wield his pen to prove to his very credulous readers the facts in the one case as "*this fact*" in the other. A serious and learned father in the church occupies nearly two pages to prove what he knows nobody denies! A whole title-page spread out before us! Large letters! "Printed in Edinburgh! By Sir D. Hunter Blair and J. Bruce! Printers to the King's Most Excellent Majesty! 1810!" Yes, so late!

After all these facts being given, and many more far more astounding, we feel sure no good man will ever hereafter doubt! We are sure this settles the controversy! And, for the sake of peace, and for the credit's sake of father Chrystie's brethren, who were formerly ignorant of "this fact" so fiercely disputed, we trust he will never expose them any more! When an antagonist yields, never strike him again; this is the law of honourable combat. And now, having yielded to our father—what we never disputed—the *first* question, we hope the matter is ended. But, should he, for the sake of having an argument, in this age of polemics, affirm that we question a fact "*incapable of question or dispute*," we shall be inclined, then, to question *something* that we shall be sorry to "*dispute*."

The second reason may, with some, have a shadow of doubt about it. It is:

"2. Has the manner in which they were received by the Church of Scotland been so understood in our church as to direct us to a knowledge and observance of all the obligations they contain?"

With the writer we agree, that "until very lately"—since the doctrine of the Church of Scotland in regard to the extent of the power of the deacon has been questioned—all were agreed. He resolves the inquiry into two particulars:

"1. Do the words, 'as they were received by the Church of Scotland,' refer to the prior and then existing ecclesiastical deeds of the Church of Scotland relative to doctrine, government, or worship, whereby these documents, Confession of Faith—Catechisms, Larger and Shorter—Form of Church Government, and Directory for Worship, were augmented, modified, or defined in their import, meaning, and authority?"

This question is worthy of attention, though to us almost self-evidently plain. And we answer in the affirmative, fearless of the consequences with which father Chrystie would horrify his readers. We shall remove these ugly features. His *first* result, of which we are warned, is that we should be acquainted with ecclesiastical deeds in existence when the Confession of Faith, &c., were adopted; and this, too, in order to make an intelligent profession. All right. Just as all our

people should be acquainted with the present discipline, lately adopted by our Synod, though we never thought of "*naming*" it in our terms of communion, or formally asking applicants if they have read it, and understand it. Yet it is, nevertheless, of authority in our church, and binding on all our members. The great evil now in the Covenanted Church is this very thing, staring us in the face—ignorance of the faith embodied in the standards and covenanted attainments of the Covenanted Church of Scotland—ignorance of what the church then knew, and professed, and swore in her covenants, and recognised in the provisos of her acts adopting the Westminster formulas, and of which doctrine, government, &c., she declared, when receiving them: "It is also provided, that this shall be no prejudice to the order and practice of this Kirk, in such particulars as are appointed by the Books of Discipline, and Acts of General Assemblies, and are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory." Does this proviso refer to nothing "*prior*"—to nothing "*then existing*" as "ecclesiastical deeds of the Church of Scotland?" If this be a matter of question, we may question, indeed, the existence of London and Westminster. See farther, the Act approving the Confession of Faith. "And the said Confession *being in nothing contrary to the received doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this Kirk*,—the General Assembly doth, *therefore*, after mature deliberation, *agree unto and approve* this said Confession." Nothing here referring to the "*prior*" and then existing deeds! Yes, infallibly. In every adopting act, there is reference to the prior and then existing deeds relative to doctrine, government, &c., whereby the documents in question are defined in their import and authority. That this exposes Covenanters to the duty of being intelligent, and to the duty of reading much—much, especially, of the deeds and doings of their fathers, in order to be consistent with their engagements to approve of their faithful contendings, &c., can be no prejudice to the *fact* of their position and relation in obligation to the deeds ecclesiastical of the church with which they are identified. But it may be some prejudice to the *manner* in which the Witnesses have been for some time carrying forward reformation attainments—binding up the testimony, and finishing it, so that no item be lost. Formerly Covenanters were intelligent, and did read much of the deeds and sufferings of their fathers; they retained the old ecclesiastical records of their contendings; they loved them, and maintained them. Then there were no disputes about the 2d Book of Discipline; it was recognised in their Faithful Contendings, Vindications, Declarations, Testimonies, &c.; and any one opposing would have been cut off from the fellowship of the faithful "Society people," as an apostate. Alas, we are not the sons of those fathers!

Nor need Covenanters be terrified, in this age of extreme free thinking, by the popish maxim—"I believe as the church believes." This need not be brandished over our heads, while so many among us don't believe what their church believes—that is, what they themselves profess to believe! No, not while leaders in the church can write against Discipline, old and *new*—and can trifle with our solemn obligations, by confining them to the things "*named*" in the brief synopsis called Terms of Communion—and can recognise no obligation descending upon us, and prior to the organization of the Covenanted Church, by its "founders in this country," because it rested upon the Church of Scot-

land. So far as the present dispute is concerned all are safe, if they are honest,—the 2d Book of Discipline is neither voluminous nor rare. Any man, or woman, or boy, or girl, can have it. If our church has never furnished it to her members, neither has she furnished the Confession of Faith. How soon will this trite sophism be turned upon the Confession? “*Our church has never furnished it to her members!*” Did Covenanters believe the doctrines of the ecclesiastical deeds of the Church of Scotland as they were regarded and practised when the Westminster deeds were modified and defined, and so adopted, we should have no trouble now about deacons, or the extent of their power.

And now, since there is such effort made to establish the false position, viz., that the import, meaning, and authority of the Westminster standards were neither “augmented, modified, nor defined by prior and existing deeds of the Church of Scotland,” we need only to look at two plain facts. *First*, that laws made and enacted under the limitation of a proviso regarding prior and then existing law—proviso expressly guarding against the prejudicing of existing statute, fully recognises the legal and binding obligation of the old law. This every civilian knows, and every ecclesiastic ought to know—does know. *Second*, that said proviso is as certainly made in this case as was ever made in any case of legislation on earth.

The second particular into which the question is resolved, is thus stated:

“2. That we are required to receive them in that original integrity and entireness with which they were by that church received, unaltered, un mutilated, and incorrupt. And this is suggested by the very phraseology employed—it is not, in the active form, expressive of the modifying action of that church in her own prior ecclesiastical state; not as *they received them*, but as they, the documents themselves, *were received*; in other words, it refers not to the qualifying circumstances, or prior state of the Church of Scotland in receiving them, but to the condition of the documents when received or adopted.”

On this we remark—*First*. The Church of Scotland did not receive them in their “original entireness, unaltered.” But she did—1. *Add* the adopting Acts, and to them we are as much bound as to original deeds; they are *our* adopting Acts. She *added* a preface to the Directory for public worship, and made it as binding as the Directory itself; *it is adopted* in the Act adopting the Directory. She did—2. *Explain and limit* the meaning in some parts; as, *first*, the Confession of Faith, Chap. xxxi. Art. 2, to mean “only of kirks not settled, or constituted in point of government;” as, *second*, in the preface to the Directory, she says, by way of explaining its obligation, she requires “a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the *substance*.” She did—3. *Leave out*, or did *not adopt* some parts; as, *first*, “that *article* which holds, that the doctor hath power of the administration of sacraments;” as, *second*, “the distinct rights and interests of presbyters and people in calling ministers.” These were left open to the farther discussions and conferences between Scotland and England in order to the consummation of the union betwixt the two churches then so happily in progress.

On the above we remark—*Second*. The distinction between, “*as they received them*,” and “*as they were received*,” is a distinction without difference, and is a sophism, and so naked that any schoolboy

can see it. The standards in question, after all the logical acumen displayed, were received by the Church of Scotland *precisely* as the Church of Scotland received them. She received them in the identical act of approving or adopting them; and in the Acts adopting, as prefixed respectively to each part of the Westminster documents, she did fix, settle, define, limit, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, as designed by herself when she first made them her own. "Now, as the Church of Scotland received them," *not* "in their original form, unaltered," but *as* modified, explained, defined, limited by provisos, &c., to be explained in good faith "in nothing contrary" to "prior existing" doctrine, government, discipline, "*so we receive them.*" "And is this nothing?" "Why it is the very circumstance that distinguishes the Reformed Presbyterian Church from all the ecclesiastical bodies around bearing the Presbyterian name." Father Chrystie's reference to other Presbyterians will not do here. Let it be remembered—1. The Church of Scotland did not receive the Westminster documents as first compiled and sent down to her from the Westminster Assembly. She received them as a foreign element. She legislated on them; compared them with the Bible and her prior and then existing standards; she passed judgment on them; altered, improved, explained, *then* she adopted. 2. Seceders did, in substance, the same in this country; they explained them by their Testimony; limited, defined, &c., then adopted. Hence they say in their terms of communion, "*as* received by the Associate Church." So of other Presbyterians. 3. The Reformed Church in this country, differing from all others, never passed any formal act of adoption making them her own. She received them *as* a birth-right inheritance, *as* always her own since they were first adopted; that act, or those acts of adoption she claims as her own, "*as they were received by the Church of Scotland,*" which Church of Scotland is the Reformed Presbyterian Church; *she is no new church founded in this country!* Yes, this is precisely the difference betwixt us and other Presbyterians. We preserve the identity with the Church of Scotland by preserving her adopting Acts *as our own*; this no other church does.

After all we have now said of this essay of our esteemed father, there yet remains a paragraph which draws more deeply upon the integrity and validity of obligations to all the attainments of a covenanted reformation than any thing we have now noticed. It is the last paragraph. There he says:

"On that title-page is made mention of the Sum of Saving Knowledge, as of *public authority*, in immediate connexion with the Confession of Faith, &c., and the Form of Church Government, &c. This is surely *more* than can be said of some other documents plead for."

The 2d Book of Discipline he means, of course. This is puerile—lamentably puerile. The printer has placed the Sum of Saving Knowledge on the title-page; therefore, it has *more* authority than the 2d Book of Discipline! Worse; therefore, it has as good authority as the Confession of Faith! For he says:

"Now, if the words 'as they were received by the Church of Scotland,' mean with the same existing ecclesiastical deeds of doctrine, order, or worship, already in being in that church, or at the same time, and by the same act adopted and recognised, of course the 'Sum of Saving Knowledge' goes

along with those we adopt and recognise, and we are bound to the one as much as to the other."

If there be any meaning in all this—happily there is none—it is this: we are bound to the Confession, the Sum of Saving Knowledge, &c., from the fact that they are all in the title-page, and there said, by the king's printer, to be of "*public authority!*" "And we are bound to the one as much as to the other!" The design may be gleaned from what follows:

"But the silence of our judicial acts on that document—the Sum of Saving Knowledge'—and the constant silence of our whole church in relation to it, leave it without any judicial authority."

If this have any meaning—and we fear it has too much—it is this: we are bound to the Confession of Faith, *only*, because our church, in being founded in this country, "*named*" it in her terms of communion; and, therefore, for similar reasons, we are *not* bound to the Sum of Saving Knowledge, *because it is not "named" there*. For if we are bound to the one as much as the other, independently of our American terms, and as the terms do not *name* the Sum of Saving Knowledge, and we are therefore not bound to it as a standard, for the same reason we might have left out of our terms the Confession of Faith, National Covenant, &c., and so have been bound to neither as standard. The meaning of father Chrystie, in the whole article, is, evidently, that we are not bound to the Confession of Faith, Covenants, &c., by any approving Act of the Church of Scotland, but by our terms, adopted when laying the foundation of the church in this country. This appears further from what follows:

"Therefore, it is evident that the clause in our Terms of Communion, 'as they were received by the Church of Scotland,' refers not to any accompanying action of that church as it regards other documents, nor to any prior or existing enactments of doctrine, government, or worship, whereby obligations are augmented or diminished, but only to that character of integrity belonging to these documents themselves."

If we mistake not—and we would rather hope we do—the meaning of all this elaborate article, and much of kindred spirit recently from its author, it is that with the judicial deeds, Acts, Covenants, and standard obligations of the Church of Scotland, we have nothing to do, but as we chose by our own acts and ecclesiastical deeds in this country. Our Terms of Communion determine every thing—obligation, extent, and all—we are bound to nothing but what is "*named*" there, and to that only because "*named*" there—we are bound to nothing, as a church, because the Church of Scotland was bound to it! We have not so learned our identity with the Church of Scotland, and the descending obligation of her Covenants. Rather, in application of the song of the one church and spouse of Christ, to this entire subject, we from our inmost heart, rejoicing in our ecclesiastical identity with our mother church, would sing in faith—"Even marching through the flood on foot, there we in him were glad." When the church in public covenant with God bound herself to all her attainments in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, then, blessed be God, we were bound in her! Yes, we are bound to the National Covenant of Scotland, though not an attainment of the second reformation, and even though it had never been "*named*" in our American Terms. And so also of the 2d Book of

Discipline. "Named," or "not named," there can never settle our obligation in covenant to a Covenant God—our Covenant fathers' God.

And now, in conclusion. Could we believe the theory of our esteemed father as put in the article before us and in other elaborations on the subjects of ecclesiastical identity, the unimpaired and descending obligations of the covenant deeds of our fathers of the Covenanted Church of Scotland, and our relations to the whole standards of the mother church, we should cease our contendings to maintain in this country a separate ecclesiastical organization. We would rather, after the enlightened and liberal example of the Associate Reformed Church, throw away, to the moles and to the bats, all that accumulated heap of rubbish—as bound up in the whole attainments of a Covenanted Reformation, gathered together at the expense of so much toil, and reproach, and suffering, and blood, during a long period of fiery trial, and go with those from whom we have come out, and who are to the letter carrying out the theory in question.

J. B. J.

REJOINDER TO THE REMARKS OF T. S. IN RELATION TO THE SECOND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE, AND THE WESTMINSTER FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.*

In the essay of Mr. S. it is said, "We have heard it remarked that the Form of Church Government is binding as far as it goes." Query, How far does Mr. S. think it binds? After all his labour, Mr. S. is obliged to confess, that the Form of Church Government *has not those things which it wants*; and, also, that they must be supplied out of the second Book of Discipline.

Mr. S. says, "We view the second Book of Discipline as good authority, except where it is repealed by the acts of the General Assembly." Will Mr. S. inform us how much of it was repealed by those acts? I know of no part of it that was repealed by those acts, except what relates to the Doctor.

Whatever we may think of the form of election prescribed in the second Book of Discipline, it is the form prescribed in the printed acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and observed by Mr. Renwick when he ordained the elders at Darmed.

It is admitted that our church testified against the Revolution establishment in Scotland, because it consigned to oblivion the attainments of the second Reformation, and went back to the establishment of Presbyterianism in 1592. But, "That the second Book of Discipline was ratified by the Parliament of Scotland, in 1592, and that it is to this act of ratification that reference is made in these extracts, where that year is named," we do not admit. It is hardly to be supposed, that those who set forth the Testimony of 1761 were so absurd as to testify, first against the second Book of Discipline, and afterwards for it, in the same Testimony.

Thornburn and his fellows were no such blockheads. They blamed the parliament of 1592, not for ratifying the second Book of Discipline, but for not ratifying it.

* The substance of this essay was sent to the Reformed Presbyterian; but it has not been published.

This article has appeared in the February number of the Reformed Presbyterian, with some paragraphs omitted.—Ed. Cov.

Let us know the true state of the case.

"In June, 1592, the Parliament passed an act. . . . This act ratified and embodied some of the leading propositions in the second Book of Discipline. . . . This settlement was not without its defects. Not to mention some important pieces of reformation, craved in the second Book of Discipline, which it entirely left out. The supreme court was deprived of the right, which it had hitherto possessed, of appointing its own meetings; and the power of presbyteries, and the liberties of the people, were fettered by the continuance of lay patronage."—M^cCrie's *Life of Melville*, p. 275. Oxford ed.

Did brother S. not know what is above stated? or did he assert that the Parliament of 1592 ratified the second Book of Discipline, in order to mislead his readers?

I shall not inquire whether the second Book of Discipline is a good law; but shall content myself with proving that it is law in the Covenanter Church.

" . . . Each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the Most High God, do swear

"That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government."—Solemn League and Covenant, Sec. 1st.

Now, where do we find the discipline and government of the Church of Scotland at that period? In the second Book of Discipline, and not in the Westminster forms; for they had no existence till two years after.

But it may be objected that the Covenant cannot bind us to any thing that is wrong. Admitted: and if there be wrongs in the second Book of Discipline, let them be pointed out and rectified; but let us not pretend that we are not bound by a document to which we are solemnly sworn.

Brother S. would have his readers believe that those who are in favour of deacons are opposed to the Westminster standards, because they adhere to the second Book of Discipline. Now, we take those documents *as they were received by the Church of Scotland*. But the adopting act of the Church of Scotland places the second Book of Discipline and the Westminster forms side by side: that what was wanting in the one, might be supplied from the other.

Henderson, Rutherford and Gillespie, did not go to learn Presbyterian Church government of the English: they went to teach them. Nor do they appear ever to have thought of abolishing their own most excellent standards, which they had sworn to maintain.

The Deacon men, as we are called, think that the best way of manifesting their attachment to the Westminster forms, is to reduce them to practice. When brother S. shall have ordained deacons in his congregation, and when the officers of his congregation "meet together at convenient and set times, for the well ordering of the affairs of that congregation, each according to his office," he will have done more to convince us of his attachment to the Westminster forms, than if he were to write volumes on the subject.

No Deacon man, as far as I know, has ever questioned the authority of the Westminster standards. We all hold them for constitutional law: we believe that those who framed them were endued with a more than ordinary measure of the Holy Spirit.

Brother S. should not endeavour to bewilder the public mind, by pretending that we are opposed to the Westminster standards; for he knows that it is not so: neither should he pretend that the point at issue between him and us is, whether the magistrate should support the church; he knows that we are as much in favour of that as himself. He knows the point on which he differs from the Reformation Church is, Whether the civil magistrate should manage the church's temporalities? The Reformers held the negative: Mr. S. holds the affirmative.

The reader will perceive that Mr. S.'s essays are built on false assumptions. Of course, his arguments need not be considered in detail. When a disputant endeavours to make a false issue with his opponent, it argues that he is conscious of having a bad cause.

THE APOSTLESHIP A TEMPORARY OFFICE.

[Continued from page 230.]

2. The other case, in which there is a doubt as to the application of the name APOSTLE, is Rom. xvi. 7. Here the phrase *επισημοι εν τοις αποστολοις* may mean either *eminent apostles* or *highly esteemed among* (that is, by) *the apostles*. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the former is the better construction, we are not shut up to the conclusion that Andronicus and Junias (or Junia, as Bishop Onderdonk writes it, even while claiming him or her as an apostle) were Apostles in the strict sense. We have just as much reason to believe, that they were Apostles in another sense. Even supposing, for the present, that no such sense of the term can be proved from usage, we have just as much reason to infer it from this passage, as to infer that these two persons were Apostles in the strict sense. For against this inference lies, first, the whole weight of the strong presumption that the apostolic office was a temporary one; and, secondly, the extreme improbability that two eminent apostles, in the strict sense of that title, would be thus named among a crowd of private Christians, and never heard of elsewhere. Is it easier to believe this than that the word apostle has a double meaning, even supposing this to be incapable of proof from any other quarter? We are not now determining the true sense of the passage. We are only showing that a passage which admits, first of two grammatical constructions, and then (assuming that contended for by our opponents) of two interpretations, cannot be regarded as decisive of so difficult and grave a question as the one respecting the perpetual or temporary nature of the apostolic office.

In these two cases, it is doubtful to whom the name Apostle is applied; but in the other three, there can be no such doubt. We admit that Barnabas, Epaphroditus, and the brethren who accompanied Titus, are expressly called *αποστολοι*; and from this the inference is drawn by our opponents, that the Apostolic office, strictly so called, was conferred upon these persons, and that it consequently did not cease with the original incumbents. This inference involves the assumption that the term *αποστολος* has always the same meaning, namely, that of Apostle in the strict sense, as denoting one of the original thirteen, or a person equal to them in official rank and power, as supreme ruler of the church under Christ himself. In order to estimate the probability of this assumption, it is necessary to refer to the analogy of other terms, used to denote office in the Christian church.

The other terms admitted, upon both sides, to be so employed, are *πρεσβυτερις*, *επισκοπος*, *διακονος*, *ποιμην*, *διδασκαλος*, *πρωφειτης*, *αρχιερος*.* Now let it be observed that, of these seven words, not one was invented for the purpose, or derived from the Hebrew. They are all pure Greek words, used by profane writers, and already familiar to the Jews who spoke that language, before they were appropriated to the use in question. From this state of the case it would be natural and reasonable a priori, to conclude that all the words would have at least a double sense, as used in the New Testament, viz. a wide or popular meaning, according to their etymology and previous usage, and a stricter technical meaning, as appropriated to the designation of ecclesiastical office. How far this natural presumption is confirmed by the actual usage of the New Testament, may be forcibly stated, as to some of these terms, in the words of a well known episcopal writer.

“Many words have both a loose and a specific meaning. The word ‘angel’ is

* *Ευαγγελιστης* is omitted, because its precise meaning is a matter of dispute. As to the rest, there is a formal agreement.

often applied loosely, (Acts xii. 15; Rev. i. 20, ix. 14.) but distinctively it means certain created spirits. The word 'God' is applied to angels, (Deut. x. 17. Ps. xvii. 7, cxxxvi. 2.) and idols, (Ex. xx. 3, xxiii. 24, &c.) and human personages or magistrates, (Exod. vii. 1, xxii. 28; Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6, cxxxviii. 1; John x. 35;) but distinctively it means the Supreme Being. The word 'deacon' means an ordinary servant, a servant of God in secular affairs, and any minister of Christ; but a Christian minister of the lower grade is its specific meaning. So with the word 'elder,' it is sometimes applied to the clergy of any grade or grades; but its appropriate application is to ministers of the second or middle order. The above remarks, it is hoped, will enable those who feel an interest in consulting scripture on the subject before us, to do so without any embarrassment from the apparent confusion of official names or titles." *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined*, p. 14.

"We would also advert to the fact that, however distinct may have been the three above Latin names for the three grades of sacerdotal office, those names of office were, in the Greek, and at an earlier period, applied but loosely. At least, they were so in the New Testament. Thus we read 'this ministry [*deaconship*] and *apostleship* (Acts i. 25)' for the office to which Matthias was admitted. 'I am the apostle of the gentiles, I magnify mine office [my *deaconship*,] the ministry [*deaconship*] which I have received,' 'approving ourselves the ministers [*deacons*] of God,' (Rom. xi. 13; Acts xx. 34; 2 Cor. vi. 4,) are passages applied by St. Paul to himself. We also read, 'who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers, [*deacons*] by whom ye believed?' (1 Cor. iii. 5,) and 'do the work of an *evangelist*, make full proof of thy ministry, [*deaconship*]'—thou shalt be a good minister [*deacon*] of Jesus Christ,' are admonitions addressed to Timothy, (2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 6.)" *Ib.* p. 20. "It may not be improper to add some further illustrations of the uncertainty of official names. Thus we say the Jewish 'priesthood,' including in that term, with the priests, the superior order of high priests, and the inferior one of Levites. Thus also we have the phrase 'ministry [literally *deaconship*] of reconciliation;' and the expressions, 'that the ministry [*deaconship*] be not blamed;' 'seeing we have this ministry, [*deaconship*,]' 'putting me into the ministry, [*deaconship*,]' and more especially 'apostles, prophets, evangelists, &c., are all said to have been given for the work of the ministry, [*deaconship*,]' (2 Cor. v. 18, vi. 8, 4; 1 Tim. i. 12; Eph. iv. 11, 12,) in all which passages the word *deaconship*, *διακονία*, the appellation strictly of a sacred body of men, or of their office, includes, nay, signifies chiefly, those who were superior to deacons. The word 'presbytery,' therefore, being no more definite than 'ministry' or 'deaconship,' cannot explain itself in favour of our opponents. *Ib.* p. 21. The mere expression *Presbytery*, therefore, does not explain itself, and cannot of itself be adduced in proof of parity."

We make these quotations from an argument against the doctrine which we are defending, not for the sake of the specific application which the author makes of an important principle, but for the sake of the principle itself, which is, that names of office "do not explain themselves," and "cannot of themselves be adduced in favour" of either side of the question. An obvious deduction from this rule is that the mere use of the name "apostle" can prove nothing as to the precise rank of the men to whom it is applied, which can only be determined by a careful collation of the general usage with the context in any given case. Let us proceed to this comparison; but first let us consider the analogous usage of the other titles which have been enumerated, and which are employed to designate ecclesiastical office. In order to secure a satisfactory result, we shall survey them *seriatim*.

1. *Πρεσβύτερος* sometimes means *older*, as an adjective in the comparative degree, (Luke xv. 25; John viii. 9;) sometimes an *old man* in the proper sense (1 Tim. v. 1, where it is put in opposition to *πρεσβύτερα*;) sometimes an officer or magistrate under the Jewish commonwealth, (Matt. xxi. 23; Mark xv. 1; Luke vii. 3; Acts iv. 8, &c.;) sometimes an officer of the Christian Church, (Acts xv. 2, xx. 17; 1 Tim. v. 19; Tit. i. 5; Jas. v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 5.)

2. *Επίσκοπος* (which only occurs five times in the New Testament) in one case is applied to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church, or the spiritual guardian of the souls of all believers, (1 Peter ii. 25.) Elsewhere it denotes the official overseer of a particular church or congregation, (Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7.)

3. *Διάκονος* sometimes means a menial servant, a domestic, (Matt. xx. 26, xxii. 13, xxiii. 11; John ii. 5, 9;) sometimes a minister or agent either of good or evil, (Gal. ii. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 15;) sometimes a secular representative of God, (Rom. xiii. 4;) sometimes a minister of the old dispensation (Rom. xv. 8;) sometimes a minister of the Christian Church generally, without regard to rank, (2 Cor. iii. 6, xi. 23; Eph.

iii. 7, vi. 21; Col. i. 7, 23, 25, iv. 7: 1 Thes. iii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 6;) sometimes a *deacon*, the lowest order of church-officers, (1 Tim. iii. 8, 12.)

4. Ποιμήν sometimes means a literal shepherd, (Matt. xxv. 32; Luke ii. 8, 15, 18, 20;) sometimes a spiritual pastor, both in reference to Christ himself, (Matt. xxvi. 31; John x. 2, 11, 12, 14, 16; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 25,) and to his ministers, (Eph. iv. 11.)

5. Διδάσκαλος sometimes means a teacher generally, as opposed to a learner or disciple, (Matt. x. 25; Rom. ii. 20;) sometimes a public teacher of religion, (Luke ii. 46; John iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; James iii. 1,) especially the founder of a school or sect, (Matt. ix. 11, vii. 24; Luke xviii. 18;) sometimes an official teacher in the Christian Church, (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11, iv. 3.)

6. Προφήτης once means a poet, regarded by the heathen as inspired, (Tit. i. 12.) Elsewhere it means, sometimes a prophet of the old dispensation, (Matt. i. 22, viii. 17, &c.,) sometimes an inspired teacher in the Christian Church, (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, xiv. 29, 32, 37; Eph. iv. 11.)

7. Ἄγγελος sometimes means a human messenger, (Luke ix. 52;) sometimes a spirit, good (Matt. i. 20, &c.) or bad, (Matt. xxv. 41; 2 Cor. xii. 7;) sometimes an ecclesiastical superior (Rev. i. 20, ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 5, 7, 14.)

Now if ἀπόστολος has one invariable meaning in the New Testament, it is contrary, not only to what might have been expected from the origin and previous usage of the term, but also to the analogy of the other terms used in the New Testament, to designate ecclesiastical office. The only probable supposition *a priori* is, that it would have the same variety of meaning as the rest. Now of the seven terms, which we have been considering, the three which occur most frequently in application to ecclesiastical office, have a threefold usage perfectly distinguishable. They are all used in a popular sense, in a general religious sense, and in a specific ecclesiastical sense. Thus πρεσβύτερος is used, in a popular sense, to signify an old man; in a general religious sense, to signify a minister of any rank; and in a strict ecclesiastical sense to signify a Presbyter. The popular sense of διάκονος is a servant, its more restricted sense a minister, its most restricted sense a deacon. The widest sense of διδάσκαλος is a teacher of any kind; its more restricted sense, a religious teacher; its most restricted sense, an authorized official teacher in the Christian Church. The three corresponding senses of the word ἀπόστολος would be (1) a messenger of any kind; (2) a religious messenger or missionary; (3) an Apostle, in the strict official sense before described. And this distinction, suggested by analogy, is verified by usage. The first of these senses occurs in John xiii. 16, "the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent (ἀπόστολος) greater than he that sent him." Here ἀπόστολος stands in the same relation to the *sender*, as the *servant* to the *lord*. The second sense occurs in Rom. xi. 13, where ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος means not merely a Christian teacher of the highest rank, but one *sent out* as a missionary to the heathen. The same idea is still more clearly expressed in 1 Tim. ii. 7, where the collocation of the words connects ἀπόστολος, in a peculiar manner, with κήρυξ and διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν. The very same form of speech is repeated in 2 Tim. i. 11. In neither of these cases would the word *bishop*, in the modern sense, seem natural in such a position. If ἀπόστολος is here used in the technical sense, without any special reference to its etymology, why is it thus twice placed between the titles *preacher* and *teacher of the Gentiles*? We are, of course, not endeavouring to show, that Paul was not an Apostle in the strict sense, but that the word is sometimes used with special reference to its etymology, and in its secondary sense of a religious messenger or missionary. The third or strict sense is the usual one, and need not be exemplified.

Let us now apply this usage of the term to the three cases which remain to be considered. 1. It appears from Phil. iv. 10—18, that the Philippian Christians had sent a present to Paul at Rome, by the hands of Epaphroditus. For this act of benevolence the apostle heartily commends and thanks them in the passage just referred to. It is a certain fact, then, that Epaphroditus was a *messenger* from them to Paul, for the specific purpose of supplying his necessities. When, therefore, in a former part of the same letter, Epaphroditus is described in these terms, "Epaphroditus, my companion in labour and fellow-soldier, but your ἀπόστολος," which is more probable, that it means an Apostle in the strict sense, or a messenger? The solution of this question is made still more easy by the words which are added—"and he that ministered to my want"—which are clearly explanatory of τὸν ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν. This interpretation of ἀπόστολος not only deducts one from the alleged proofs of an addi-

tion to the number of apostles, but adds one to the proofs that ἀπόστολος is sometimes used in the sense of messenger.

2. It appears from 2 Cor. viii. 16, 17, that Titus, in compliance with Paul's request, and his own strong inclination, was about to visit Corinth, and that Paul sent with him "the brother whose praise was in the gospel throughout all the churches," and also another "brother, whom (says he) we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent upon the great confidence which I have in you." Of these two persons who accompanied Titus, one is expressly said to have been "chosen of the churches to travel with us [i. e. Paul,] with this grace which is administered by us, to the glory of the same Lord and declaration of your ready mind." He was therefore a messenger of the churches, and both he and the other companion of Titus were messengers of Paul to the church at Corinth; and the other would even seem, from the last clause of v. 22, to have been a messenger from that church to Paul. These facts afford sufficient data for the decision of the question as to the sense of the word ἀπόστολοι in the following sentence. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of, they are the ἀπόστολοι of the churches, and the glory of Christ." (2 Cor. viii. 23.) Here are two cases, then, in which the word is applied to persons, who are not known to have been Bishops, but who are known to have been messengers, and are so described in the context. This prepares us for the only remaining case, that of Barnabas.

3. Acts xiv. 4, 14. In order to understand this case aright, it is necessary to bear in mind the nature of the work in which Paul and Barnabas were then engaged. This we shall state in the words of a favourite Episcopal writer. "That this transaction at Antioch [Acts xiii. 1] related only to a special missionary 'work,' will be found sufficiently clear by those who will trace Paul and Barnabas through that work, from Acts xiii. 4 to xiv. 26; where its completion is recorded—'and thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the *work* which they fulfilled.' This 'work,' their missionary tour, being 'fulfilled,' all was fulfilled that had been required by the Holy Ghost, when he had them 'separated' or 'recommended to the grace of God' 'for the work to which he had called them.' This call, therefore, this separation, this 'work,' related only to a particular mission. And this laying on of hands was no ordination, but a lesser ceremony, which has no bearing on the controversy between parity and episcopacy."* "When the latter [i. e. Barnabas] had been made an Apostle, we know not; neither do we know when James, the brother of the Lord, Sylvanus, &c., were admitted to that office."†

The case then stands thus; two men are called ἀπόστολοι, one of whom we know to have been an Apostle in the highest sense; but when the other "had been made an Apostle we know not." From this application of the term our opponents infer that both were Apostles in the strict sense. To this we might reply, that Barnabas is here called an Apostle in the strict sense, or rather included in the term ἀπόστολος, for he is never so called separately, although often mentioned and several times described, (Acts iv. 36; ix. 27; xi. 24; xiii. 1; xv. 35;) merely because he was Paul's colleague in this work, just as Silas is included in the description "Roman citizens," (Acts xvi. 37, 38,) for no reason that appears but this connexion with Paul, who is expressly and repeatedly declared to have been a Roman citizen, (Acts xxii. 25, 26, 27, 29; xxiii. 27.) Even granting, therefore, that ἀπόστολος is here used in its strict sense, it is by no means certain that it could have been applied, in that sense, to Barnabas alone; the rather as we have found no other case, in which it is so applied, either to him or any other person not of the original thirteen.

So too on the other hand, even admitting that he is individually styled an ἀπόστολος, it does not follow that he is so styled in the strict sense of the term. The word, as we have seen, is used in three distinct senses—(1) a messenger of any kind—(2) a religious messenger or missionary—(3) an Apostle in the strict sense. The name is here applied to a man who is nowhere else called an apostle, or described as one, but who was, at the very time referred to, engaged with Paul in "a special missionary work," a "missionary tour," to which the Holy Ghost had called them; for "this call, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission." Under these circumstances, which is more probable, that ἀπόστολος, as thus used, means a *missionary*, or that it means a supreme ruler of the church, equal in rank to the original thirteen? If it means the latter, it is singular, to say the least, that Barnabas, who is so often mentioned and repeatedly described, is nowhere else called an Apostle, which, in the case supposed, was his grand distinction. But if, on the other hand, he is so called in the lower sense, it is easy to

explain why he is no where else so called, viz. because his apostolic character was temporary. "This work, this missionary tour, being fulfilled, all was fulfilled that had been required by the Holy Ghost, when he had them separated or recommended to the grace of God, for the work to which he had called them. This call, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission." True, he afterwards went out upon a similar mission, but not, as it would seem, under church authority, nor is the narrative of that mission upon record. Paul, on the contrary, was still an Apostle and is still so called, which makes it at least probable that he was an Apostle in a higher sense than Barnabas.

Still it may be argued that as both are called Apostles, and as Paul was certainly one in the highest sense, the inference is plain that Barnabas was also an Apostle in the highest sense. This would be valid reasoning, if it were not equally certain that Paul was an Apostle in the lower sense too. One of the senses of the word applies to both; another applies certainly to one of them. Which is more reasonable, to infer that the latter applied also to the other, or to infer that the former is the sense here intended? In the one case, this solitary passage is adduced to prove what is no where else recorded, viz. that Barnabas was strictly an Apostle. In the other case, nothing is assumed or supposed to be here proved, but what is clearly revealed elsewhere, viz. that both Barnabas and Paul were missionaries.

The argument admits of a familiar illustration. In the foreign missions of our own and other churches, the word "missionary" has a double sense; a strict one applicable only to ordained ministers or clergymen, and a wider one including lay-assistants. The first is considered the most proper and is certainly the most usual sense; but the other does undoubtedly occur, even in the official documents of missionary boards, especially when several or all of those engaged in the work are spoken of collectively. Let us suppose then that in a certain mission, two persons, A and B, have long been labouring, the first as a preacher, and the second as a lay-assistant; but that in some one report or journal, they are twice mentioned by the common name of *missionaries*, and it becomes a question with some readers of the document, whether B was not an ordained minister. On examining the series of reports and journals, it is found that B is no where else even called a missionary, and that in the case in question, no act is ascribed to him which necessarily implies that he is an ordained clergyman. From these premises two opposite inferences are drawn. The one is, that as A is certainly a clergyman and as both are called missionaries, B must be a clergyman also. The other is, that as B is no where else represented as a clergyman, and as both he and A are certainly missionaries in a wider sense, that is the sense in which the term is used. Without insisting on a choice between these opposite deductions, as entirely conclusive, we may ask what would be thought of an argument to prove a doubtful point, as to the organization of the mission, from the mere application of the term in such a case. But in the case of Barnabas there is this distinctive circumstance, that the antecedent probability is in favour of the supposition, that the apostolic office, in the strict sense, was confined to a certain number of persons, among whom Barnabas was not; and that this presumption can only be removed by positive proof that he was an Apostle.

The amount, then, of the argument from names is this, that of five cases, in which the name apostle is said to be applied to persons not of the original thirteen, there are two in which the application is itself disputed, and at least so far doubtful as to render them unfit to be relied on as proofs; while in these cases, and in all the rest, the word either requires or admits another sense than that of an Apostle proper. These cases, therefore, make no change in the truth of the general proposition, that the extension of the Apostolic office to persons not of the original thirteen, is no where taught in scripture, either directly, by explicit assertion of the fact, or indirectly, by the application of the name Apostle, in its strict and highest sense.

III. A third argument in favour of the proposition, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, is that the qualifications for the Apostleship, as a permanent office in the church, are no where stated. Even supposing that an explicit statement of the fact might easily have been omitted, which we do not grant, and that the absence of any unequivocal application of the name may be accounted for, which seems impossible, the question still arises, why are the qualifications of an "Apostle-bishop" not revealed? It is not enough to say, because Paul or Peter has not left epistles to those who were to consecrate Apostle-bishops. Granting the fact, why was not such a revelation made? Were the instructions to Timothy and Ti-

tus, as to "Presbyter-bishops," given without necessity? If not, why was not an occasion sought or made for giving the qualifications of Apostles? Because this office demands none in particular, or because it is less important than the others? It may be said, indeed, that we have no right to inquire why certain things have been revealed and others not. But this would be a mere evasion of the argument by the misapplication of an acknowledged principle. The question is not what should have been, but what has been revealed; and if both parties are agreed that certain offices are recognised in the New Testament, and the qualifications for those offices carefully detailed, and if one of the parties alleges that another office is there recognised, the other party has a right to ask how the omission of its qualifications is to be explained upon the opposite hypothesis. This would be the case, even if the disputed office were the lowest. If, for example, the qualifications of Deacons had no where been given, the evidence of such an office, as a permanent order in the church, would be much less conclusive than that of the Presbyterate, although Deacons are expressly mentioned, in connexion with the Presbyters or Bishops, in two of Paul's epistles. How much inferior, then, is the evidence that Apostles were permanent officers of the church, when both these proofs are wanting. And how much weaker still when we consider the paramount importance attached to the apostolic office by the adverse party.

Even admitting, then, that no occasion does present itself in the New Testament, as it stands, for the detail of the qualifications of Apostles, that very circumstance increases, in a high degree, the improbability that such an office was intended to be permanently established. But this admission is gratuitous. By whom were subsequent apostles to be consecrated, if not by their predecessors in the office? If, then, Timothy and Titus were apostles, and addressed as such in Paul's epistles, why does he not instruct them in relation to the paramount importance of admitting only qualified men to that high station? Is it because the same qualifications which are required in presbyters, are also required in apostles? Even if this were so, the great alleged superiority of the apostolic office would entitle it to the honour of a separate enactment, especially as presbyters and deacons are distinctly treated, though the qualifications for these two offices are almost identical. This difficulty is not merely theoretical, but practical; for how are the qualifications of Apostle-bishops now to be determined? By what test shall they be judged? Those described in the first chapter of Acts are totally inapplicable to all modern cases. How then is it to be ascertained whether those admitted now to the alleged rank of Apostles, are as certainly possessed of the necessary qualifications as Presbyters and Deacons who are tried by the directions which Paul gave to Timothy and Titus? We do not maintain that this omission is itself sufficient to disprove the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, but merely that it renders it so far improbable as to require the most explicit proof to establish it.

But even this is not a full view of the subject of apostolical qualifications. It is not only true that no account is given of the qualifications of Apostle-bishops, as permanent officers in the church, after it had been planted by the original Apostles; but also that the qualifications which are given of an original Apostle, are of such a nature as to discountenance, in a high degree, the opinion that the office was intended to be permanent. When the death of Judas made a vacancy in the apostolic body, the disciples proceeded to elect a successor, and Peter, in the name of the eleven, declared the qualifications which were requisite. These were (1) that the candidate should have been one of Christ's original followers; (2) that he should be a witness of the resurrection. (Acts i. 22.) The obvious *prima facie* inference from this is certainly that none could be apostles who were destitute of these qualifications. And this is very much confirmed by the case of Paul, who seems not to have known the Saviour personally, during his abode on the earth, but who, in vindicating his own claim to an equality of rank with the eleven, says expressly, "Have I not seen the Lord Jesus?"—thereby admitting that to have seen him was necessary to the apostolic character. This might be urged, with plausibility at least, as a direct proof that the apostolic office was a temporary one, because the number of those who had actually seen Christ after his resurrection, was limited, and must soon be exhausted. All that we now allege, however, is, that the absence of express declarations, that the Apostolic office was continued in the church, is the more difficult to be explained on the opposite hypothesis, because when the qualifications of church officers are given, in two separate epistles, those of Apostles are not included; and because the only requisites prescribed in the election of a man to fill a vacancy in the original apostolic body, are precisely such as cannot be possessed by any men at present.

It may, however, be alleged, that although the permanence of the apostolic office is not explicitly asserted; and although the qualifications of Apostle-bishops are not given; and although the name Apostle, in its highest sense, is not applied to any but the original thirteen; others are, nevertheless, spoken of as actually exercising apostolic powers; and that as it is the thing, and not the name, which is really in question, this is sufficient to establish the perpetuity of the Apostleship. Before proceeding to examine the grounds of this allegation, there are two preliminary observations to be made upon it.

1. The omission of the name Apostle is by no means an unimportant circumstance. The title was not so regarded in the original institution. It did not grow out of circumstances, nor was it, in any sense, the result of accident. It is not said, in an incidental way, that the twelve were called apostles, as it is said that the disciples were called Christians at Antioch; but we are told, that our Lord "called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also HE NAMED APOSTLES." (Luke vi. 13.) The office and the name were conferred by the same authority. When the persons thus chosen are afterwards mentioned, it is commonly by the name which Christ bestowed at first, or by that of "the twelve," denoting their limited number. This is especially the case after our Lord's ascension, when there seems to be no case of the Apostles, in the strict sense, being called by any indefinite name. Now these two facts, viz. that the name was coeval with the office, and is recorded as a matter of some moment; and that the original Apostles are almost always, and after Christ's ascension always, called by it or some other title equally definite—render it *a priori* highly probable, that if the office was to be continued, the name would be continued with it; and that if continued in common parlance it would be applied in the New Testament; and that if applied at all, it would be applied with greater frequency than ever after the name had been extended to a multitude of persons. How is it that as the number of apostles increased, the mention of the name becomes less frequent, even when the organization of the church, and the qualifications of its officers, are the subject of discourse? These considerations will, perhaps, suffice to show, that the failure to establish the explicit application of the name Apostle to the alleged successors of the original thirteen, is by no means a matter of indifference, even if it can be shown that they possessed and exercised apostolic powers. Not that the actual possession and exercise of peculiar apostolic powers does not prove them to have been apostles, but that the omission of the title makes it harder to establish the fact of such possession and exercise, and entitles us to call for more explicit proof than would otherwise be necessary.

2. Before the exercise of apostolic powers by persons not of the original thirteen can be adduced in proof of the permanent continuance of the apostolic office, it must be determined what are apostolic powers. It cannot mean all the powers of the original apostles; for some of these are admitted, on both sides, to have ceased. It cannot mean any of these powers indefinitely; for some of them are admitted, on both sides, to be lawfully exercised by presbyters; and this would prove that presbyters are the successors of the apostles in the highest of their powers which did not cease. If the possession of any apostolic powers is a proof of the succession, then the succession is in presbyters. If the possession of all the apostolic powers is necessary to establish a succession, then there is none at all. Either of these conclusions would be fatal to the adverse argument, which cannot have the slightest force, except on two conditions—(1) that the apostolic powers, shown to have been exercised by persons not of the original thirteen, be such as are not acknowledged to have ceased—(2) that they be such as were not exercised by Presbyters. For if they were powers possessed by Presbyters, their exercise proves nothing but the continuance of that office, which is not disputed; and if they were powers which have ceased, their exercise in apostolic times proves nothing as to the rights and powers of any office now existing in the church. With these preliminary observations, we here leave the subject, reserving to a future time the full exhibition of our fourth argument against the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, which is, that no peculiar apostolic powers are said in scripture to have been exercised by any person, who was not either an original apostle or a presbyter.

THE WRONGS OF SLAVERY.

1. *Slavery does wrong to the owner.* The slave system is, to a great degree, a system of irresponsible power. The master has almost

unlimited authority over his servants. Of course, there are limits beyond which he is forbidden by law to go. But within these limits his authority is unquestioned and unquestionable. Of the conduct of his servants he alone is to judge. Whether it shall be approved or condemned rests with him alone. When offences are committed, he is to judge what kind and what degree of punishment is to be inflicted. At all times, and in all moods, sick or well, depressed or elated, calm or excited, he is to exercise this more than monarchical power. Now, we assert that it is wrong for any human being to put such power into his hands. It exposes one to greater temptations than any man, no matter what his elevation of mind or strength of character, ought to be subjected to. Irresponsible power is always a dangerous power; the wisest and best of men cannot safely be intrusted with its exercise. Occasions may arise when, under strong provocation, men of strongest minds and calmest tempers may lose all self-control, and, influenced by passion, say and do things, which for years may cause the most poignant emotions of shame and anguish. It is but a few days since a friend, a venerable man, a man who uniformly treats his servants with courtesy and affection, and who is regarded by them with reverence and love, said to us that he trembled whenever he thought of the nature of the power which as a master he continually wields. There are hundreds and thousands of our best citizens whose feelings respond to those of our aged friend. They understand the dangers attendant upon the exercise of irresponsible power. They know from experience the constancy and magnitude of the danger, and shrink from exposing their children as they have been exposed, to the fiery trial. To this cause, more than any other single cause, we believe, are to be attributed the great number of instances of emancipation by will. They know that slavery, as a system of irresponsible power, is a wrong to the slave owner.

Again. Slavery is wrong to the owner, because it places upon him, in addition to his own moral responsibility, the responsibility which belongs to others. In becoming the owner of a human being, one takes that being, mind and soul, as well as body, into his own care. His will is substituted for the will of the being owned. To his commands, instead of the decrees of conscience, the slave must conform. He judges between the right and the wrong. In fact, obedience to him is the slave's great rule of right, and disobedience to him the sum of wrong. He comes directly between the slave and the slave's God. Now, where is the moral accountability of the slave? The accountability is not his, for he is not his own. Yet the accountability must be somewhere. If the slave is ignorant, degraded, and vicious, some one must be responsible for his ignorance, degradation, and vice. And upon whom does this responsibility devolve? Upon whom can it devolve except upon the master? In becoming the owner of a slave, a man assumes the moral accountability of that slave. An undesirable and fearful assumption, it seems to us. We know not how others may feel, but for ourselves the load of our own responsibility is quite as much as we like to bear. We should regret exceedingly to answer for others' sins, finding it sufficiently hard to answer for our own.

2. *Slavery is a wrong to the children of the owner.* Slaves, as a class, are ignorant and degraded, incapable of exerting a pure, moral, or intellectual influence over the young; yet, to them, the care of the young is in great measure confided. During the period when the most

lasting impressions are made, and when it is of infinite importance that right impressions be made, the young are intrusted to those who are, far too often, morally incapable of making a right impression upon mind or heart. Is not this a wrong? Is it not an actual wrong? Are there not many men and women in our midst who tell us, that it has taken them months and years to remove the impressions made upon them in their susceptible years, impressions which have long rendered them the victims of superstitious fears, of which, even when suffering, they have been utterly ashamed?

Slavery sometimes proves even a more deadly wrong to the children of slave-owners. All of us, who have lived in the midst of slavery, have known too many instances, instances written in blood's dark lines upon memory's page, of deeds of violence, done in moments of passion by men, who, in childhood's hour, were wont freely to vent their anger upon the slave children around them, and who thus grew to manhood with passions unchecked and ungoverned, utterly destitute of self-control, and utterly unfit for temptation's trying hour. Could all the dark deeds which owe their existence to this fearful system be written in their own dark lines, a volume would be produced, repulsive, indeed, to the eye, and painful to the heart, but a most eloquent protest against slavery as the fatal foe to the young.

3. *Slavery is a wrong to the slave.* It denies him the right of liberty, that right dear to the humblest being, without which the palace of luxury is a prison, with which poverty's lowly dwelling becomes the abode of peace and happiness. It denies him the sacredness of marriage. When the slave pronounces the solemn vow of affection, he knows that at any moment the command may come for him to break the vow and bid farewell to the companion chosen as his life-friend. For him there is no marriage; for him no law sanctions the marriage rite, and no law frowns upon the forcible sundering of the marriage tie. At any moment, when caprice may dictate or avarice tempt, the slave-husband and slave-wife may be torn asunder and for ever. Slavery denies the slave the sacredness of home. He has no spot on earth which he may call his own, no asylum of the affections where the intruder may never come. Wife and children, home and heart, are all at the mercy of others. We speak now of the system of slavery. That system, as we all know, in many, very many instances, through the humanity and kindness of masters, loses these repulsive features. Hundreds of families are there in Kentucky, in which the tenderest care is exerted over the slave, in which his feelings as a husband and father are sacredly regarded. Still, however many such instances of kindly affection there may be, the essential nature of the system remains the same. In theory, if not practice, the slave is denied the inalienable rights which we have mentioned. And other rights, as dear and sacred, are denied him. He is denied the right of intelligence. In some States of the Union, the endeavour to impart knowledge to a slave stamps the offender as a felon, and exposes him by law to a felon's fate. Thank Heaven, no such relic of barbarism disgraces the statutes of Kentucky; but the existence of such a law in the States, where the slave interest preponderates over all other interests, proves the essential character of the system, and demonstrates how terrible a wrong slavery is to the slave.—*Louisville Examiner.*

SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS.

The following article, extracted from the Scottish Presbyterian, gives a concise view of the various branches into which the Presbyterian family, in Scotland, has been divided.

“In the reign of Charles II. there were two bodies of Scottish Presbyterians diametrically opposed to the Church of England, and to each other, called “Resolutionists” and “Remonstrants,” and answering to “Hoadleyites” and “Romaineists” in England,—using the terms in their conventional sense. At the Revolution, these two bodies, for the most part, coalesced as “Establishmentarians,” but some of the Remonstrants would admit of no settlement that did not embody the Solemn League and Covenant, whereupon they separated and called themselves “Reformed Presbyterians.” Thus, at no period since the Revolution, have the Scottish Presbyterians been *one*. 1st. In 1690, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians.—2d. In 1733, a dispute arose at Kinross about the placing of a preacher. In 1740, eight preachers were deposed by the General Assembly, and formed the first Secession, so that, in 1740, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians. 3. Seceders.—3d. In 1747, a dispute arose on this point: on admission as a Burgher, an oath was to be taken, embodying the words, “I do profess the religion presently established in this realm.” Some of the Seceders thought this a declaration against Romanism; others thought it in favour of the Establishment, and they parted as “Burghers” and “Antiburghers,” so that in 1747, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians. 3. Burghers. 4. Antiburghers.—4th. In 1755, a dispute arose at Jedburgh, similar to that at Kinross. Two preachers were deposed, and formed the “Relief Presbytery,” so that in 1755, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians. 3. Burghers. 4. Antiburghers. 5. Relief Presbyterians.—5th. In 1806, some Burghers wished a declaration to be made in favour of the union of civil and ecclesiastical powers, others murmured and parted, as the “Associate Synod of Original Seceders,” so that in 1806, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians. 3. Burghers. 4. Antiburghers. 5. Relief Presbyterians. 6. Associate Synod of Original Seceders.—6th. In 1821, the Burghers’ Oath became obsolete, and the Burghers and Antiburghers prepared to coalesce, but some Burghers parted off as the “Original Burghers’ Associate Synod,” thus, when six bodies were reduced to five, they at the same moment parted into six; and in 1821, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians. 3. Relief Presbyterians. 4. Associate Synod of Original Seceders. 5. United Associate Synod. 6. Original Burghers’ Associate Synod.—7th. In 1834, the *Romaineist* party in the General Assembly passed the veto act, which gave an absolute veto on the placing of a preacher, to the majority of male heads of families being communicants. This being declared illegal by the Court of Session and House of Lords; on the 18th May, 1843, and subsequent days, about 450 *Romaineist* preachers and elders left the Establishment, and formed the “Free Presbytery,” so that in 1843, there were,—1. Establishmentarians. 2. Reformed Presbyterians. 3. Relief Presbyterians. 4. Associate Synod of Original Seceders. 5. United Associate Synod. 6. Original Burghers’ Associate Synod; and 7. Free Presbyterian.”—(*Inverness Courier*.)

The recent amalgamation of the Relief and United Associate Synods, reduces the above number to 6 separate Presbyterian bodies in Scotland. Other parties have expired, or are dying in the nursery.

[For the Covenanter.]

THE CHERRY STREET CONGREGATION.

A correspondent of the Reformed Presbyterian makes some unfavourable comments upon the deed of the Cherry Street Congregation, Philadelphia, contrasting it with that of the Second Congregation in that city. Now, on this we remark—1. That the writer is mistaken—he does not intend to misstate—in saying, that “the property is held in trust for the consistory.” It is held in trust *for the congregation*; and hence, according to that deed, it is regarded in law, not at all as the property of the consistory, but of the congregation. This statement is made on the authority of the eminent counsel by whom the deed was prepared with the utmost care. Indeed, it is matter of surprise, that any one could think otherwise. With this remark, we might leave the whole article: its foundation is gone. But—2. That deed contains no enumeration of standards of faith, as does the deed of the Second Congregation.* In the original draught, prepared by the congregation, there was such enumeration, even more minute than the one of which this writer approves. Their counsel advised its omission, on two grounds. 1st. That it was unnecessary; inasmuch as should any party arise claiming the property, they would profess their adherence to the same principles. This we know, from the New Light division. 2d. It would be hurtful. In any case, oral and documentary testimony would have to be taken, in reference to the position of the respective parties, the mention of standards, or any other matter of the kind, would only embarrass the investigation. All that is necessary, is the definite statement, which is made in that deed, of the location of the church. Testimony will settle, if it should ever be called in controversy, the doctrines held by that congregation, with every circumstance respecting their application. Moreover, their soundness in the faith is sufficiently established without any formal declaration of their creed in a document like this. 3. The Consistory is mentioned in the deed upon the principle, that in law, some body of known constitution is necessary as a medium between the congregation and the persons named in the deed. This is so in the case of all unincorporated societies. No power, however, is thereby conferred upon the Consistory, which the rules and customs of the church do not confer upon it. And, as every one there knows, the Consistory claims and exercises no authority to dispose of mortgage, or in any way alienate or endanger the property, except by a vote of the congregation. And here, we remark, that if the counsel of the Cherry Street Congregation understands the law—and he is one of the most eminent and trustworthy on this subject, in the city—all the provisions of the deed of the Second Congregation binding their trustees to act according to their will, are merely so much blank paper. If their deed has any legal validity at all, the trustees hold the property independent of the congregation.† 4. As to

* It is remarkable that in this professed enumeration of the standards of the church, by the 2nd Congregation, the Covenants, National and Solemn League are entirely omitted.

† Since this article was written, we have been informed that this deed of the Se-

the title "trustees," this is the law title. The congregation were obliged to use it, the law of that state recognising no such style as Deacon. This is one of the misfortunes attending the church in a community which gives her, as a church, no legal existence. Deacons, however, according to the decision of Synod, having the power usually exercised by trustees, it is of little consequence that they should be called by that name in such deeds. 5. That deed was prepared with great care, the congregation holding some five or six meetings in reference to it, watching and deciding upon every step of the process. 6. There is not a trace of likeness between this deed and those which give the property of the church into the hands, as their own, of Popish bishops. Such statements are utterly unfounded and slanderous. Finally, if a better deed can be devised—one which will satisfy even anti-deacon men, that the Consistory claims *no* power to demise, alienate, or interfere with the property of the congregation, it will gladly accept it—and no persons more gladly than its officers. This was what the congregation and its officers aimed at, and what they think they have arrived at.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

China.—We have thought the "Celestial Empire" exempt from the dangers which threaten the monarchies of the West. We have been in error, as appears from the following. It is from the pen of Dr. Gutzlaff—good authority—and is preceded by the statement that the revenues of the empire have fallen off within the last six or seven years nearly one-third. He says:

"The most remarkable result of these financial difficulties and the consequent embarrassment of the Government, is the appearance of something very like a democratic movement among the people. The municipal institutions of the country, resting upon groups of ten families, again grouped in hundreds, and in thousands, much resemble, in form, those common in this country a thousand years ago; and it appears, from Dr. Gutzlaff's statement, that these have already been made the means of organizing a systematic local resistance to the decrees of the Emperor,—the "elders and gentry" of each district meeting in council, and acting in concert with like assemblages elsewhere, with a view to setting aside whatever imperial regulations they especially dislike. With this movement, others, we are told, are also apparent, of a less regular and more dangerous character, communism being preached from the text so much affected by anarchists nearer home, that the 'poor are getting poorer, and the rich richer every day,' and that all social ills are to be cured by a re-distribution of the wealth of the community."

These threatened agitations are worth pondering over. They demonstrate that an irresistible and omnipotent hand is at work in all nations, hastening on the downfall of existing organizations.

cond Congregation is, at best, a sort of second-hand instrument. The original deed is made to two of their elders and one member of the congregation, "as tenants in common," and these three persons have made this deed to the trustees named, but are still held responsible for the ground-rent, and in fact pay it. It is, to say the least, very questionable whether this deed has any legal validity. It may be good to the congregation for the use of the property while there is no dispute about it, but we believe that in its present position a title could not be given in case they wished to dispose of it. To make a good title, the deed would require to be signed by every individual who was a member of the congregation at the time of the purchase, and if any are dead, by their heirs. This is on the principle, that in law, an unincorporated society can have no successors.

Turkey and Russia.—Some time ago, it was supposed that the difficulties between these powers were finally settled. Later accounts are different: instead of being settled, there is reason to believe that they are becoming more complicated. Russia *will not* be satisfied. She modifies her demands, and insists that England and France shall be entirely excluded from the negotiations. "Her object," says an intelligent correspondent of an English journal, is "to gain time." Her eye has long been upon Turkey, and it is plain she thinks that the time is at hand to make the onset.

Hungary.—This kingdom has strong claims upon the sympathies of Protestants. "Four millions of Protestants are found among the Magyars, and but for almost unparalleled persecutions, nearly all Hungary would be Protestant."

"At each coronation, the king of Hungary had to take an oath of fidelity to a Constitution, which guaranteed the equality of religious denominations, (*confessions*;) but this equality was only apparent, and in 1609, at the instance of the Jesuits, the evangelical ministers were summoned to Presburg. They were incarcerated in the dungeons of Tyrnau, (twenty-five miles from Presburg;) some were constrained to abjure, others were banished, others still, after suffering frightful tortures, were led, loaded with chains, to the galleys at Naples, several were tortured even to death. From 1702 to 1783, the Hungarian churches remained, with but few exceptions, without pastors. Some districts, however, *placed under the dominion of the Turk*, enjoyed religious liberty; but these portions of the country, having returned under the sceptre of their former princes, this liberty was wrested from them anew. If evangelical Christians, excluded from public offices, ventured to complain, they were subjected to heavy fines, or to corporeal punishments. If a Popish procession happened to pass a Protestant church, and could enter it, the priest mumbled some prayers, and thereby took possession in the name of his Church."

Under these circumstances, true religion declined. An institution was, however, established, through the exertions of *one* man, a minister of the church. It is a Christian school; and until the late revolution, was in a flourishing condition. "But," says the correspondent of the Presbyterian, "the misfortunes which have descended in torrents, in the course of the present year, 1849, on Hungary, have also smitten, and more than once, the Institute; its pious directors imagined that their work was about to be destroyed; but the Lord came to their help. In the month of July last, twelve pupils, who had completed their studies, were dismissed to commence their labours." We add a few extracts from a letter addressed by the Superintendent of this Institute to M. D'Aubigné:

"God, in whom we trust, knows that our single purpose is the salvation of souls in Jesus Christ; it is for this solely that we labour—for this that we pray. It was for the sake of the Protestant Church in Hungary that our Institutes were founded, and it is surprising to see how greatly, in a short time, the Lord has blessed our undertaking. But four years we have laboured, and upwards of six hundred young brethren have been instructed by us, not only in all the elements of the sciences, but above all, in the word of God, which, alas! is too much neglected in the other schools in this country. We have no doubt, that this knowledge which we have spread will bear fruit,

according to the promise of God; and the Lord has already procured us the joy of seeing the first-fruits of the harvest, which he is preparing by means of our labours.

“Sustain us this year by the gifts of your charity. Every thing in this country is so desolated by the events which have occurred in it, that, without your aid, we should not be in a condition to support our institutions. If we should be compelled to interrupt our labours, the consequences resulting from it would be very sorrowful. The matter at stake is the kingdom of God and his precious gospel, in a country where his word has subsisted in spite of great trials, and where many have made, and still make, a good confession before many witnesses.”

Rome.—Little change takes place in the affairs of the Papal States. France is to leave twenty-five thousand troops in Rome during 1850. Under their protection, the Pope *may* return. In the mean time, papal discontent does not diminish. If he return, his seat will be held by a very frail tenure; and, we feel assured, of short duration. A Frenchman writes as follows:

“One of the principal causes why the Pope has always hesitated to return to his capital, occupied by our troops, is the fear which the instability of our government and our policy causes him. I cannot say if the late changes will give him more confidence, but I doubt it. We are still, as before, with Rome on our hands. We have, like Samson, carried off the gates of the city, but we do not know what to do with them. For my part, I will not cease to repeat, ‘Let us leave the place; let us leave a work which does not belong to us. Rome is not our place, and we have already remained there too long.’ The best means of getting out of the difficulty is harking back; and you will see that such is the resolution which must, in the end, be taken, if we do not enter on another path more rife with danger. This question must be fairly stated: ‘Here we are in Rome; are we for the Republic or for the Popedom?’ There is no alternative. No doubt France sought something else—an equilibrium. But now the experiment has been tried, and we must feel that what we asked from the Pope was impossible, that it is not allowable for the Popedom to give it. We are only at present prolonging a fatal misunderstanding. What we call secularization is for the Popedom, abdication; what we call reform, is revolution. As long as the Pope possesses a temporal sovereignty, he will not have either the power or the right to share it. Again, I say, we will not be able to change the nature of things, *sint ut sunt aut non sint*; and if it is designed to change them by force or intimidation, it is as if the cry of ‘the Roman Republic for ever!’ was raised.”

Germany.—We have further accounts of the great effort now making to unite in some schemes of church extension and consolidation, the whole evangelical body in the German States. For this purpose they met by delegation in Wittemberg—“the city of Luther.” In the progress of their discussions, the most startling revelations were made respecting the moral condition of the masses of labourers in the German cities. The correspondent of the Presbyterian thus sums up:

“There is not a large city in Germany but receives *ten, twenty*, and even *forty* thousand of these, within its walls, in the course of a year. It was Wichern again, who took it upon him to unfold to the eyes of the Assembly such statistics of the demoralization of that class of society, as would have been utterly incredible, if it had not been known that he spoke with a profound knowledge of his melancholy subject. Whatever is most cynical in atheism, imposed on adepts, as terms of initiation, whatever is most brutal

in communism, most sanguinary in the devices of openly avowed anarchy, are found in these dregs of society, in which a zealous propagandism is prosecuted. But also the friends of the gospel are every where at work, to bring the only effectual remedy to this immense evil; they endeavour to reach the workmen by means of the workmen themselves, in those numerous associations which have, as means, industrial schools, and as their final object, the gospel of salvation."

This is the favourable side of German religion. The following summary, which we take from the columns of the *Christian Intelligencer*, reveals the condition of the mass:

"The Protestant Church there is divided into sections and parts according to the different principalities or States. There is no bond of union or connecting link between the Lutheran Church of Bavaria, and that of any other country in Germany. In each district its position is isolated, and its actions are different. In each division of the country, though professedly Lutheran, a different order of things prevails, each country having its own formularies, liturgy, hymn book, and discipline; and every attempt to promote a union of all the Protestant churches in Germany has failed. There is also much internal division of opinion. The Protestant Church in Germany is either Lutheran, or Reformed, or United. The two Confessions, the Augsburg and Geneva, are amalgamated in the Grand Duchy of Baden, in Hesse, and in Rhenish Bavaria; in Old Bavaria, Saxony, and some of the smaller States, the Lutheran exclusively flourishes, and the Reformed in other parts of the country. The United or Evangelical Church appears rapidly on the decline. For in effecting this union thirty years ago, the doctrinal differences were not settled on a common basis, so that there exists no common rule of faith, as seen in the Grand Duchy of Baden and in Rhenish Bavaria, an evil which is becoming more and more felt. In Prussia a schism has taken place in the United Church, by the separation of the old Lutheran party, who were sound in doctrine, from the remainder, who are hostile to revealed religion and evangelical truth, and striving for ascendancy in the church."

"The educated and upper classes are mostly avowed unbelievers, who never set foot in a church; and their example is fast spreading through the whole rural population. We see this in the smaller Saxon States, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, the Palatinate, or Rhenish Bavaria, and parts of the North of Germany. Things are somewhat better in Wirtemberg, Old Bavaria, Westphalia, including the district of Elberfeld, and in Pomerania. But in most of the larger towns and cities, the usual seats of political demagogues and revolutionary agitators, the population are openly profane, and morally corrupt. The churches are almost wholly deserted. There are, in Rhenish Bavaria, towns containing from six to eight thousand persons, where not more than from ten to twenty persons attend church on the Sunday morning, and on the great festal days not a single individual is found at the sacrament. We scarcely need add, great demoralization prevails. The Sabbath is totally disregarded, both in Catholic and Protestant communities. All manner of business is carried on, and the shops are open. It is the principal day of recreation; fairs are held, and the sacred hours are set apart for dancing and revelry. The vast majority of schoolmasters are tainted with infidel opinions. Family worship is almost wholly laid aside, and the rising generation threaten to grow up in the wildest skepticism, and to be worse than their fathers." "*Evil men and seducers wax worse and worse.*"

Germany is ripe for judgment.

France. 1. Its Political State.—This cannot be better or more truly described than in the following extract:

"There is still the same stagnation in the bosom of the political world, but we are more uneasy than ever respecting our future condition. The ascendant party feel the reins slipping through their fingers. They begin to understand that it is not enough to escape from daily difficulties by temporary expedients of questionable morality; they see new perplexities constantly bubbling up from the bottom of affairs. Our politicians are particularly anxious concerning the result of the approaching elections. They know that the provinces, upon whose conservative feelings they have hitherto so confidently relied, begin to escape from them, having come, to a great degree, within Socialist influence. I know that in high places they feel much terror at the prospect of the remodeling of the National Assembly; we are forced to believe that a *Red* majority will easily be obtained. From the tone of certain journals, and from conversations which I have myself heard, I am almost certain that they will be disposed to use unconstitutional measures to prevent the dangers which threaten them."

But what do these Socialists aim at? The same writer adds:

"When I wrote you last, I had read but a few leaves in Proudhon's last work, 'The Confessions of a Revolutionist.' Since then I have read the whole of it, and this is its principal idea. He has some trouble to make himself understood, for a personality as decided as that of Proudhon's is the sonorous organ of many thoughts. According to him, there is at present a mighty struggle between the parties of the past and the future. The party of the past is the party which defends *religion, property, and authority*. The party of the future is that which would abolish *religion, property, and authority*. Concentrating himself upon the last point, Proudhon declares that the ideal which we ought to reach is *anarchy*, or the absence of all government, and he reviews the great features of contemporary history, to show that we are rapidly tending thither. We shall not be happy until we have neither *God, capital, nor government*, and this will happen when *demand and supply* will be equal."

2. *Religion*.—The prospect is not wholly dark, even in the darkest places. And, first, a paper is about to be established in France, under the direction of two priests, whose object is to popularize the idea that the celibacy of the clergy is an evil, and may be thrown off by common consent, as it is only an ecclesiastical regulation, and not based upon principles of divine right, of faith, or of morality. And, again, among the questions before the French Assembly, at the last dates, was that of rendering obligatory the observance of the Sabbath, or, rather, abstinence from work on that day. The debate was full and earnest, and gives evidence, as every one would anticipate, that religious considerations had not much to do with it. Still, the fact is encouraging.

"On Monday, the Assembly was occupied with a debate on the Sabbath question, a rarity in France. The discussion originated in a petition, signed by eight hundred inhabitants of Marseilles, praying the Assembly to enforce the complete cessation of labour on Sundays. The petition, based on the Divine origin of the Sabbath, expressed regret that, in many places, Monday was observed as a day of rest, instead of Sunday, and young people in particular were drawn into deplorable courses, instead of passing the Sabbath with their families as a day of religion and repose. The law of 1814, for the due observance of the Sabbath, has been repealed; and by the Charter of 1830, as well as the present Constitution, there is no established State religion. As all religions are equally respected and protected by the laws, it is deemed impossible to enforce the Christian Sabbath without doing violence to the Jewish and other religions which do not observe the Christian Sabbath. In these circumstances, the Report stated that, although the

Committee felt the great importance of the petition, it could only recommend it to the consideration of the Minister of Justice, with the suggestion that, although the government could not impose a complete and absolute cessation of labour on the Sabbath, it might stop all labour on public works on that day. M. Poujoulat was the only member who expressed a wish that the Assembly should go beyond the recommendation of the Committee. He was frequently interrupted by cries, that if the workman were a Jew, he would wish to rest on the Saturday, and, if a Mussulman, on the Friday. M. Laurent (de l'Arrigiere) reminded the previous speaker, that the vote come to by the Constituent Assembly was merely to prevent masters from forcing their work-people, contrary to their consciences, to work on the Sabbath; whereas the present petition was to the effect that all sects should be obliged to keep the same day holy, whether it were consistent with their faith or not. M. Bineau, Minister of Public Works, observed, that his predecessor had issued an order to all in charge of public works, directing them to suspend labour on Sunday, except in urgent cases; and that he himself had given further directions that that order should be strictly executed. This was considered satisfactory by the Assembly; which accordingly referred the petition to the Minister of Public Works. It evidently shows no small progress in religious feeling, that a debate on the proper observance of the Sabbath should be tolerated by the French Legislature."

Belgium.—We have occasionally furnished some accounts of the Protestantism of Belgium. The following is of the latest date:

"The Evangelical Society of Belgium has now twelve organized churches, with a Confession of Faith and an ecclesiastical Government. We have masters and mistresses of schools, and three colporteurs of tracts and Bibles. We have a library in a good situation in Brussels for the sale of tracts and Bibles, and we pay the rent of chapels and rooms for the service of Christ. Having, up to the present time, obtained no subsidy from the Government, all our expenses, which amounted last year to about £1700, must be met by gifts and subscriptions from the friends of the work. All our churches, composed of converted Roman Catholics, are young and poor, and all must depend on the support of sister Christian churches. Our deficit to meet our Christmas payments, although we have been obliged to reduce the number of our schools, is about £480. We have stations at La Bouverie and Genval, with 150 attendants; Liege, 200; Charleroi, 160; Pamlequin, 50; Louvain, 80; Raste and Fontain l'Eveque, 75; Gollisseau, 60; Leert Forsteau, 80; Nessonveau, 180; Ververs, 90; Lire, 200; Wezt St. George, 50; Sprimont, 50. Schools—One at Nessonveau, with 45 attendants; Brussels, 130; Gollisseau, 170; Charleroi, 50; La Bouverie, 70; Montequ, and Fontain l'Eveque, 40; Leert Forsteau, 30. Independent of these schools we have evening adult schools for work-people, which are exceedingly useful; these are held sometimes by the masters. I have given you here the usual attendants at each church, but they generally exceed this number by twenty, thirty, and fifty persons."

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

Wisconsin.—At the recent election in Wisconsin, the question of free suffrage was voted upon, and decided in the affirmative; the vote showing 4090 for, and 3603 against it. This establishes the right of every male citizen, of whatever colour, over the age of twenty-one years, to vote at all elections in the State. This is honourable—most honourable to this young State. So far, she begins right. When will all the nominally free States become so indeed?

Jews in the United States.—"There are," says the Jewish Chronicle, "in the United States more than sixty thousand Israelites, and this number is swelled monthly by emigrants from all parts of Europe. There are more than one hundred of the natural descendants of Abraham in our country who have embraced the gospel of Jesus Christ. Of this number there are more than twenty preaching Jesus of Nazareth as the Saviour of men; a remarkable number to the whole number of converts; shadowing forth our expectations of the future, when the millions of Judah shall be grafted into the symbolical olive tree. Of this number, also, there are six in a course of preparation for the same work. What encouragement Christians have to labour for the conversion of this people, if one-fifth of those who embrace Christianity become preachers of Christ crucified!"

Congress.—There seems to be no question before that body but slavery, and slavery extension: at least, one or other show themselves in every quarter and on all occasions. The North is pretty thoroughly aroused; and, with the exception of a few recreants in both houses, will go *en masse* in favour of restricting slavery to its present bounds, if brought to a direct vote. Still, we have our fears. The administration is attempting to evade the question by leaving the whole issue with the territories themselves. Let it be as it may, however, in Congress, we believe that slavery can go no further. It will carve new states out of Texas, as long as it can; but it seems to have reached its western limit.

CRIME IN BOSTON.—The annual return of the Jails and Houses of Correction in Massachusetts furnish a *black* list of eight thousand five hundred and forty-five; and of these Boston has furnished considerably more than one-half. As usual, Intemperance has imprisoned the largest number—two thousand five hundred and seven—besides inducing the crimes which have incarcerated thousands more. The expense to the state of all this crime and imprisonment is estimated at about ninety-six thousand dollars, sixty thousand of which is for Intemperance!

SABBATH RAIL-ROADS.—In a recent Circular of the American and Foreign Sabbath Union, it is stated that more than forty Railway Companies now stop their cars on the Sabbath, and that on more than two thousand miles of rail-road the men employed enjoy the rest and privileges appropriate to that day.

ERRATUM.—For "throne of state," February No., p. 216, read "stone of fate."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

MRS. WHITTLESEY'S *MAGAZINE* for Mothers. Mrs. A. G. Whittlesey, Editor.

This is a monthly periodical of thirty-two octavo pages. The design is good, the doctrines sound, the style perspicuous. If this first No. be a fair specimen of what the work is to be, we give it our hearty commendation. We have fault to find, which can easily be corrected. No attempt should be made, as is done in contemplation, to present a likeness of our Saviour blessing little children. This ought to be renounced.

THE COVENANTER.

APRIL, 1850.

THE MONSTROUS GOVERNMENT OF SLAVERY.

[Continued from page 246.]

3. The government has been and now is administered by men, the greater part of whom do not even pretend to be the friends or followers of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of all the presidents, none but two are known to have made a profession of any religion. One of these took the sacrament in Philadelphia, from the hands of Dr. Priestley, a Socinian blasphemer of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The other, his son, was a member of the Arian congregation of Quincy, near Boston. Whether he ever received the Lord's Supper among these heretics, is not known. No president ever worshipped God in his house, or asked a blessing on his meals. Not one of them would ever have been admitted to membership in any well-regulated Presbyterian congregation. All this elevation of ungodly men to office is directly contrary to the declaration of the Holy Spirit: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Wicked men cannot administer well the government of the commonwealth, for the Spirit says again: "As a ranging bear and a roaring lion, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people." Again: "When the wicked bear rule, the people mourn." Can any thing be more preposterous than for the professed disciples of Christ to choose the seed of the serpent to reign over them—to elect men to be the executors of the laws of the God of heaven, that do themselves habitually and openly violate the statutes of Jehovah?

Such presidents, as a matter of course, elect men for heads of departments and for other official functions, who are like themselves, who are without God and without Christ in the world. The factions of the commonwealth act on far different principles. Whigs do not elect Democrats, and these, again, do not elect Whigs. Are the questions of finance—for they do not rise higher—which divide these political wranglers, more important to the public weal, than those which respect virtue and vice, moral order and turpitude, religion and impiety?

Nearly all voters act as if it were so. Can they have the fear of God before their eyes? It is not to be thought strange, that when men, not only irreligious, but grossly immoral, as is now commonly done, are honoured by the suffrages of the people, they will succumb to the slave power, and show by the whole of their action as public functionaries, that "the Lord is not in all their thoughts?" The basest of men are allowed the right of suffrage. Demagogues, without principle, court the votes of those who, the Apostle James says, "are natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed." These have as much power at the ballot box as enlightened and virtuous citizens. Yes, more. Ambi-

tious and unholy aspirants to office court especially the lowest dregs of the people. Both the Whigs and Democrats court the suffrages of the ignorant, grossly idolatrous papists, who arrived on our shores but yesterday, and who are utterly unacquainted with the country, and especially with the import of our free, republican institutions. The factions court them with more assiduity than they do the well-known Protestant population who have, under God, made, and who in fact are, the nation.

So nearly are the parties balanced, that these popish foreigners can turn the scale at will. When the Whigs, a few years ago, gained the ascendancy in the state of New York, by a majority of 16,000, the priests thought they foresaw that the same party would prevail in the succeeding election for president, and they instructed their people to vote for General Harrison, the Whig. Except in Ohio, they generally obeyed their spiritual guides, abandoned the Democratic party, with which they had nearly all before that time voted, went over to the Whigs, and Harrison was elected. Without their votes, he would have lost the election. In 1844, they returned to their former party, secured the election of Mr. Polk for President, and of Shunk, the democratic candidate for governor of Pennsylvania. Can the government of a nation be well administered, when the most important governmental functionaries secure their election by pandering to the ignorant and profane, who are easily made the tools of crafty demagogues?

4. The late war with Mexico, waged by the slave power, in the government, for the purpose of enlarging the domain of slavery, and perpetuating its reign, bears fearful testimony to the bad administration of the government. The waste of \$100,000,000, and the sacrifice of at least 30,000 of our citizens, and probably 60,000 people of a young and feeble neighbouring republic, have been the direct results. The public morals have been fearfully desecrated, a thirst for war and conquest has been produced, a gold mania engendered, the slave trade has received a new impulse, and the seeds of discord between the North and South have been sown—"sown to the wind," and we shall "reap the whirlwind" in the dissolution of the Union.

Such have been the bitter fruits of the government of this nation. The tree must be corrupt.

But—III. The constitution is chargeable with many great evils.

1. *The very impious dishonour done to the God of heaven.* It was not the intention of those who framed it to honour the Christian's God. Indeed, it is abundantly evident they intended to do homage to no God. Every nation before it professed to honour some divinity. The commonwealth of the ten tribes of Israel worshipped the calves set up by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel. The Hindoos have their Juggernaut. But the United States do not, in their constitution, recognise any God. His name is not once mentioned in the fundamental law of the commonwealth, except in the date. That is not to honour him. No other date was used at the time by the people. The era of its adoption could not be otherwise known. It was forced on the convention. An Atheist uses the Christian era in his dates. Does the Deist mean to honour our Lord Jesus Christ, when he uses the common era in dating his letters?

The law of the Lord, as revealed in the light of nature, or in the Holy Scriptures, is not recognised as the rule of duty. On the con-

trary, "we the people," is its declaration, "ordain this constitution" as the supreme law of the land. The will of fallen, corrupt man, as expressed by a majority of the people, is regarded as the ultimate fountain of all national law. The people of Israel, taught of God, as an example to all nations, say: "The Lord is our Lawgiver." The command is—"All nations shall serve him." No man has or can have a right to govern other men, all of whom are God's subjects, unless God gives him the right. "Who art thou that judgest another's servant?"

This is so palpably trampling under foot the rectoral majesty of Jehovah, we are shocked that any professed disciple of Christ attempts to apologize for the iniquity. Were the state of Ohio to frame a constitution without any reference to that of the nation, the Federal government would regard it as an act of secession from the Union, as rebellion, and would not suffer such an infraction of the national compact. The national constitution is a declaration of independence of God's throne.

2. It violates a fundamental principle of lawful government—that the majority shall rule. Either of the little states of Delaware or Rhode Island, has as much weight in the Senate of the United States, and in the election of a president, when it is referred to the House of Representatives, as any of the great states of New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio. The electoral colleges are not only an expensive and cumbrous part of the governmental machine; they are vicious. More than one president has administered the government, when a majority of the people, in the popular vote, was against him. This provision of the constitution was adopted, in imitation of the electoral college of Germany, in which thirteen hereditary princes elected the emperor. It is a remnant, and a very bad one, of the federal aristocracy of Europe.

The two houses, an upper and lower, is of the same aristocratic origin. It is copied from the Lords and Commons of England. We have no two houses in our presbyteries and synods. In the synod of Jerusalem there was but one house, but one in the Sanhedrim of Israel. The French convention, in their lately framed constitution, provide for but one house. The senate, by the United States' constitution, a minority of the law-making power, can overrule the majority. What is far worse—in the presidential veto, one man can, and often does, thwart the will of the nation. In all these cases, the minority governs, which is of the essence of despotism.

3. *The constitution guaranties negro slavery, by many provisions.* (1.) Five slaves entitle the holder to three votes, added to his own. This reward of oppression sends twenty-five members to Congress. (2.) Permission was granted to import slaves for twenty years, after the adoption of the constitution; and the property so imported, and the posterity of imported slaves, are held to-day by a right derived from the constitution. (3.) The restoration of runaway slaves is secured by the organic law of the commonwealth. (4.) The power of the nation is pledged to prevent the slaves from gaining their liberty by revolution. (5.) Full faith and credit are to be given to the laws of the slaveholding states. (6.) The supreme court has decided that slavery is guarantied by the constitution. (7.) Congress has so decided in the admission of Missouri and other states, with slave constitutions, into the Union. (8.) This has always been the sense of the nation. (9.) Congress and the U. S. government hold to bondage, under the constitution, all the slaves in the District of Columbia. (10.) The stubborn and de-

plorable fact that there are three millions of slaves in the land, and no law to relieve them—no provision for their emancipation—no ray of hope for them shines in the whole firmament of power—all proclaim, trumpet-tongued, that the organic law of the nation is a slaveholding monster.

4. *No religious test shall ever be demanded as a qualification for office.* It never shall be asked whether a U. S. functionary is a friend or an enemy of God or the devil—whether he is a Hindoo brahmin, a Mahometan mufti, or a disciple of Christ Jesus. Thus the sanctuary of God is opened to desecration by the base adulterer and impious blasphemers.

All these are positive, direct, and gross violations of the law of the Lord, and hostile to the nature and ends of his holy and beneficent ordinance of civil government. They all frown on the church of Christ, are adverse to her welfare, and tend to mar the best interests of the human race. They have sealed the damnation of millions of native Americans, because their ancestors were children of Ethiopia, on whom the sun had looked and made them black. "Ah! sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters. They have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward."

5. *The greatest evil, in the constitution of the United States, is the entire disregard of "Messiah, the Prince of the kings of the earth."* All kings, or civil rulers, are commanded, under pain of Jehovah's high displeasure, to do homage to him as Mediator. "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss ye the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." This command is to serve the eternal Son as Mediator, who is "set on the holy hill of Zion." Ps. ii. 10—12, and 6. The command of God the Father is, "that every knee should bow—and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 10, 11. But the construction, in this land of thousands of Protestant churches and millions of Bibles, does not once call upon his name. "Tell it not in Gath."

In view of all these alarming national sins, what is the duty of those who have consecrated themselves to the Lord, for the work of the holy gospel ministry?

1. To watch against the contaminating influence of those evils which have diffused their poison through the whole mass of our population. We have all lain among the pots, like the Israelites, when enslaved in Egypt. Our "carnal minds are naturally enmity against God, are not subject to his law, neither indeed can be." The filthiness of these national impurities finds an easy admission into our defiled souls. It enters by all the avenues which our external senses open to hold intercourse with the world around us. We breathe an atmosphere laden with a pestilential virus. Satan, the god of this world, the prince of the power of the air, knows well how to use these all in seducing us from our Lord Jesus Christ, and for drawing off our affections from his holy law, and from his church. He knows that our minds are polluted by the whole course of our education in heathen academies and colleges. If we would cultivate holiness in the fear of the Lord, we must occupy the watch-tower, and exercise a ceaseless vigilance

over our inner and outer man, that we be not carried away by diverse lusts, and so be disqualified for the exercise of the holy functions of the gospel ministry. "What I say unto you, I say unto all—Watch!"

2. Be well prepared to warn others against these evils. The spirit of the civil institutions of the land is Laodicean, and seeks compromise between truth and error, virtue and vice, God and the devil. Men, many ministers, baptize this detestable neutrality in the cause of God, by the deceptive names of peace, charity, good-will, forbearance, and brotherly love. Some even among ourselves go so far as to teach that we ought to preach the truth only, and not attack the errors abroad. "Who," they say, "ever heard of a sheep attacking a wolf?" These false teachers are not the followers of the prophets and apostles of the Lamb, who stopped the mouths of lions, who boldly and magnanimously reprov'd all sin, refuted and denounced all error, warned the people after the example of Christ, to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees—false religion—and of the leaven of Herod—corrupt and slavish politics, and who were gloriously rewarded with the crown of martyrdom. Let all Covenanters emulate this noble example.

3. The minister of Christ must warn his people against partaking of this national dishonour done to their Redeeming Head. "Those who receive the mark of the beast in their foreheads," by swearing the oath of allegiance to him, "or in their hands," by the active support of him at the ballot box, "the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." This tremendous denunciation falls not on those only who incorporate themselves with the old despotisms of Europe, but also on all, who support any throne, that rejects the authority of Prince Messiah. All the churches, except the Reformed Presbyterian Church, incur the penalty denounced by the Spirit in the Apocalypse. If men perish under this fearful malediction, not having been warned by the watchman, their blood shall be in his skirts.

In the present condition of the church, the faithful performance of this great duty exposes the minister of Christ to more obloquy in this republic than in any other nation of Christendom. The people of the old world have been forced for ages to groan under the oppression of despotic thrones, whose yoke they would gladly shake off. The people in our country have made the government, which fairly represents the corrupt masses, by whom it has been created. Few ministers have faith and integrity enough to encounter, for the honour of our Lord and Master, "*the reproach of men.*" But let the sons of the prophets remember, that we have the promise of our God, "That as our day is, so our strength shall be." Let them reflect that the more we expose ourselves for Christ's sake, for the church's interest, and for the reformation of the commonwealth, the more we glorify our king, and the greater our blessed reward, in the day when called to render up an account of our ministry. If we sow in tears, we shall reap a rich harvest of joys immortal and honours eternal in the heavens. Our function is a glorious one, our warfare heavenly, and our victory certain. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit. I beheld till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed,

and given to the burning flame—and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” Then, and the time is short, shall shout, “a great multitude, as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, “Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” “Amen, even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly.”

[For the Covenanter.]

REVIEW OF T. S. AND OTHERS.

In our last, we selected a few of the gross misstatements of T. S. We might have reviewed more. There are some remarkable features in his essays, and in others recently appearing in the Reformed Presbyterian. In these essays, the true issue now in our church is evaded. New questions are raised, of a divisive tendency, never in dispute among us. Arguments of opponents, really bearing upon the question at issue, are unnoticed. Refutations of arguments meet no generous reply or concession. The most solemn disavowal of error charged on us, meets with no corresponding frank withdrawal of charges.

We argued that there are many important truths—reformation-attained truths—truths sworn to in solemn covenants—truths on the subject of church government, by us believed and practised, not in the Westminster Form, or in any *other* Standard, but the Second Book of Discipline; and, consequently, that we have the right of appealing to the Discipline, to settle controversy on all these subjects, and on the subject of the extent of the deacon's power particularly; and the more so, since the Book of Discipline was once law and standard in the church of Scotland, and that law, too, admitted by T. S. to be “*rule*” never repealed. We refuted his argument, that “the tithing was a civil arrangement.” And this has something to do with the question in debate. We furnished the refutation of the naked assertion, that “the doctrine that the Levite was the deacon of the Old Testament church is *new light*.” We gave the proof that it is the doctrine of the Bible, and the *old light* of Westminster times. To nothing of this kind has he ever fairly replied. But instead of meeting vital points, he deserts the field, and raises the battle cry where he knows no Covenanter will ever attack him. Scarcely an argument is found in all his essays, except against what nobody affirms on the deacon question. Truly he is a valiant man, who will plant his standard behind the old rampart of the civil magistrate's right “to provide for the temporal support of the church,” and then boldly challenge Covenanters to make battle! Such a man will never take fright at his own shadow!

The question is often asked by those without, and by many in our own church—what is the question now really in dispute—the question in which our ministers and people really differ, and which threatens to disturb the peace and unity of our ecclesiastical organization? We shall take a little pains in giving an answer. Some among us deny the office of the deacon entirely, as involving a third and distinct and perpetual officer, whose power is confined to temporalities exclusively. These deny the doctrine of the Form, and hold—some of them—that *the seven* referred to in Acts vi. 1, were extraordinary and temporary; others, that they were Evangelists, and preached, as they say, Stephen and Philip did, without any other than the first ordination. These, however, now do little, except swell the number, and give their votes and influence to the party really in the field, in opposition to having deacons in all our congregations. The issue is upon other *ostensible* ground. While they grant the divine institution of the perpetual diaconate, they hold—*first*, that the power of the deacon is limited to the

poor, and plead the Form as decisive. They hold, *second*, that there lies on us no obligation from our Standards to have deacons in all our congregations. They hold, *third*, that all temporalities of the church beyond the poor belong to civil things, and to the "*circa sacra*" power of the civil magistrate, and in his absence to the people in their civil capacity, and consequently the trustee, as an agent of the people, is the proper manager, as a civil substitute, of all temporalities beyond the poor.* They hold, *fourth*, that Covenanters in America are bound to nothing as subordinate standards, beyond the Westminster compilation and Reformation Principles, or beyond what is "*named*" in our Terms of Communion.

These *are* the points at issue. Other matters, indeed, as merely subordinate, and of minor importance, grow out of these, but they stand or fall with them. On these questions there are two sides, by consent of all. There are many other questions, grave, indeed, raised by one party, involving charge of error upon the other, about which there is no dispute. *Some* of these were the subject of a former article. Against this unhappy business of throwing out false charges against our brethren, we solemnly protest.

If any of our brethren really believe there is innovation or danger on the head of Consistory, let them come out from their lurking places—present to Synod in any regular or tangible form, and we pledge ourselves to aid in the application of the corrective. This, we fear, they neither dare nor design to do—we fear they prefer the system of fighting behind the bush. They know Synod is not pledged to any dangerous Consistory—to any dangerous consistory *power* whatever. They know more—they know Synod has disclaimed all such power as that of which they *seem* to complain. They know the Reformation Church of Scotland practised upon the consistory

* We may not understand their position here precisely. There seems to be a confusion in the exhibits of their system—if any system they have—in regard to the extent of the power of the diaconate. We want them to come out and save us from mistaking them. Do they say the deacon's power extends not beyond the poor—that this is the doctrine of the standards, the form of Government, and the testimony? Do they say all else beyond the poor belongs, not to the divinely appointed diaconate, but to the people? Do they say the elders have an intermediate diaconate, a power in temporal things between the deacon and people, magistrate or trustee, a power of collecting, of distributing, of applying, which deacons have not, and which they (elders) do not hold as deacons, but as elders, as rulers? Where does the power of ordained officers end, and the power of unordained agents of the people, as the "*substitute of the civil magistrate*," begin? And who are the ordained officers for temporalities? How is it? For we find our brethren committing to ordained officers many temporal affairs—most temporal affairs—yea, all kinds of temporal affairs beyond and beside the poor. On what principle? Or is all this without principle, system or consistency? We ought to know, for we are in constant danger of stumbling over this heap, to the hurt of, perhaps, both them and ourselves. Is the poor fund the only ecclesiastical or church fund—all else civil? Is the poor fund more sacred than the fund for the maintenance of the ministry, the gospel and its ordinances? Is the ministry of the poor more sacred, more ecclesiastical than the ministry of the altar—so that the former is an ecclesiastical temporality, the latter not, but civil, and belonging to the civil magistrate? Will they tell us what they hold about these things? Will they tell us what the Confession, the Catechism, the Testimony teach on this head? We want to know where these standards set off among civil things—"*circa sacra*" all beside the poor? Do they place the ministry and its maintenance among civil things or ecclesiastical? Has Christ ordained, in settling the apostolical or New Testament Government of the Church, ministers to be fed of his altar, or at the civil crib? Does not the very ass know his master's crib? But alas! our Israel has become bewildered. Some will look to our Master's altar for support—some to Cæsar's crib.

Being unable to comprehend our brethren, we have stated the question as we understand it, and have appended this note to bring out an explanation, if we misunderstand.

principle now maintained by Synod, and that in this respect we are in the footsteps of the flock. They know this principle of consistory obtains in all the Presbyterian Churches, except that they almost all go farther than we do. We now say once more—"the enlargement of the sphere of this discussion by the introduction of the new element of consistory in this debate, is not only novel," but we fear for effect. Who introduced it into the present debate? It is unfair. Its introduction is more than unfair, since the action of Synod in 1845 and '47. And moreover, we now challenge our brethren to furnish one historical fact going to show that any Presbyterian Church, or any respectable Presbyterian writer opposed the Consistory, or the doctrine of the extent of the deacon's power, as held by our Synod and by us, until that opposition appeared in our Synod in 1838; raised by the party now opposing the existence of deacons in all our congregations. Why this *talk* about "new elements," "enlarged sphere of discussion," "standards changing," "church shifting," &c., &c.? All know the force and design of the pro-slavery argument of Northern men, "You put back emancipation in the South, by your anti-slavery agitation in the North, by your *ultraism!*" Another thing every body knows—this plea of ultraism will not atone for the sin of the slaveholder. And one more other thing every body knows—this plea of the slaveholder is not *sincere*—it is to shift blame, and charge it where it does not lie. He knows slavery should be abolished, but because abolitionists tell him so, he gets in a rage and wont do it!

Leaving, for the present, the discussion of the *four* questions *really* in debate, we proceed to notice some mis-presentations of questions involved in the main issue. We think this important, because, if division take place in our church, it will be on this ground. Our people will not be seriously alarmed by most of the false charges thrown out. But not so of the oblique statement of questions involved in the *discussions* on the main question.

"Controversy is eminently diffusive, and rarely terminates at the point at which it commences, or remains satisfied with its claims in the outset. It spreads, like fire, hurtful to the sight, and destructive in its progress."

Against this work of *spreading hurtful fire* we shall set our face, no matter from what quarter it may come, or by what venerable names it may be endorsed. We shall discuss—discuss for the purpose of eliciting *truth*, and of perpetuating *union*.

T. S., Reformed Presbyterian, Vol. XIII. p. 76, enters upon "*An inquiry as to what is our standard of ecclesiastical government.*"

Now, we certainly understand him as setting out to prove that the Westminster Form of Church Government is our standard on this subject, "*to the exclusion of all others,*" see pp. 79. If this be not his position, we ask him to state it again; for we shall drive him from this. He throws the whole subject of "inquiry" into synthetic form, thus, "*Is the Second Book of Discipline the church's subordinate standard, on the subject of her government and discipline to which we are bound?*" Mark the question—"the church's standard." He offers three arguments to prove the negative of this question. Of course, as if this were the question, and somebody took the affirmative. This is unfair, because, *first*, it represents us as holding what we do not hold. We do not say the Second Book of Discipline is the (to the exclusion of all others) standard. But we do say that our ordination vows bind us to "*all the attainments of the reformation.*" In ordination vows, we all affirm to these words—"Do you approve of the testimony of the Reformed Covenanted Church, in Britain and Ireland, in behalf of all the attainments of the reformation?" 6th Query

at ordination. Though all this be not "*named* in our terms of Communion," the *substance* of the thing is there—we are bound to the Form—the whole Form, "as received by the Church of Scotland, and to the whole discipline not repealed, or otherwise provided for in the Form." Now why not state us just so? This would have been fair, because it would have stated the *truth*, and would have harmonized us, *for substance*, in the truth with T. S. The question is unfair, because, *second*, it places us in the affirmative, while we really are in the negative of the question. Let us state our own affirmatives. We grant no man the right of putting them into our mouths. We all agree—because none can deny that the second book was once "rule," law in the church of Scotland. This is what we affirm. Then the question *fairly* is—*did the church of Scotland repeal the whole book?* We say no. T. S. really affirms, and *onus probandi* rests upon him, and as an honest disputant, he is bound to furnish as clear proof of the repeal, as we have of the enactment of the church making the Second Book law. This he cannot do. He should, therefore, as a peaceful man cease strife on this head. The question is unfair, because, *third*, his first proof—a fair exposition of his meaning and use of the question—assumes a ground that no consistent Covenanter can honestly occupy. He says:

"It is not found in our Terms of Communion, specified as one of our standards." pp. 77.

Now we here remark for the special benefit of brother T. S., that no man should argue *seriously* what he does not believe; nor should argue against what he knows and admits to be true. But he knows and admits that the Second Book is still "*the rule.*" "In these the Church of Scotland retained her books and acts as *the rule*, and she provides that that right shall not be prejudiced." pp. 82. And he *knows* that neither the *Scottish testimony*, nor "*the books,*" nor "*the acts,*" are *named* in our Terms of Communion. He knows, too, that a rule that binds not, is, to say the least, a very strange rule in Church Government.

Passing for the present the article of May, we notice in this connexion, the essay of T. S. in the Oct. No. Vol. XIII. pp. 217. The issue is there very unfairly presented. He says, in professing as a public essayist to give a true statement of issues in our church, in the following language:

"The question with regard to the second book of discipline is not, &c.," "but whether it was made by the church, part and parcel of the uniformity in religion and church government established in the middle of the seventeenth century. And the same is the question with regard to the Form of church government. We maintain that the form of church government was adopted by the church of Scotland, as containing the propositions respecting ecclesiastical government, on which she was prepared to conclude a uniformity with the church of England, and this was not the case with the second book of discipline."

This statement of the question is prefaced by a promise that the question shall be *exactly* stated, and yet it is any thing but exactly stated. It is stated either ignorantly, or it is designed to mislead and ensnare. It is not wise to set a snare before any bird. The first part of the statement of the question is true—it represents the question fairly, if understood of the church of Scotland only. We do maintain

that the uniformity in church government in Scotland, did, in the middle of the seventeenth century, include, in addition to the Westminster Form, the Second Book of Discipline, exactly on the same principle that it did still include the National Covenant as a part of her covenanted uniformity in doctrine and ecclesiastical obligation. They stand or they fall together—they were Scotland's own peculiar standards, never forced upon England. See the very words "named," in our Terms of Communion, "*National Covenant of Scotland*," not England, Ireland, and Scotland, as affirmed of the Solemn League. The covenant was Scotland's, never England's. So the second book was Scotland's, never England's. The latter part of the statement of the question—and which defines the meaning and design—presents a very different issue. On this T. S. would fallaciously make the argument. And even this little part of the statement is calculated grossly to deceive. We do not deny, with T. S. to use his own words in his statement :

"But we maintain that the form of church government was adopted by the church of Scotland, as containing the propositions respecting ecclesiastical government, on which she was prepared to conclude a uniformity with the church of England."

Thus far we agree exactly, and hence an unfair statement of the question. The remainder is ambiguous—very: "And this was not the case with the second book of discipline." If it be said of the uniformity with England, so far as it was obtained, then the statement is true. If it refer to what Scotland desired, then it is, in substance, untrue. Scotland swore in the Solemn League to endeavour, not only to hold her own attainments in discipline, but to bring England up to the same high stand. She aimed and laboured for further reform in the way of union with England. She needed for a complete standard of church government a "*Directory of Government*," &c. This, T. S. seems to insinuate, was designed by the church of Scotland to fill the place of the second Book, else what does he mean by this:

"In the mean time in what pertains to the directory for government, we view the second book of discipline as still good authority, except where it is repealed by the acts of the general Assembly." p. 219.

In page 222, we have the following statement of matter in dispute which we should have passed over as a good-natured hoax, but we find it reiterated in a subsequent number, by a hoary head, from whom we were not expecting any such *pleasantry*. It is this?

"It is objected that the Form of Church Government was not adopted by the church of Scotland, as a part of the covenanted uniformity."

The reiteration will be found, same vol. p. 314 :

"If I am right in my perceptions of discussions now before the church, it appears to be questioned, first, Whether the church of Scotland ever received them at all."

Now we shall believe these brethren who thus write, to be in *earnest* when they refer us to the discussions in which the denial referred to is found, except in their own essays in the Reformed Presbyterian. It is too late, brethren, to adopt the maxim, "Report say they, and we will report it." Jer. xx. 10. Far better write essays on the perpetual motion, or on air balloons, than on such questions, until writers should at least "know on what ground this fact is questioned," rather

till they have *some ground to suspect* even that their brethren *question* an *undoubted truth*. To follow such elaborations is to trifle.

In this connexion, one item more of misrepresentation, evidently designed for effect—we refer to Ref. Pres., Vol. XIII. pp. 236-7. We have for some time past observed in this magazine, as was manifest with the New Light party, an overweening concern to deceive the churches abroad in regard to our positions here, and to deceive our people in this country, concerning the positions of the sister churches. The action of the Scottish and Irish Synods is before our people, and it requires only an ordinary share of sense and candour to see the agreement of their action, and the action of our Synod, on the deacon question. Any difference is in our favour, with a mere mite of exception. The Irish Synod has carried legislation farther than we have—they have enjoined their ministers and elders to instruct the people—of course to discuss, or, in other words, agitate. p. 235. This our Synod has never dared to do. More—we have just been able, and no more, to ward off laws tending to suppress free discussion. The Scottish Synod has in her Testimony, and in her recently published report, asserted the power of the deacon to be beyond the poor—to extend to church temporalities generally, p. 229. Let us compare. The Irish Synod says:—

“Resolved that this Synod affirm the minute of 1828, which asserts the scriptural character of the deacon’s office, and recommend it to the ministers and elders of the church to use their best endeavours in their respective places, to have the congregations under Synod’s care instructed in respect to the nature and duties of the deacon’s office; (but their Testimony says, ‘other temporalities,’) that as soon as practicable, consistently with the peace and edification of their respective congregations, deacons may be appointed in them.”

The Scottish Synod says:

“1. *The origin and end of the deacon’s office.* The committee are of opinion that it is of divine origin, and, judging from the occasion, instituted more immediately to minister to the wants of the indigent, though not exclusively, but to attend to the temporalities of the church generally.”

Add to this the constitutional law—the Testimony of both Synods—the standard, contrary to which they could not require their ministers to instruct their congregations, which says:

“Deacons are associated with the teaching and ruling elders, in managing other temporalities in the church.”

This is the delectable “cold water,” hailed by the Ref. Pres. so condemnatory of “rash legislation,” and “ultra deacon men among us,” reckless men, who never would “rest satisfied with a simple affirmation of the scriptural character of the deacon’s office, delaying the question of the introduction of the officer, till such time as it can be done consistently with the peace and edification of the congregation.” p. 236.

Now, let us ask the Ref. Pres. and its party, why did the disaffected anti-deacon party of the Miami congregation ask a separate organization, and you vote for that organization, when the only reason that could honestly be given was that the pastor dared to do what the Irish Synod recommends all her ministers and elders to do—“*instruct the congregation in the nature and duties of the deacon’s office?*” And is this fostering division what you mean by being “on the conservative side,” as you insinuate? Can you inform your readers

where to find the "rash legislation," which does not delay the question of the introduction of the officer till such time as it can be done consistently with the peace and edification of the congregation, but which requires his (the deacon's) introduction, peace or no peace, as you insinuate to the prejudice of the truth and Synod? We have examined for our Synod's "rash legislation," ordering the introduction of the deacon, as obliquely hinted, but it is not to be found—there is no such legislation.

Not satisfied with the miserable innuendo, the action of 1845 is directly attacked, as leaning to the other extreme—"loose, general, evasive." Yet, brother Roney, you and all your brethren passed that "loose paper." So say minutes of Synod,—“Then, on motion, the preamble and resolutions, as amended, were unanimously adopted.” Good brother of the Presbyterian, you should not write so loosely in '49 of your loose action of '45. But you have your object before you. And, moreover, the paper of the "excellent brother," Rev. D. Scott, was opposed by deacon men—not as you say—but for the very reason of its effect to suppress discussion; while the Irish resolution expressly "recommends" discussion, "instruction of the congregations." Here it is, as objected to by deacon men, and we ought to know why we offered the substitute:

"Whereas, it is desirable on the one hand, to allay *and prevent* this agitation, Resolved, that congregations be left to the free and unbiassed management of their temporalities, each according to its present mode."

From beginning to end of this paper of the "excellent brother," there is not one word about "instructing the congregations," as in the Irish resolution—but the contrary—"congregations shall be left unbiassed." Is this the startling (!) coincidence between the resolution of the Irish Synod, and the paper of the "excellent brother?" Startling! To recommend ministers and elders to "use their best endeavours" to instruct—"to leave unbiassed!" The "coincidence!" No, indeed. But, because it was to operate as a gag, and for that very reason deacon men opposed, and all voted the "loose substitute." Because it forbade to bias any congregation, and instructing in the nature and duties of the deacon's office, as asserted in the Scottish report and in the Scottish and Irish Testimony, would so bias, it was opposed by all who in '45 were for instructing as recommended by our Irish brethren.

In the closing paragraph of the article now before us, we have some "startling" statements in regard to the Scottish report. Take the following:

"It is expressly admitted that the standards of the second reformation, confine the official business of the deacon to distributing to the necessities of the poor."

So far from this having even a shadow of truth for its foundation, the "Second Reformation" is not expressed in the report any where, or in any connexion. Nor is the confining of the official business of the deacon expressed in the report at all, but the very reverse. In p. 229, the report says:

"To attend to the temporalities of the church generally."

In p. 230, it suggests for consideration:

"1st, Whether there are not certain things fit and expedient to be com-

mitted to elders and deacons jointly and in common, such as serving at the communion table, (!) the church door treasury, and allocating money to the poor, and general missionary and benevolent objects. 2d, Whether there are not certain things fit and expedient to be committed to the deacons, (alone!) such as the charge of church property, (civil?) providing for the temporal support of the public ordinances, and the collection, distribution, and disbursement of money generally."

The only expression in the whole report, from which the idea could be wrenched even, is in answering the following question—one that has no bearing upon the extent of the power—"5. What are the relations of deacons to the church courts, and to whom are they more immediately responsible?" Would men of sense, in answering this question, define the extent of the power of the deacon, and that too expressly contradictory to the definition given in the proper place in the report? The Ref. Pres. may make the Scottish Synod so stultify itself—we will not. Hear the answer: "Three different answers may be given to this question, and three different plans proposed. According to the first the deacons are associated with the teaching and ruling elders in distributing to the necessities of the poor." Here, speaking of the poor, they associate ministers and elders with the deacon. But just above, same page, they say, speaking of the deacons not associated with ministers and elders, "2. Whether there are not certain things fit and expedient to be committed to the deacons, such as the charge of the church's property." This brings to view a distinction, worth consideration on the part of those who explain the "Form," when it speaks of the associated power of ministers, elders, and deacons, "to take special care of the poor," designing no more than the Scottish Synod in their report—the associated or Consistory power regarding the poor; yet not touching "the charge of the deacon over the church's property." The more so, since their "standard," and constitutional law, their testimony, extends the power beyond the poor.

In saying that the "Scottish Synod expressly admits that the standards of the Second Reformation confine the official business of the deacons to distributing to the necessities of the poor," since in their Testimony and in their report, they expressly contradict the statement, they are placed by their fast friend, the Ref. Pres., in a far worse dilemma, than ultra-deacon men in this country—for they make no such "express admission." They don't admit any such limitation of the deacon's power in the "Form," more than the limitation of the elder's. They refuse all limitations on this subject, and, consequently, all contradictions in the Church of Scotland's Reformation first and second, or in the standards, testimonies, reports or resolutions of the Scottish and Irish Synods, whatever on the subject of the extent of the deacon's power. Some documents say more, some say less, but none contradict.

The Ref. Pres. will find it necessary to try again before he can deceive people of sense in regard to this matter. And, as an old friend, we would kindly hint to him that a few more such naked attempts to make a false impression will do good—will render harmless, by and by, all such false representations as have recently so much tarnished the pages of a sheet, once so "vapid in its tone." "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good cause." "Love the truth and peace."

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

Scotland and England—The Condition of the People.

I have already touched, incidentally, upon the condition of the masses in Great Britain, and more particularly in Ireland, where the hand of oppression is, if not the heaviest, the most visible. In Scotland, you see fewer indications of poverty than in the sister island. In fact, the peasantry of North Britain are in a comparatively enviable condition. The farms are *all* large. In the plains—I speak of the Lowlands—from one hundred and fifty to six hundred acres, or even more: in the more elevated moorlands, from eight hundred to three thousand acres. They have not been, for centuries, so far as I could learn, subjected to that dividing process which has been one of the banes of Ireland. Every farm has a name, which not only distinguishes it, but, after the manner of the nobility, its tenant. The farm houses, in the plains, are large and substantial: they stack their grain: the barns and outhouses not so good. The rents, however, are very high—from two to six pounds an acre for the best farms: the moorland farms are rented in the gross, and at a far lower price. Still, the Scottish farmer has his trials, and severe. 1. He labours for his landlord, more than for himself. His fields are large, fertile, well tilled, beautiful: but the best and the most of their produce finds its way into the coffers of the owner of the soil. His flocks and herds are of the finest breeds, fat and sightly, but all have the same destination—to supply the overflowing treasures of a pampered, and often foreign, aristocracy. And every year adds to their draughts, so that, at the present moment, the agricultural population of Scotland abound in complainings. 2. As the farms cannot be divided, the sons and daughters of the family—all that can be spared—are compelled, at an early age, to abandon their houses, and seek their fortunes in the great cities and towns, or in new countries,—an alternative painful enough, but upon the whole, much to be preferred to the habit of subdivision, which has contributed so largely to the impoverishment of the neighbouring island. Hence, as one cause, the rapid growth of Glasgow—it is the El Dorado of the youthful Scotch, when, with strong thews, resolute hearts, and sober, religious habits, they push their way on in the world's struggle. In Scotland, wages are good, compared with Ireland. A labourer in the quarries near Stirling, in whose house at St. Ninian's I spent an hour, has received for some years half a dollar a day, and gets employment about two-thirds of the time. With an intelligent and prudent wife, and by totally abstaining from the use of strong drink, this man has succeeded in saving enough, after maintaining his growing family, to erect a substantial cottage. But, to use the language of his wife, you may be sure they have had their privations. In the larger and more commercial cities, and in manufacturing towns, wages are rather higher; but employment harder to get, and places of very uncertain tenure. I neglected to ascertain the wages of farm labourers—low, I have no doubt, they are. In the villages, the dwellings generally seemed to be comfortable—small, mostly one story, and with no attempt at ornament. The Scottish peasantry and labourers are substantially clad. So are the workmen and women in such factories as I visited. Their living, judging by the few instances in which I had an opportunity of making observations, is very plain—with little variety, but healthful. Oatmeal, as in Ireland, is a staple article of diet; and, when well prepared, an excellent one. With

this, a scanty supply of meat, and perhaps some tea added for the adult and labouring members of the family. I need hardly say that the population bears the aspect of health and vigour; and, as compared with the people of this country, this holds true particularly of the females. I except here the factory operatives, who evidently suffer from close confinement in heated rooms; and yet, so far as appearances are to be trusted, even they cannot be denominated as a class, sufferers. They work reasonable hours, and make, in good times, when they have full employment, at least living wages.

So far I have described the condition, as it struck me, of the men, sober, discreet, and industrious. There is, however, a large portion of the labouring classes, as in all countries, who lack one or all of these attributes. Strong drink is the bane of Scottish society. It is almost universally used. In every city, town, and village, drinking shops abound. Of course, those who frequent them cannot thrive. The earnings of good seasons and ample work are squandered; and hence, in the frequent revolutions of business, multitudes are thrown into a suffering condition, and become pensioners upon the public bounty,—and yet you see comparatively few evidences of this fact. The times were hard when I was in Scotland. It was about the close of a long period of embarrassment in manufacturing and trade. And yet the general appearance of even the cities, except Paisley, which has been sinking for twenty-five years, was not outwardly indicative of any thing like extreme suffering. In the country all was beautiful. Few stragglers to be seen. Scarcely any in rags. Of the villages the same may be said, with some exceptions. In short, the misery of the Scottish poor is kept out of sight, presenting a remarkable contrast, in this respect, to the sister island, where wretchedness seeks no retirement, but rather thrusts itself importunately before you, even in the public avenues.

Scotland is a delightful country: the most beautiful I have seen. There are spots in Ireland—I speak of the North, the South I did not see—most lovely; but no combinations of the grand and beautiful in nature and in art have I ever seen to be compared with more than one Scottish scene. No part of it within the range of my travels is uninteresting: much is eminently attractive. None who has seen them, can ever forget the Stirling and Edinburgh panoramas—the fair plains of the Lothians, the moss-covered hills to the east of Ayrshire—the sublime ridges and peaks around Lochs Katrine and Lomond.

But, what of the religion of Scotland? To this I can give, from observation, no very definite answer. I learned enough, however, and saw enough to know that, to a most painful extent, the glory has departed. The Scottish Sabbath is not in the towns—the large towns—what it once was. Infidelity has contaminated a large proportion of the manufacturing population. The churches have declined—in some cases, it is to be feared, far—from their pristine purity as it regards the character of religious ordinances and Christian morals. Still, Scotland is a religious country; and, taking every thing into the account, maintains an eminent position, not only intellectually, but religiously; and when her third reformation comes—or rather, when she returns and takes up, and receives into her heart, her former and covenanted attainments, she will shine with a new, with resplendent lustre.

What I have said of the Scottish farmer and labourer is, in the main, true of the English, (I allude to their external and business condition,)

with this explanation that the English operatives—and, perhaps, the farmers—occupy a lower and more ineligible position than the Scottish. Farms rent high—the supply of labour is even more abundant—the poor abound—and in the manufacturing cities you constantly meet objects most pitiable in dress and aspect. However, I was there at an unfavourable time. Business had been dull in Manchester for two years. A large proportion of the operatives were out of employ; and how they lived at all, even with enormous poor-rates, is a mystery. In the country, things wore a settled aspect. Little wretchedness was to be seen. The farms are, of course, highly cultivated: the farm-houses, many of them old, but spacious,—and not a few so connected with the out-houses as to make an enclosure—a memorial of the times when every man's needed to be his castle. The face of the country—what I saw of it—from Manchester to London, and in the neighbourhood of London, is level—few hills of any size. Consequently, the scenery is tame, presenting almost no view worth a second look. The towns have mostly an old appearance—and with their tiled roofs, and mossy sides and eaves, a strange one to the traveller from the new world. The parish churches are frequently striking objects—embosomed in groves, and overrun to the summit of their towers with moss and ivy. Now and then, you see an old baronial manor or castle, or an elevation, and sometimes a village, covering the slopes of the hill. The people—the common people—are, as we know from what we see of them here, frequently coarse and boisterous in their demeanour. As to religion, I can furnish nothing new. The Sabbath is not well kept,—it never has been in England. As in Scotland, the suffering classes are much out of sight—except that in the great towns you are arrested by not a few mendicants of all ages. But even these are few, compared with what you see in Ireland, and much less importunate. Here again, as in the sister kingdoms, strong drink spoils and debases the masses, and pollutes the fountains of all social action. I found the dissenting interests more influential than I had expected. They are very strong, and hold the Establishment in check with a pretty strong hand. Finally, in all the kingdoms, there is little hope of any great reform until the aristocracy are rooted out, and the actual moving elements of society have the control in matters of legislation, as they now have in all business affairs. Or in other words, until the free church gains the ascendancy in the British Constitution, and the vast estates of the empire are distributed more equally among the people.

I now close this series of letters—written under some disadvantages, but at least with the intention of doing even-handed justice to all parties in those isles of our fathers.

J. M. W.

ON THE FALL OF THE ANGELS.

Vincent, in his Exposition of the Shorter Catechism, has judiciously observed, that “if a man finds his house on fire, it is of more importance to have the flames extinguished, than to ascertain how they commenced.” Still, as God has revealed to us the means of quenching that flame which has set our world on fire, I deem it not unlawful to inquire into its origin, provided we do not attempt *to be wise above what is written*. 1 Cor. iv. 6. (Gr.)

Of the fall of man, Scripture gives us a very explicit account; and, I believe, an equally explicit account of the fall of Satan.

That pride was the first sin of the Devil, seems to be admitted by all. The only subject of dispute is, In what way did Satan's pride first discover itself?

Milton tells us, that God the Father having revealed to the angels the doctrine of the incarnation, Satan and his fellows refused to worship Christ as God-man; because, then, they would be doing homage to a nature inferior to their own. Rutherford has shown this to be a mere figment of the poet's imagination, without any countenance from Scripture.

Scripture assigns no reason for Christ's incarnation, but that he might redeem his people; hence, we are authorized to assert, that if man had not fallen, Christ would not have become incarnate. From these premises, Rutherford reasons thus: Had the incarnation been revealed to Satan and his fellows, the fall of man must also have been revealed to them; and, consequently, their own fall; as it was by their temptation that man fell. But that God revealed to the reprobate angels their fall, before it actually took place, is altogether improbable.

Let us now inquire, if Scripture gives us any information on this subject. It seems to me that it does. Ezekiel xxviii. 15, 17, I humbly conceive, can properly be applied only to Satan.

It will be objected by some, that the character mentioned there is the king of Tyre. True; but it may also apply to Satan.

In Scripture, characters that very much resemble each other, are often called by the same name. Thus, Christ is called David, John the Baptist is called Elias, Rome is called Babylon, and the Roman government is called the Devil, because actuated by him. Compare Rev. xii. with xvii. Satan is called the old serpent, and all his servants are called serpents. As there are many things common to Christ and his people, and some things peculiar to each, so it is with Satan and his children. *Diabolus*, which we translate Devil, is used by the Apostle in 1 Tim. iii. 11, as a common name for slanderers.

From these considerations I conclude, that the character described in Ezekiel xxviii. 15, must be Satan. It could not be said of the king of Tyre that he was perfect from the day that he was created, till iniquity was found in him. Iniquity is found in every man as soon as he is created, for in Adam all have sinned. Rom. v. 12.

From Ezekiel xxviii. 17, then, we learn, that Satan's pride began in his having too high an opinion of his own perfections.

Indeed, reason seems to say, that this was the only way in which sin could commence in a pure spirit.

The same subject is evidently alluded to in Isa. xiv. 12—15; and there we learn, that Lucifer's, or if you please, Satan's pride, prompted him to aspire to equality with the Most High: the consequence of which was, that he was seized and cast down to hell. See Rev. xii. 7—9.

But some ask, How could a holy being sin?

I say, with Edwards: Prove to me that a holy being cannot sin, and I will prove that there never was a sin committed; for God made all things very good. Of course, none of them was sinful. The objection betrays ignorance of the difference between created and uncreated holiness.

A being possessed of uncreated, essential, infinite holiness, cannot sin; but a being having only a created, finite, and dependent holiness, may change from holy to unholy by sinning, as the event has shown.

The creature did not bring itself into being: it cannot preserve itself in being. There is, in every creature, a principle of defectibility, or tendency to its original nonentity. In order that a holy creature may continue such, it must have a continual supply from the fountain of holiness; but God was under no obligation to afford that supply, either to men or angels. He saw fit to withhold the supply, and angels fell.

All this, we admit, is incomprehensible; but what is not incomprehensible? Which of all Jehovah's ways can we comprehend? How small a portion is known! The thunder of his power who can understand?

If any of your readers can give a more rational and Scriptural account of the origin of moral evil, and the fall of the angels, than what is given here, I shall rejoice to see it in your magazine. PRATENSIS.

FUGITIVE SLAVES.

Henry Clay thus explains, in his great compromising speech, the clause of the Constitution requiring the surrender of fugitives from slavery:

"I do not say, sir, that a *private individual* is obliged to make the tour of his whole state, in order to assist the owner of a slave to recover his property; but I do say, *if he is present* when the owner of a slave is about to assert his rights and regain possession of his property, *that he and every one present*, whether officer, or agent of the state government, or private individual, is *bound* to assist in the execution of the laws of their country."

There may be some straining in this: we are not sure that every bystander is bound to assist the slaveholder directly: but, certainly, every one who swears to this Constitution, is bound to two things:—1st. Not to interpose any obstacle to the recovery of the slave, either by concealing him or promoting his escape, or by any violent interference on his behalf. And—2d. He is bound, when called upon, to aid, as a law-abiding citizen, the public officer who, according to the law, either of the State, or of the United States, is engaged in the apprehension or safe-keeping of the fugitive. When we say "bound," we mean that so much is comprehended in his oath. Morally, he cannot be bound to either of these things: for the law of God not only forbids man-stealing, which the arrest and delivery of fugitive slaves is, but as expressly commands to "hide the outcast."

We have always thought the enactments of such of the northern states as have forbidden their officers, &c., to be employed in this unhallowed work, to be unconstitutional. Judged by the divine law, their only sin has been, not going far enough;—not forbidding altogether the arrest of fugitives on their soil—in not declaring that so soon as the foot of the slave touches their territory, he shall be free; but, tried by the compromises of the Constitution—by their own compact, they have violated the law. With one breath they say, "Fugitives shall be *delivered* up," in the next they forbid "their delivery;" they will only permit them to be taken by another authority, and by other agents. We add, that it would not surprise us to find the last law of Pennsylvania on this subject repealed,—and, perhaps, the similar laws of other states, as a peace offering to the South. Slavery, if the signs of the times do not deceive us, has wrought pretty successfully upon the North already.

Still, whatever the results of the discussion now going on, as it regards the institution of slavery, one effect will, certainly, be wrought,—the

pro-slavery element of the Constitution will be brought out in a clearer light than ever. The whole country will be compelled to see and acknowledge that this instrument contains guarantees and compromises with the accursed thing; and not a few, we hope, will be driven to the conclusion that to swear to support such compromises is a flagrant offence against Christian morality. Gov. Seward, like the late J. Q. Adams, proclaims the clause respecting the surrender of fugitive slaves, to be "immoral." He says, in his late speech in the U. S. Senate, referring to the *law* on this subject,—but, as the reader will see, including in his denunciations the Constitution:—

"We deem its principle therefore unjust, unconstitutional and immoral; and thus, while patriotism withholds its approbation, and the consciences of our people condemn it. You will say that these convictions of ours are disloyal. Grant it, for argument's sake, they are nevertheless honest. And the law is to be executed among us, not among you—not *by* us, but by the federal authority. Has any government ever succeeded in changing the moral convictions of its subjects by force? But these convictions imply no disloyalty. We revere the Constitution, although we perceive this defect; just as we acknowledge the splendour and the power of the sun, although its surface is tarnished with here and there an opaque spot. Your constitution and laws convert hospitality to the refugee from the most degrading oppression on earth into a crime. But all mankind, except you, esteem that hospitality a virtue. The right of extradition of even fugitives from justice is not only admitted by the Law of Nature and of nations, but rests on voluntary compact. Only two compacts found in diplomatic history admitted *extradition of slaves*. Here is one of them. It is found in a treaty made between Alexander Comnenus, the Greek Emperor, at Constantinople, and Oleg 2d, King of Russia, in the year 902, and is in these words:

"If a Russian slave take flight from his master, or if he shall be held under pretence of having been bought, his master may pursue him, and take him wheresoever he may be found; and whosoever shall prevent his master from taking him shall be guilty of offending against this treaty, and shall be punished accordingly." This was in the year of Grace 902, in what is called the Dark Ages, and the contracting powers were despotisms. And here is the other:

"No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any laws or regulations therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour is due."

This is from the Constitution of the United States in 1787, and the parties were the Republican States of this Union.

The Law of Nations disavows such compacts—the Law of Nature, written in the hearts and consciences of freemen, repudiates them. Armed power could not enforce them, because there is no public conscience to sustain them."

This is true, but we cannot help asking, How can Gov. Seward swear to this Constitution? This question he was asked in the Senate. It cannot be answered. The following is excellent. It cheers us, that such sentiments are uttered by such a man, in such a place. It is not often that this nation has heard from the lips of its statesmen the doctrine of the paramount authority of God's law:

"I know that there are laws of various sorts, that regulate the conduct of men. There are constitutions and statutes, codes mercantile and codes civil; but when we are legislating for States, especially when we are founding States, all these laws *must be brought to the standard of the laws of God*, and must

be tried by that standard, and stand or fall by it. It is of this principle that an eminent political philosopher of England, Burke, said,

‘There is but one law for all,—namely, that law which governs all law,—the law of our Creator,—the law of humanity, justice, equity,—the law of nature and of nations. So long as any laws fortify this primeval law, and give it more precision, more energy, more effect by their declarations, such laws enter into the sanctuary, and participate in the sacredness of its character. But the man who quotes as precedents, the abuses of tyrants and robbers, pollutes the very fountains of justice, destroys the foundations of all law, and therefore removes the only safeguard against evil men, whether governors or governed, the guard which prevents governors from becoming tyrants, and the governed from becoming rebels.’”

Policy may prevail for the time. Ungodly politicians sent to Washington by the votes of Christians, may betray the interests of liberty for gain and for office—but truth will be circulated. There are still a few to stand up for the right, unterrified by Southern threats, and unswayed by the bribes of a timid and truckling administration.

[For the Covenanter.]

ANTI-DEACON CATECHISM.

The controversy about deacons seems to be at a close: the anti-deacon men are beginning to travel over the same ground that they travelled ten years ago.

It occurred to me, in my private meditations, that it might help the rising generation to understand and remember the anti-deacon arguments, if they were presented in a catechetical form. What do you think of the following?

1st Q. Is the 2d Book of Discipline still law in the Reformed Presbyterian Church?

A. No; *we have no more to do with it than with the history of Russia.**

2d Q. What book contains the government and discipline of the Church of Scotland, to which we are sworn in the Solemn League and Covenant?

No answer.

3d Q. What are the standards of Presbyterian government and discipline?

A. Only the Westminster Form and Directory.

4th Q. I thought we received those documents as the Church of Scotland received them; viz., as they were agreeable to her own books of discipline?

A. The Church of Scotland did not receive them; they were received by her. Take notice of that distinction, as it is equally intelligible and important.

5th Q. But do not our Terms of Communion say, that Presbyterian church government is only *for substance*, contained in the Westminster Form?

A. Yes; and when a tree casts its leaves, its substance is in it. Is. vi. 13. So you see, that the *substance* of the tree means the whole of it; root, trunk, branches, *leaves*, and all.

6th Q. Are they a *perfect system* of church government?

A. No.

* I am informed that this expression was used explaining the Terms of Communion.

7th Q. Why might not their defects be supplied from the 2d Book of Discipline?

A. Because it allows the deacons to manage all the temporalities of the church?

8th Q. What does the Westminster Form say of the deacon?

A. It says that his duty is to take special care of the poor.

9th Q. Is the deacon a perpetual officer in the church?

A. Yes.

10th Q. Why, then, has the church no deacon?

A. Because she does not need them.

11th Q. Explain that. Does not the Westminster Form say that the number of deacons is to be proportioned according to the condition of the congregation?

A. Yes; and so, where there are no poor, there is no need of deacons.

12th Q. But, I thought, the term *each*, in that section, applied to elders as well as deacons. Why have we no congregations without elders?

A. Because elders are not deacons.

13th Q. But why have we no deacons in congregations where there are poor to be provided for?

A. Because elders can take care of the poor, as well as deacons; and the church having done very well without them for one hundred and fifty years, there is no need for reviving the office now.

14th Q. But did not the Church of Scotland commit the management of her temporalities to deacons, at the time of the Westminster Assembly?

A. Yes; but the church having had two hundred years to consider the meaning of the Westminster Form, must understand it much better than Henderson, Rutherford, and Gillespie, who had just newly composed it. You know, that the longer we study a subject the better we understand it.

15th Q. The phrase concerning the deacon, "*Whose office is perpetual*," you understand, then, to mean that the church should be perpetually without them?

A. Certainly; what else *could* it mean? Q. E. D. PRATENSIS.

ROMANS XIII.

The following is an extract from a work lately published by a Presbyterian in the State of Ohio. The more the Bible is studied, and the more society becomes imbued with its spirit, the more clear will the true interpretation of such passages as Rom. xiii. become. The time will come when it will be a matter of wonder that Christians should ever have imagined that they were obliged, under pain of damnation, to yield a conscientious obedience to a tyrannical and godless government:

"History tells us that Rome was built by the marauding shepherds, Romulus and Remus, who consulted the *heathen oracle*, not the Lord, as to who was to have the direction in building it. When built, it was opened 'as a sanctuary for all malefactors, slaves,' &c., who constituted the main part of the inhabitants. They chose Romulus 'as their king, who was accordingly acknowledged *chief of their religion*, sovereign magistrate of Rome, and *general of the army*. Besides a guard to

attend his person, it was determined that he should always be preceded, wherever he went, by another of twelve men, *armed* with axes, tied up in a bundle of rods, and who were to execute the laws, and impress his new subjects with a high idea of *his authority*. The principal religion of that age consisted in a firm reliance on the soothsayers, who pretended, from observations on the flight of birds and the entrails of beasts, to direct the present and dive into the future. *Romulus, by an express law, commanded that no election should be made, no enterprise undertaken, without first consulting them.*

Is this the mode of God's establishing government?—this the way He commissions his agents? Then verily the government of hell is appointed of God, and *therefore* we are to pray for and sustain Satan as the prince of the power of the air. No, no! Such governments are not the creatures of God's approval. We are not to pray that they may be sustained, but that they may be broken to pieces by the 'stone cut out *without hands,*' and the righteous kingdom of Jesus Christ established on their ruins; 'that the kingdoms of this world may become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and that He may reign for ever and ever; that the thrones may be cast down, and the Ancient of Days may sit.' When thus the kingdom is given to Christ and his saints, then, as his faithful subjects, we will sustain it. But in Paul's day, the kingdoms of this world belonged to Satan. Jesus Christ did not accede to the *condition* on which the arch deceiver, the devil, proffered them to Him. And O, that all of His professed followers, when on the same condition they have been offered preferment, had with the Saviour said, 'Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'

The governments appointed of God are such as acknowledge God's right to appoint—such as acknowledge Him as the Lawgiver. But none will contend that the Roman government can be included under this head. Of course, therefore, Paul could not have meant that they were appointed of God.

A. DRESSER.

MANCHESTER CONGREGATION.

This congregation, finding it impossible to retain their meeting-house, have disposed of it, on terms that enabled them to get rid of their debt, which amounted to £1000, (\$5000.) They have rented a convenient Hall, and are recommencing operations under hopeful auspices. We are rejoiced at this; for Manchester attracts a large influx of that kind of population among which Covenanting principles find a tolerably favourable reception: and not a few resort to this place from our own congregations in Ireland and Scotland, for the purpose of finding employment in its factories. The sister Synods appear both to be interested in the cause there, and will, no doubt, exert themselves to keep the standard of the Covenant lifted up in the west of England.

SCALE OF APPORTIONMENT BY SYNOD'S COMMITTEE.

A Committee of one from each Presbytery, namely, Messrs. David Scott, Rochester, J. M. Willson, New York, Thomas Sproul, Pittsburgh, R. Hutcheson, Lakes, and William Sloane, Illinois, were appointed by Synod at last meeting to distribute the labours of licentiates and unsettled

ministers until next meeting of Synod, (including May, 1850, till May, 1851.) By correspondence maintained between the members of committee and the chairman during the past three months, he is enabled to present the following schedule of appointments, which have been most harmoniously agreed on,—that to the

Presbytery of Pittsburgh, Rev. Messrs. Thomas Hannay, R. J. Dodds, and H. McClurkin, licentiate, be assigned.

Presbytery of New York, Mr. Williams, licentiate.

Presbytery of the Lakes, Mr. John French, licentiate.

Presbytery of Illinois, Mr. Acheson, licentiate.

Presbytery of Rochester, Rev. Robert Johnson.

And whereas the Rev. M. Roney still continues unable to labour in the ministry, the committee assign him no appointments.

And further, whereas, several young men are expected soon, in their respective Presbyteries, to receive licensure to preach the gospel, said young men, when licensed, shall labour within the bounds of the Presbyteries by whom they shall be licensed, until further arrangements be made by the Committee.

All which is respectfully submitted.

Rochester, 12th March, 1850.

DAVID SCOTT, *Chairman.*

NEAR CONTEMPLATION OF DEATH.—That estimable woman and admirable writer, Caroline Fry, about a week before her death, being informed by her physician that her malady was fatal, communicated the intelligence by letter to a dear friend. The strength of her faith appears in her language. “Dearest, God hath spoken, and we have no more to do. If this be true, it is only a question of more or less time, more or less temporary alleviation. Never, never can it be sad to me to stand still and watch for the parting of the waters of Jordan, to let me pass and close on all I desire to see no more; and not from me can ever the cry be heard for a little more time to suffer and to sin, and wait and long for Him my soul desires. If it ever should be so, He will have cause to say I have held strange language with him heretofore; when for very love, as I believe, I have entreated, implored Him that he would not let me come to him, when I could not be satisfied with any thing beside. No, no, His Spirit will not let me be so false. To-night, to-morrow, if it be His pleasure!” On the day preceding her departure, she addressed another correspondent: “The bright, the blessed hour for which I have toiled and waited for so many years, the panacea at all times of every painful, every fearful thought, has seemed, in my spasmodic agonies of breathlessness, immediately at hand.” On the following day, finding herself much weaker, she said, “Oh, if I die to-day, what a mercy! But the blessing would be so great I dare not calculate on it. I want no more of the world! How dark is all behind, how bright the prospect before! so unclouded, so safe, so secure. Jesus, so true to me, I so untrue to thee! Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none on earth I desire besides thee! This is my bridal day, the beginning of my life! Oh, if this is dying, what a mercy! I have written a book to testify that God is love, I now testify that he is Faithfulness and Truth. I never asked a petition of God, that sooner or later, I did not obtain.” Shortly after, with a countenance glowing with heavenly joy, she fell asleep in Jesus.

ETERNITY.—We see that our youthful joys were but this morning; we see them withered ere it is night—withered to be green no more. The grass can be turned in one hour to withered hay, but hay can never return to its former freshness. We look back on our early joys and say, “they are as a dream when one awaketh.” How short was the vision, and whither has it fled! We are just preparing to live; but now we have awoken and find that we have nothing to do, but to prepare to die; for what has happened to the joys of life, will shortly happen to life itself. “In the morning it flourisheth and groweth up—in the evening, it is cut down, and withereth” in the grave. We have already passed the greater part of life’s comforts.

Every hour is carrying us still further from them. We cannot return; but an irresistible current is bearing us down into the gulf of eternity. There is no return—there is no stop. It will be but a moment, and we must go to our long home, and leave the mourners to go about the streets. We cannot be younger, but we shall soon be dead; and on a dying bed we shall feel the truth of our text, and the propriety of its figure more than ever. All our life will seem but a day, and having passed the short day of dreams and shadows, we shall disappear. We shall take an eternal leave of earth, and wing our way to the bar of God. The places which now know us, will know us no more. Our lands and houses will pass into other hands. Strangers will occupy our substance and walk over our graves, without knowing that we were buried there. Our names will be forgotten on earth. The world will go on as before. The sun will rise and set as usual. Mirth and diversion will be as bright as ever. None will take thought of our pleasure or pain; while we shall be either mounting the regions of life, and soaring high in salvation, or shrieking to the ear of hell, and sinking in the pit that hath no bottom.—*Dr. Griffin.*

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Tahiti.—France is not likely to succeed, after all, in establishing Popery in Tahiti. It is stated that at Papete, the seat of government, there are three Popish priests; but not one convert has been made from the natives residing there, and but three or four native children attend their school. At another place on the same island, there are two priests, but no native convert, and but nine or ten children in the school. This is cheering news.

Sandwich Islands.—Some time ago, we referred to the efforts then making by the American Board to render their missions in these islands *self-supporting*. The object is likely to be attained. The results, thus far, are stated as follows:

“Several of the brethren have resolved to support themselves in one or two years. In the school changes were made, which will relieve the Board of perhaps \$5,000 a year. The High School, at Lahainaluna, was on certain conditions made over to the government; and they have appropriated \$3,000 a year to its support. They retain the same teachers, and pursue the same studies as heretofore. Several of the pastors will, after this year, be entirely supported by their people; others partially so; and every year the amount called for will be less and less to the end.”

In every respect, this is most encouraging. It not only demonstrates how strong a hold Evangelical Christianity has taken in these islands, but equally shows how great has been the social and physical improvement among a people who a quarter of a century since were naked, debased savages. Then, they had no property. Now, they erect churches, and maintain pastors, after providing for their own support.

Turkey.—The controversy between Turkey and Russia has nearly lost its interest. The Autocrat has in part prevailed. Turkey has put restraints upon fugitives, except such as procure passports to go abroad. Still, the passions engendered have not subsided. The interference of France and England has ruffled the mind of Nicholas. He waits his opportunity—and it may not be long delayed—to seize upon the European possessions of Turkey, driving the Ottoman back towards the Asiatic sources of his empire. M. Noah, an intelligent observer of events, predicts an immediate war. We give his language:

“All the wars between Turkey and Russia for the last thirty years have been mere skirmishes on the outposts—feelers, as it were, to ascertain where the real strength lay; and the wars ended as Nicholas desired, by the friendly

mediation of European powers. Now, however, the time has arrived to meet the great struggle in earnest, and the storm is nearly ready to burst upon the head of the Commander of the Faithful. The new railroads will bring from distant territories regiments free from any debilitating or painful service. Commanding the resources of a country with a population of sixty millions, where his will is law; popular among his people, moving in every direction, and superintending every thing in person; with skilful generals and soldiers, trained as such from infancy; with abundance of means, and Europe tranquillized, the attack on Turkey will be made by 500,000 men, and a squadron from the Black Sea larger than that of any naval power except Britain, backed also by the powerful alliance of Austria if necessary. Constantinople and the towers of the Dardanelles must, therefore, fall.

"In vain will the Sultan appeal to the Christian powers to resist him with an army, the united force of which would enable him to check the rapid advance of the Cossacks. Neither France nor Germany, nor any of the Northern powers, can be brought to unite in a war against Russia, having to pass through Austria to reach the confines of Turkey. In vain will the Sultan proclaim a religious war, and unfurl the standard of the Prophet. He will secure the multitude, but not a disciplined force to stand up against the powerfully organized troops of Russia.

"If the Emperor postpones or delays the final action, he loses strength, for he gives time and efficiency to diplomacy; but if he is ready at the breaking up of the ice on the Danube, to push forward his columns, Constantinople falls, and the Sultan crosses into Asia, the natural boundaries of the Moslem race. But it will be asked, will the European powers consent to allow Russia to occupy a position so dangerous and controlling? That is not his intention. He prefers having a new empire created out of Turkey in Europe, including Greece and the Islands of the Archipelago, which he can control, having the Greek Church as its origin and spiritual head. The Emperor will thus release himself from Continental jealousy and interference, while he controls the Dardanelles and the Black Sea, and indirectly the commerce of the Mediterranean."

He adds:

"Then that series of bloody wars will take place shadowed forth in the Bible, as the wars of Russ, Meheec, and Tuball, in which all the Christian powers will take part. This is destiny, and cannot be averted. Of territory Russia has sufficiency; but sixty millions of people have been accustomed to see the finger-post erected by Catharine: "*This is the road to Constantinople,*" and over that road they must go. This advent—this opening of another seal—will surely take place during the present year, and will be pregnant with greater events than the flight of the Pope or the downfall of Hungary.

The accounts from the missionaries in Turkey are rather encouraging. They are permitted to carry on their work with less disturbance, and with some good results. They say:

"During the past year, the progress of the work in Trebizond has been slow. But, though there have been few conversions, the truth has been making progress silently. Three years ago, Protestantism was treated only with abuse. Now its merits are discussed openly, candidly, and with results favourable to the cause of truth. Persons of rank and influence who would lose their standing if they should attend Protestant worship, are not afraid openly to condemn the superstitions of their own church, and advocate Protestant principles. Three years ago they would have been imprisoned or bastinadoed. The work is greatly prospering in Aintab. Their place of worship is crowded to overflowing, and new hearers are daily added to their congregation."

Rome.—The Pope is not yet in the Vatican. One apology is framed after another. It is still possible that he may never return. In the mean time the government is conducted worse than ever. A correspondent of the Evangelist describes its spirit and doings truly:

“It becomes more and more evident that the restoration of the government of the Cardinals, was the restoration of Popish despotism in undiminished pretensions. Separated from the charities of domestic life; accustomed to great deference on the part of their inferiors, and to fawning solicitations from the great; appearing often in splendour before a prostrate people at state and church ceremonies; and handling a power which claims passive obedience, and which extends to the very secrets of the heart; the Cardinals see only the meaner side of human nature, and fall easily into a merciless asceticism, which looks upon a palpitating heart, as calmly as a chemist watches his crucible. They call their government spiritual, and pretend to have primary regard to the salvation of souls: they cling with a death grasp to temporal power, and threaten eternal damnation for the violation of a police order.

“The church teaches that the prayers of the living may profit the dead, and thus touches the natural affections of families to the quick: yet we have recently seen mothers, wives, sisters and daughters, dragged to prison by night at the order of the Cardinals, for being present at a mass for the repose of the souls of their nearest kindred, who died fighting for their country against foreign invaders. The Pope had excommunicated these republicans, and mothers’ hearts must be stifled even in prayer, for sons who contest his temporal power.”

“We know a gentleman, bred as a lawyer, who was present at an interview with the Cardinals at which a plea for clemency in some such heart matter was presented to them; but said he, ‘you might as well talk of mercy to a pack of wolves.’

“The case of Dr. Achilli has brought out the spirit of the present Roman Government in a way to satisfy the world that Popery is the same unscrupulous, remorseless, and gospel-hating power that it was in the days of Luther. He was arrested, in the first place, under a name not his own; by means of deception practised upon a French officer, who supposed himself obeying an order from the French Prefecture; and upon criminal charges of the most awful kind. Upon his remonstrance at his arrest under the name given, he was told that he was only to be taken before the French Prefect, who would see that no injustice was done him. But he was not allowed to see this officer: he was given immediately into the hands of the Papal police, and taken next morning to the Inquisition. The interference of M. de Tocqueville, the Minister of Foreign affairs at Paris, was repulsed by the accusations of seduction and murder, dating back some eighteen years, and to before his succession to high honours in the church. But the committee of investigation in their first interview with M. Corcelles, the French Minister at Rome, were told, ‘Gentlemen, these charges are entirely dropped; there is absolutely nothing in them. The Cardinals claim authority over this man as an apostate ecclesiastic, and we have nothing to do with the matter, as he is a Roman!’ And there, at the threshold of the Inquisition, French intercession had ceased. The Cardinals have said firmly, ‘The Papal government is decided not to give this man up.’ He was married but a few weeks before his arrest, (lawfully married under the Roman Republic,) but neither his wife nor any of his kindred have been permitted to see him. His wife has been compelled to leave Rome to escape the persecutions of the priests, who three times came to her residence, each time took away her Bible, and threatened her with penalties. He has now been about six months in close confinement, and has not yet been examined! Lately he has been thrust into solitary confinement and put under a severe discipline! There he lingers; a witness to the violated honour of France,

whose name that nation will yet blush to read; and a witness against Rome' whose influence will be mighty for her downfall."

"In proof that the Papal Government itself is simply the Inquisition, we have only to take its police regulations. For example: the police accompany the priests to houses to search for Bibles. The doors are guarded, and the family threatened with arrest if they refuse to give up this and other books forbidden by the church. If a Roman family profess themselves Protestants and claim a right to their Bibles, they subject themselves to endless annoyances, after the seizure of their books. The police accompany the priests in a thorough visitation of families, to see that every one has been to confession and partaken of the sacrament. Whoever cannot produce a ticket in evidence of his confession is reported, and upon refusal to submit is excommunicated. If a tradesman, his customers are threatened with similar sentence if they encourage him; if a teacher, he is silenced at once, and whatever his standing or employment, he is liable every moment to banishment. The profession of teaching is particularly looked after. Even a drawing master is obliged to pass an examination as to his religious faith, before he can obtain a license. Even foreigners are forbidden to hold prayer-meetings for their own countrymen in their private apartments. They may have balls, as often as they please, feast days and all; but a re-union of half a dozen friends on the Sabbath for religious service is a political offence!"

Dr. Achilli has been *permitted* to escape; or, rather, has been aided by the French officers.

Switzerland. 1st. *Political.*—Switzerland is in a critical position. The great powers are jealous of its republican institutions, and are evidently preparing, at the first opportunity, to crush or remodel them. The correspondent of a leading paper says:

"Serious troubles are anticipated by several European states from the revolutionary party in Switzerland. Some twenty thousand men—the refugees of all Europe—driven from their native land, sought an asylum in Switzerland, and there they organized themselves and corresponded with revolutionists in every direction. To use Napoleon's favourite phrase, 'The pear is now ripe;' for these refugees are ready to invade France. They calculate on assistance from the revolutionists of that country. The French government has taken every precaution to crush any demonstration. But as France is at present resting over a volcano, it is difficult for any disinterested spectator to see how she can crush a revolution at home, put down one in a neighbouring state, and take charge of Rome at the same moment. Political events become more intricate, more interesting and more important as the days and weeks of the new year roll onward."

2d. *Religious.*—Events seem to be tending, in some other cantons, to the same issues as in the Canton de Vaud. Of Berne, the correspondent of the Presbyterian says:

"The Evangelical Society, which has its seat at Berne, has covered the Canton with its colporteurs and evangelists, and, at many points, has promoted the establishment of meetings for edification, which are held in churches and school-rooms. These meetings have not, as yet, been obstructed in any way by the authorities. The government, which, at bottom, is scarcely less hostile to the gospel than that of the Canton de Vaud, has not yet entered, like the latter, into the path of persecution. The Bernese pastors begin to understand better the necessity of paying attention to ecclesiastical questions, and of bringing them before their flocks. It is by *acts*, as well as *words*, that the clergy are labouring to revive the Church, and recover its independence, in regard to the State. The last sessions of Synod were

marked with many cheering manifestations in that direction: a petition to government in favour of the persecuted Vaudese Church; a strong protest, addressed to the Grand Council, against the corrupt press; the formation of a commission to direct the noble work of Home Missions, and a request to the pastors to engage actively in this work in their parishes. Finally, in a pastoral conference held on the 19th of September, 1849, the great question of the separation of Church and State was approached openly—a question which, but lately, had been smothered as soon as started. The memoir, drawn up on this subject by the pastor, Romang, arrived at this conclusion, which was adopted generally by the assembly, that it was not expedient to *provoke* the separation, but no more was it necessary to *dread* it, and that, whatever happens, they ought to prepare themselves for it, and to prepare the people by enlightening them on the true notion of a Church. A crisis seems at hand: a new Constitution is expected, which is in the course of elaboration in the bureaux of government, and for which the pastors have also presented a plan. One circumstance creates an important difference between the present position of the Bernese Church, and that in which the national Vaudese Church has been since 1839; the former has not been deprived of her Confession of Faith, (the Helvetic,) and she herself has never renounced her standard; she possesses, in that rule of teaching, a support against the encroachments of the State, and a bulwark against false doctrines. There are still, among the Bernese population, especially in the country districts, many fire-side centres of life, many families, in which family worship is maintained.”

The Theological School at Geneva is well organized and prosperous, as appears in the following :

“ There are forty-one students, twenty-one in the theological, and fourteen in the preparatory departments. The students are from Switzerland, France, England, Germany, Belgium, the Valleys of Piedmont, (Waldenses,) and America. The Professors are *Dr. Merle d'Aubigné*, President and Professor of Pastoral Theology and Church History; *Dr. Gausson*, Professor of Dogmatic Theology; Rev. Professor *La Harpe*, of Hebrew and Biblical Criticism of the Old Testament; Rev. Professor *Pilet*, of Sacred Rhetoric, and Criticism of the New Testament; Dr. Professor *Scherer*, of Exegesis. The expenses are about \$250 per annum. Board, as a general thing, in Geneva, is high, on account of the presence of many English; but there is a boarding-house kept by an excellent Christian, where the board amounts to 60 francs per month, (2 85 per week.) There are no charges for tuition in the seminary.”

France. 1st. *Political.*—Affairs are tending rapidly to a new revolution. The government of Louis Napoleon is following, very closely, the track of Charles X. and Louis Philippe: it muzzles the press, and abridges freedom of speech, and of assemblies. More than a hundred prosecutions have been instituted against the journals: and measures precisely similar to those of the late government, were used to prevent the holding of Socialist banquets on the 24th of February, the anniversary of the late revolution. The army was called out, and every preparation made for the violent suppression of the republicans. They yielded, however; but, evidently, only for the time. They are gaining strength in the provinces. Elections to fill vacancies in the Chamber frequently terminate in their favour. In the Assembly, the *priest* party have met with an unexpected and signal defeat upon the Education Bill. The design of the law was to confer large powers, in regard to education, upon the priesthood. This claim was struck out by a decided majority. 2d.

The Evangelical Party.—An event has just taken place which greatly encourages the friends of true religion in the French Church. We refer to the appointment of a Professor of Theology in the College of Montauban. We give it in the words of the correspondent of the Presbyterian. The extract is rather long, but cannot well be abridged :

“Since 1830, it has been the established usage to have the new professors nominated directly by the Minister of Public Instruction. This mode, which left the Church without any participation in the election of her teachers, could not be approved of, as to its principle; but, as to fact, it most frequently produced appointments that were favourable to orthodoxy, to which the Government had respect, especially under the administration of Mr. Guizot. Along with the ideas of popular suffrage, which the Revolution of February had spread every where, and which, it must be admitted, are, if any where, in their place in the administration of the church, direct nomination by the Minister was considered, on this occasion, out of the question. After having, for a long time, discussed the means of setting in operation an electoral machine, so considerable, and so much out of order, the following plan, at last, was adopted. The *Consistories*, to the number of ninety-three, which manage the affairs of our churches, and are their only official representatives, were requested to prepare, each, a list of three candidates; all these lists were to be forwarded to a *central Consistory*, that of Montauban, which would make out a definitive list, consisting of the three candidates who should have received the votes of the greatest number of Consistories; finally, the Minister would confine himself to a choice out of these three.

“The operation lasted about three months. The result was the giving of forty-four votes to one candidate of the latitudinarian party, (we scarcely have a heterodox party, properly so called;) thirty-six, and thirty-four, to two candidates of the evangelical party. Thus, the definitive list contained two representatives of orthodoxy, and a single one of latitudinarianism; this was a first advantage in our favour. The mismanagement of our adversaries gave us a second. The candidate, to whom they had given the forty-four votes, is an intelligent and learned man, but so eccentric, so singular, that his appointment would evidently have introduced either ridicule or disturbance into the faculty; in a word, he is a man to whom no one acquainted with him could offer that station. The minister, therefore, had but a single reasonable thing to do, which, however, he did with pleasure: this was to appoint the candidate who stood second on the list. In this way, Mr. Pedezert, pastor at Bayonne, has obtained this important post—a man of lively piety, and decided orthodoxy, as also learned and capable, who, as we hope, will do honour to the Consistories which gave him their votes. It is proper to add, that among these Consistories there are several, which, hitherto, had evinced their hostility to evangelical doctrine; they did not give the first place to Mr. Pedezert, but they gave him the second or the third. This fact deserves notice; it indicates progress in orthodox opinion, or at least a diminution of the prejudices against it.”

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

DUTCH SETTLEMENT IN MICHIGAN.—A moral and religious body of emigrants from Holland have settled on the banks of Black river, in Ottawa county, western Michigan. The growth of the colony has been exceedingly rapid, so that the Hollanders now outnumber the American population in two adjoining counties. Under the direction of their energetic leader, Dominie Van Raalte, a city is going up at the mouth of the river, called Holland, already containing two hundred and fifty houses; around it there are flourishing villages, named in fond recollection of the

places the colonists had for ever left behind, viz : Groningen, containing thirty houses ; Zeeland, one hundred and sixty-five ; Drenthe, forty-five ; Vriesland, sixty-nine ; Overysse, thirty-five ; Graafshap, fifty—about six hundred and thirty in all, making the population over three thousand, at an average of five to a house. A conference of the ministers and elders of the seven churches comprised within the colony—and indeed composing it—was held last summer, when it was ascertained that in doctrine they were in perfect harmony with the Dutch Reformed Church of this country ; and being visited by Rev. Dr. Wickoff, as a delegate from this denomination, they united with the northern synod of this body. These churches embrace six hundred and twenty-eight families, nine hundred and twenty-two communicants, and the entire population is about three thousand. Five church edifices have been erected, and there are at least five pastors—if not seven—all of whom are supported by these churches in the wilderness. Great attention is paid to schools and Christian education ; the teachers give instruction in both Dutch and English, and must also in the Heidelberg Catechism, which is the Westminster catechism of the Hollanders. They are so prayerful a people, that they carry their devotions to their *bees*, or meeting for common work. The common council of the city and port of Holland, opens its sessions with prayer. There are besides several scattered companies of Hollanders in the surrounding country, at Kalamazoo, Grandville, Grandhaven, Alleghan, and other places. Four years ago only, the site of these colonists was occupied by the Ottawa Indians ; and now instead, civilization and Christian churches.

These are their principal settlements. Some are found, however, in the states, particularly in Wisconsin, where a weekly paper is published in the Dutch language.

ANTI-SLAVERY IN VIRGINIA.—Attention has again been turned to the anti-slavery elements of the population of Virginia, by the efforts now making to call a convention for reforming the constitution. The Legislature—composed by a vicious system of representation of a majority of eastern delegates, has given, in a bill now before it, a majority in the convention to this section of the state. The west demurs, and insists upon a more equitable adjustment according to the white population. Even in Eastern Virginia there is a growing disposition to get rid of slavery. The Richmond Southerner uses the following language :

“It is not generally known, yet it is nevertheless true, that two-thirds of the people of Virginia are open and undisguised advocates of ridding the state of slavery ; and after 1850, when the census is taken, their views will be embodied in such a form as to startle the south. We speak understandingly. We have, within the last two years, conversed with more than five hundred slaveholders in the state, and four hundred and fifty out of the five hundred, expressed themselves ready to unite on any general plan to abolish slavery, upon almost any terms. I have conversed with several intelligent Virginians, upon the policy of slavery in their own state, and they concur in the opinion, that the system is an incubus upon its energies. They all recognise the fact, that in order to secure prosperity, labour must be made honourable, and that while slavery exists, it cannot become so to any considerable extent.”

CONGRESS.—Slavery, in some form, is still the only subject before Congress. Various compromises have been offered—the principal scheme by Mr. Clay—all, however, agreeing in one point—in discarding the Wilmot proviso. The South opposes the admission of California—not that she has any hopes of succeeding in this, but to increase the number

of her demands, hoping, and not without pretty good reason, that by placing her claims so very high, she will gain all that she really cares for. Mr. Calhoun, indeed, demands an amendment of the constitution, which shall secure the South an equal share of power with the North, without regard to the more rapid increase of the free states! In this, the other Southern members do not join him. Upon the whole, from the tone of the press, and particularly the religious press, and from the expressed opinions of members of Congress,—and, finally, from the fact that a resolution ordering the committee on territories to report governments for them, with the proviso annexed, was laid upon the table by a large majority, we believe that, as the South now boasts, is a “dead letter.” Indeed, we are surprised that we expected any thing else. What could be looked for but treachery, from the unholy factions which govern the country?

THE SEASON.—The winter has been remarkably open, but has been marked by an unusual destruction of property and of life by floods, conflagrations, explosions, and shipwrecks. Few appear to see the hand of God in these occurrences, or in the desperate strife of political parties.

GENEVA HALL—CIRCULAR.

This college, established by the Presbytery of the Lakes, is situated in the village of Northwood, two miles south of Belle Centre, Logan co., Ohio: the railroad from Sandusky City, on Lake Erie, passing through the latter place. The location is high and healthy. Geneva Hall is a Christian institution—discarding the demoralizing pagan classics, and substituting in their room, the Scriptures and Christian authors, ancient and modern. The course of study will be found as enlarged as in other colleges, and no effort will be spared to make the instruction in every department thorough, so that students who finish their studies in this college may be fitted for entering upon any professional course. The morals and deportment of the pupils will be sedulously attended to—the incorrigibly indolent and the disorderly will be dismissed. There are churches of most evangelical denominations within a reasonable distance of Northwood.

COURSE OF STUDY.

Preparatory.—Latin Lessons, Erasmus’s Dialogues, Latin Testament, Buchanan’s History commenced, Greek Lessons, Greek Testament, Septuagint, (Gen.,) English Grammar, Geography, Arithmetic, Algebra, (Davies’ First Lessons.)

Collegiate—Freshman—1st Term. Geometry, Buchanan, Septuagint, (Historical Books.)

Do. 2d Term. Algebra, (Bourdon,) Buch. Ps., Septuagint, Ancient Geography.

Sophomore—1st Term. Algebra, (finished,) Plane and Spherical Trigonometry, Buchanan, Lactantius, Eusebius’s History, Rhetoric.

Do. 2d Term. Surveying, Navigation, &c., Hebrew, Lactantius, Chrysostom, History.

Junior—1st Term. Conic Sections, Hebrew, Grotius, Septuagint, (Prophets,) Logic, History.

Do. 2d Term. Analytic Geometry, Natural Philosophy, (Olmsted,) Hebrew, Septuagint, (Prophets and Job,) Calvin, Mental Philosophy.

Senior—1st Term. Calculus, Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, Hebrew, Greek Testament. (Critical,) Tacitus. Moral Philosophy.

Do. 2d Term. Hebrew, Elements of Criticism, Evidences of Christianity, Moral Philosophy.*

Chemistry will be taught by lectures, and attention will be given throughout the course to Composition, Elocution, and English Literature. Besides the regular students, others who take only a part of the course, will be received into the regular classes: but new classes will be formed only for the regular students, and at the commencement of the terms.

Modern Languages, French, German, &c., will be taught, and all the students will have access to the college library.

VACATIONS.

There will be two terms in the year, each of five months. There will be two vacations—the months of April and November. The next term will commence the 1st of May.

EXPENSES.

Tuition, \$10 per term for the regular students. Boarding about \$1 per week: washing, fuel, and lights, extra. The entire expense for one year for these items will be about \$30. Arrangements are in contemplation for the establishment of a students' commons, which will materially reduce the cost of boarding.

M. POLLOCK, *President of the Board.*
J. B. JOHNSTON, *Secretary.*

Northwood, Feb. 19th, 1850.

OBITUARY OF MRS. ANN M'ELHINNEY.

The subject of this notice was born in County Donegal, Ireland, Sept. 22d, 1805, and departed this life, at her residence, Honey Creek, Iowa, Sept. 14th, 1849, after a lingering illness of consumption, of nearly two years. She was remarkable for her evenly and peaceful disposition, and appeared to enjoy the blessing of the Peacemaker to her latter end. A short time before her death, she was asked if she was still able to put her trust in the Redeemer. "In whom else," she replied, "would I put my trust, but in Him." At another time, being asked what evidence she had of her interest in Christ, she said, "That He who had kept her in His church from her birth, and sustained her all her life long, would not cast her off now at her last." She was brought up in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and continued in that communion until 1827, when, with her husband, she emigrated to the United States. Upon their arrival in Philadelphia, they found that in the Presbyterian Church the worship of God was corrupted by the use of uninspired hymns. This led them to a careful examination of the whole system of doctrine and order professed by that body, the result of which was a settled conviction of their error, not only on the subject of psalmody, but on other points, and a determination to attach themselves to the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This they did in 1828; and until the day of her death, Mrs. M'Elhinney continued steadfast in her profession, adorning the doctrine of God her Saviour by a blameless walk and conversation.

In 1840, she, with her husband and family, moved to the State (then Territory) of Iowa, where they were for some years almost entirely deprived of public ordinances. They, with another family, organized the first society of Covenanters west of the Mississippi River. This society met regularly for three years, with only two and occasionally three male members. It has now become a congregation of more than fifty members.

Mrs. M'Elhinney often mourned, after their removal to the West, the want of a preached gospel. She was much refreshed and comforted, however, by the occasional waterings their little flock received, as well as by the Christian conference of brethren in their society. She has left a husband and nine children to mourn the loss of a loving wife and tender mother. But they mourn not as those who have no hope.

COMMUNICATED.

* A little time will be requisite for the preparation of a few of the books mentioned in this schedule, and the courses may be hereafter subjected to some modifications.

THE COVENANTER.

MAY, 1850.

THE DEACONS.*

Phil. i. 1.—“Bishops and Deacons.”

Objections against the view of the Deacons already presented, claim attention, and to these the present article will be directed. In meeting them, it is not intended to notice every whim that has been urged against the system, such as that the deacons lay on a tax and extort money from the members, that they borrow money on the credit of the congregation, that they alter the direction of funds put into their hands for a specific purpose. If deacons, in any particular place, have ever done any of these things, it affects not the system any more than an officer or member getting drunk, would affect either the doctrine or practice of the church. It is intended only to handle objections that are plausible, and may, and do bear some weight in the minds of good men, and we give them in the form in which they are proposed as nearly as possible.

Obj. I. *What is so sacred in the brick and mortar of a meeting-house that it requires to be under the cure of ordained officers?*

Ans. 1. There is nothing so sacred in the brick and mortar, timber and tiles of a meeting-house as to require ordained officers. The sacredness consists entirely in the use that is to be made of it, and not in the materials of which it is composed. The use of a meeting-house, we think, will be admitted to be sacred; and we need not burden either the reader or the writer with proof of this point. It is God's house, built for his service, and owned or possessed in some way, by his family, a divinely constituted society. Might it not be asked in return, what is so profane in the use of a meeting-house as to exclude it from the charge of ordained officers?

Ans. 2. Keeping to the style of the objection, what is so sacred in the brick and mortar of the house in which a poor family resides? what so sacred in the silver, copper, flour, *pork*, &c., provided by the church for a poor widow, a missionary, or a professor of theology, that ordained officers and constituted courts are required to attend to these things?

Ans. 3. Inquiries in relation to the sacredness of any material substance, can do little towards settling its relations to the church, or the mode of its management. Matter is not susceptible of either holiness or profanation, farther than the use that is made of it at a particular time. All places are alike sacred where the Lord's people meet for his worship; and yet there is order, there are rights and decencies belong-

* This is No. 4 of the series published in the Reformed Presbyterian under this caption. Nos. 2 and 3 we have already laid before our readers.—Ed. Cov.

ing to the house of God. If our substance were dedicated in faith, as good people have done theirs in time past, and some still do, it will be counted sacred enough to require the attention of ordained officers.

Ans. 4. The spirit of this objection would exclude the deacon from the church; for there is nothing sacred in the provision of the poor, according to the objector's sense of sacredness.

Obj. II. *We build meeting-houses for ourselves, and so have a right to manage them by our own agents.*

Ans. 1. It is true that we too often eat for ourselves, and fast for ourselves, as did the Jews, and no doubt many even build meeting-houses for themselves, and some even attend public worship to see and be seen, as is manifest from their behaviour when there; but surely no honest objector will maintain that he has no higher object in contributing to a meeting-house, than *merely* his own accommodation. Do we wish none to be saved but ourselves? Have we not regard for the honour of God? These questions are easily answered by all good people. We build meeting-houses for ourselves, for the church, for the Lord. Now, if to build for ourselves would infer the right to the sole management of these buildings by our own representatives, surely when we build for the Lord, and for his church, it is equally inferable, that officers who represent the Lord and his church, as well as ourselves, should have the management of them.

Ans. 2. If the contributors build for themselves, apostates have as good a right to the property as the church has, provided the majority of a church or congregation should apostatize; at least, they would have a right to their share of the property.

Ans. 3. There are some, yes, many, who do not build for themselves. Persons making a bequest for a meeting-house do not build for themselves; at least, among protestants, none would be willing to acknowledge it; neither do those who contribute to a meeting-house five hundred or five thousand miles distant; the stranger who is not of the church, those who religiously dedicate their contributions to the Lord, either individually or congregationally. Some of those classes named, receive no accommodation whatever, others are as well accommodated as the persons who build for themselves; surely it would be more to the honour of the church, and of her Head, if these contributions were put into the hands of the Lord's officers.

Ans. 4. None builds for himself in the sense of the objection, for none claims a share when he removes, as has been argued before. The joint stock principle is repudiated by all parties who have any just ideas of a divine organization in the church; and yet this objection goes on that principle and no other; let the objector either admit the joint stock principle entire, or relinquish his position. To organize anew under unordained officers, and do business for ourselves, either implies that the congregation is different from the church, or that divine organization is incomplete.

Ans. 5. The idea of those who are in low circumstances contributing to a wealthy congregation appears incompatible with merely building for ourselves; the two mites are not felt among the abundance of the rich, any more than the drop in the ocean, but the one and the other has its law to fulfil. The poor man honours the Lord by dedicating his substance, even if it were no more than two mites.

Obj. III. *Trustees can attend to the temporal affairs of a congregation well enough, and hence there is no need of deacons.*

The writer has nothing to say against *the manner* in which trustees, collectors, treasurers, or any such officers manage congregational affairs. His whole question is about their right. To meet the objection he would answer:

1. Where is the right of any such officers to touch dedicated property? He knows of no such right.

2. Trustees could attend well enough to the poor, and so we could do without deacons entirely. This objection bears against the office of the deacon in all respects, and the writer has heard it urged to that point in various ways. It has been asked, may I not be my own almoner? May not one, two or three appoint a common almoner for all their contributions? May not a whole congregation do the same? This system of argumentative queries lays the axe at the root of the divine office of deacons, even for the poor; and hence we find this office supplanted in so many churches, and hence we find so little effort to restore it, nay opposition to those who would restore that office.

3. A like argument would subvert the gospel ministry; and has done so in some communities. What need of an ordained officer to preach? Does ordination make him more wise or eloquent, or better acquainted with the Scriptures? May I not study the word of God for myself without ordination? May I not instruct my neighbour and his family in like manner? two of my neighbours? three? five? five hundred? Must I give all this instruction sitting? or may I stand up behind a chair like a preacher? Where may I stop? A series of queries of this kind can be framed so as to leave little distinctive to the gospel minister. Yet the church maintains his office both in principle and practice, under her highest penalties for invading his office. In like manner, even if it were shown that a man might be his own almoner, build his own meeting-house, pay his own preacher and his own missionary; do all that the deacon may do in his own sphere; it will not limit the sphere of the deacon one hair's breadth; he is the Lord's almoner, trustee, treasurer, &c., and does those things for the church and for the Lord, that others may and ought to do for themselves.

4. There are certain affairs in the fiscal arrangement of most congregations, which it seems impossible for trustees or any other officers to transact accurately without the concurrence of the ruling officers. A member receives his certificate and leaves the bounds of a congregation, his name is on the trustees' book for subscription, pew rent, or some regular contribution; now it is impossible, in a large congregation especially, for the trustee, collector, &c., to know when to discontinue his contribution, without a communication from the session. In many cases the individual may report the matter himself to the fiscal board; or a member of the board may hear of it incidentally; but in many cases the account must overrun the proper time, before the managers of the funds can know to discontinue it, unless there be a regular intercourse kept up between the session and the managers. This is provided for in the Westminster forms, where it is required that all the officers of a particular congregation meet together at convenient and stated times—each according to his office. Do the minister and elders meet with the trustees, or how do they fix this matter, and other matters of a like nature?

5. Deacons can attend to the temporalities well enough, and hence we have no need of trustees, committee-men, collectors, &c. This we

think a much more scriptural view of the matter, especially in view of the fact that we never find the two classes of officers in the same congregation; one has always given place to the other. Surely the divinely appointed officers should be preferred.

Obj. IV. *We have a warrant for trustees or some such persons employed in the temporal affairs of the church: "Whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality to Jerusalem."* 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

Ans. 1. The mere carrying of funds is neither directing nor administering, and might be performed by any person that can be intrusted with it. Supposing these to be not ordained officers that were sent, it makes neither for nor against the question on hand.

2. These persons, be they whom they may, were not sent by the congregation, or congregations, but by the apostle: "Them will I send to bring *your* liberality," &c. An ordained officer taking the oversight of the business—yes, the management, for he *sends*.

3. It cannot be shown that even these persons sent, were not ordained officers; for we find usually ordained officers commissioned on such occasions: Acts xi. 30, "Barnabas and Saul." Rom. xv. 25, "I go to Jerusalem, to minister to the saints." 2 Cor. viii. 16, "Titus," v. 18. "WE have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel, throughout all the churches, v. 19, chosen of the churches." No case has yet been shown of any other than an officer employed about the finances of the church.

4. The talk about unordained persons carrying these funds is mere talk, even with those who use it; for they generally agree that these funds were for the poor. Either then this case has no bearing on the subject, or it proves (in the objector's way of using it,) that there was never any need for deacons in the church, and never will, for the funds of the poor were attended by other than ordained officers.

Obj. V. *There is no need of ordaining permanent officers for a merely transient affair, such as building a meeting-house, repairing, &c.*

Ans. 1. It is readily admitted that there is no need for ordaining officers in any organized congregation for a merely transient affair; there are officers there already who can attend to the transient affairs without being unreasonably burdened; but it will be found on examination that there are few such transient affairs in any community as the objection contemplates; the mere building of a house is soon over, but the affairs of the house and its attendance in various ways are not transient. A Mormon temple may be a transient affair, but a Covenanter meeting-house is not intended to be such. There are many transient affairs connected with the ordinary and permanent business of a congregation, and those who attend to the ordinary can attend also to the incidental matters. Every particular act is a transient affair, but a succession of particular acts makes a permanent business.

2. The argument does not turn on the management of transient affairs, but the fiscal business of a congregation, in which there are many things not transient. A lease of property for nine hundred and ninety-nine years; a deed for ever, as it is commonly termed; an annual rent; a pastor's salary; current expenses, &c., &c., are all permanent affairs, to which attention is regularly required. Whatever requires a succession in office, cannot be reckoned a mere transient affair.

3. Joash, Jehoiada, Hilkiah, and Josiah employed permanent officers in the repairing of the temple, and these officers employed transient mechanics, carpenters, masons, &c., till the work was done. 2 Kings xii. and 2 Chron. xxiv. and xxxiv. The same principle is as easily applied now as it was then.

VI. *Property is not so safe in the hands of permanent officers as of those who can be removed at pleasure.*

Ans. 1. All officers can be removed on impeachment, when they are convicted of wrong.

2. The removing of officers at pleasure, has been tried to perfection in the government of the United States, without much benefit; almost every removal is from bad to worse.

3. Believers felt safe enough when they laid all their contributions at the feet of ordained officers, and when these ordained others over the same charge, at the first organization of the church.

4. This argument bears against deacons having the care of the poor, for there is as much danger of embezzlement in these funds as in any other.

5. The full weight of it comes against the spiritual officers as well as against the deacons; for men are liable to be unfaithful, and have actually been as unfaithful in spiritual, as in temporal things. The objection takes high ground, for it finds fault with the whole order of Christ's house, temporal and spiritual, under both dispensations. Is a human organization safer than a divine? Are the funds of the poor, missions, &c., &c., really unsafe, and no effort making to secure them? Are the spiritual affairs insecure? If so, it is time to go to work and repair the house. Better build it on another foundation entirely.

VII. *It is a profanation of the spiritual ordinance of ordination, to apply it to those whose business is only about temporalities.*

Ans. 1. The apostles thought it no profanation, for they ordained the seven. Acts vi. 6.

2. The Westminster divines saw no profanation in the case, for they allow the deacons among the permanent officers.

3. The testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian church is against the objector, for it declares that the deacon has no power except about the temporalities.

4. The objector is against himself in this case; for he admits the care of the poor, and no more, to belong to the deacon.

5. This, like most other objections we have to meet, is directly against the office of the deacons, and not against any particular part of it.

Obj. VIII. *The people must be consulted about a meeting-house, or rather, they have the right of determining its size, location, materials, &c. Now, it is at variance with Presbyterianism for officers to consult the people, or receive directions from them, in relation to official duties: hence, it is inferred that ordained officers have no concern officially in such matters.*

Allowing the first part of this objection to be correct, which the writer does with all his heart; the second proposition is in direct opposition to the whole structure of Presbyterianism. We admit that the people have no jurisdiction over their officers; but consultation and direction are different from jurisdiction. A child may direct a king which is the shortest and safest way to the city, and may be consulted in relation to two ways, which is the best; and it may be at the peril

of the king to neglect complying with the directions, yet the child has no jurisdiction over the king in the case. It is a leading principle of Presbyterianism, in opposition to Prelacy, that the people must be consulted in all matters in which they are particularly concerned.

1. Officers consult the people in moderating calls for ministers, in electing other officers, in hearing and removing objections before ordination, and in asking the people if they adhere to their call. Now it will surely be admitted that ordaining a minister, or other officer, is official duty; yet before ordaining for a particular place, the people are to be consulted before the officers can proceed a step in his instalment. The people have the sole right of choosing the persons who shall be officially set over them; and, on the same ground, they choose where they will build their house of worship, and how large it shall be. What is there to exclude officers from complying with the will of the people in the one case more than in the other?

2. The people are consulted in the affair of overtures, in all important movements in the church. Paul did not dictate to the Macedonians when they should engage in covenanting; he taught them the duty, and left the time and manner of its performance to their own free will. There are no Prelates in the N. T. Church, although there are pastors and teachers.

3. Officers have to abide by the direction of the people to a considerable extent in the case of supporting the poor, as well as missions, and all public funds. Presbyterianism does not annihilate the rights of property. The officers can administer no more than the people contribute; for we have neither tax law, nor tithe, nor any law to extort money. The people always determine how much salary they will give their pastor; he may refuse, or the Presbytery may veto, but whether accepted or refused, the people have nearly all the power in relation to a temporal part of a call. Why not be consulted by officers in relation to the house in which he is to officiate?

4. Officers must consult even the poor in relation to their necessities, to know how much they need, of what kind, and whether they will receive any thing at all. Suppose a deacon, elder, or minister takes a sum of money to a poor member of the church; the person may be so infirm as not to be able to lay it out, or may be the wife of a drunkard, who would purloin the supply before it could be appropriated to a useful purpose; here a consultation must take place, if any human power is expected to bring relief.

5. The people even dictate, to some extent, in temporal affairs, when they give for a specific object. What would have been thought of Paul and Barnabas, had they carried the funds put in their hands to some other place than Jerusalem? Or what would be thought now of the minister, elder, or deacon, who would receive money for building a meeting-house in a mission-station, and appropriate it to the use of the poor at home? The people give freely, and the officers must apply it according to the mind of the donor. The courts take cognizance of the contributions, and of their administration, in order to secure to the people the safe disposal of their offerings.

6. The Colossians were directed to say to their pastor, "Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received of the Lord, that thou fulfil it." Colossians iv. 17. And if they may deal thus with the spiritual diaconate, we see no absurdity in their being consulted about temporalities.

7. Ecclesiastical rule is not more arbitrary than civil rule, yet Jehoshaphat consulted the people, 2 Chron. xx. 21, and God blessed the resolution to which they came. So also did Hezekiah, chap. xxx. 23, and obtained a like blessing. We are not, however, to infer that the people cannot do wrong, or that God will always bless what they agree on in consultation; for when David consulted the whole congregation about bringing up the ark, they appointed committee-men, and entirely failed in their design, until they returned to the due order. See 1 Chron. xiii. and xv. chapters.

8. If there be any real evil in consulting the people, the trustee system does nothing for removing it, for under it the people claim absolute control; if it be only a bad theory, let this be shown, and let it be removed from the entire system of Presbyterianism.

IX. *It would be mockery for officers to sit in court and deliberate whether a house should be built of wood or stone, in this place or that, when the people have determined already on these matters.*

Ans. 1. There are distinct rights of officers and people, which are to be regarded by each. The Lord's people do not determine what they will do independent of, and in opposition to His officers. They arrange their business according to the best of their judgment, and ask the officers to ratify it. There is no mockery in a court deliberating on a matter which it is expected to ratify or condemn.

2. It belongs to the rulers of a congregation to judge all acts of the people, and censure what is wrong. Now all will admit that it is better to judge the propriety of a contemplated measure, than to wait until it is consummated; the proposal is more easily reversed than the work undone. Take a case: the congregation agrees to build a meeting-house, in a certain place, of hewn stone, and of such a size, and the matter comes before the session for ratification; the session finds that they have calculated more on certain supplies than ought to be expected, and they will be involved in a hopeless, or at least onerous debt. There is no mockery in deliberating on this point, ratifying the place, and the size of the house, and refusing to ratify the proposed material; they can remit this to the congregation for reconsideration. The case supposed is not an extravagant one—there are many meeting-houses now loaded with debt, to the injury of the cause of truth.

3. It is not mockery to sit in court and deliberate on a call for a pastor, after the people have determined whom they will have, and what shall be his salary; the court must deliberate about it before they ratify the call, and constitute the relation; courts cognosce the temporal provision, as well as all other arrangements belonging to a call. So also of organizing congregations, ordaining elders and deacons, and a great variety of things agreed on by the people, and ratified and carried out by the officers.

4. Many things in every day life illustrate this principle. It is not reckoned mockery to solemnize marriage after the parties have determined the matter, and entered into betrothals. It is not reckoned mockery for the government of a state to grant a charter to a company after the company has made its own arrangements. Whether a public measure originates with the rulers, or with the people, there is no mockery in using measures for mutual agreement, harmony, and peace, either in the state or in the church. If the people do nothing wrong, there is need only to ratify it, and see that the measure is fairly carried out. If

they do propose something wrong, there should be authority somewhere to prevent the execution of it. Suppose the people agree to rent the basement story of their meeting-house for a grog-shop, or for the publishing the Sunday News, there would be no mockery in the session deliberating on it, and forbidding it, neither would there be in warning against it; prevention is better than cure. There *would*, however, be mockery of all authority of officers, if the minister must preach, and the elders must hear in an unsuitable place without redress; for, mark this, there is no possible redress according to the terms of the objection, for it is reckoned mockery to deliberate in court, whether high or low. This objection is equally potent whether the temporalities be administered by deacons, or any others; it affects the rights of the rulers.

X. *Courts that are spiritual in their nature cannot take cognizance of mere temporalities.*

Query. How does any one know this? By what process is it proved? There is no truth in the assertion; for,

1. The rulers of the church have the oversight of all her concerns—we know no restrictions.

2. The charities of the church are as much a temporal concern as any other financial matter; yet these are allowed to belong to ordained officers.

3. The courts of the church always have discussed and handled these matters, to greater or less extent, according to circumstances; and still continue to handle them, whether there be deacons or not. Spiritual and temporal things cannot be entirely separated, while soul and body compose one person; nor is it desirable that they should.

The above remarks equally meet the objection of those who maintain that the care of the poor is all that belongs, of a temporal nature, to the ministry; and hence they cannot moderate sessions to hear reports, or to discuss other temporalities. The occurrences of almost every day are in the face of such statements.

XI. *The support of the poor is among the ordinances of a particular congregation; and hence it is proper for officers to attend to that affair; but there are no other temporalities that are so accounted for.*

1. It may be inquired, why do officers attend to so many other temporalities, as have already been shown that they do? Is it merely for convenience that Presbyteries and Synods are engaged at every meeting, (a large portion of time in some meetings,) in discussing and arranging temporalities far different from the support of the poor? If they be thus engaged in discussing affairs that do not belong to them as courts, it would certainly be better to do it in an extra judicial way, and not under the same constitution with their proper business.

2. It has been already shown that the support of the ministry belongs to the catalogue of divine ordinances, as well as the care of the poor; and as such, it is held forth in the symbol of our faith. Why should not officers attend to that as well as to the poor? We know no reason but the humbling fact, that this service is not in reality held as a divine ordinance by all who profess adherence to the standards; for, it is objected,

XII. *That the support of the ministry is a mere "quid pro quo," a mere compensation for services, according to Luke x. 7, 1 Tim. v. 18, 1 Cor. ix. 7, and 2 Cor. xi. 8.*

Now, if the objector maintained that it is a compensation, and yet something different besides, this would be freely admitted; but then there would be no force in the objection against officers attending to its administration.

Ans. 1. If the sentiment of this objection be correct, then the Congregationalists and Congregational Presbyterians, (as they are absurdly termed,) go on the true principle, when they hire a *minister* for six months or a year, without the intervention of a Presbytery.

2. Paul intimates that the support of the ministry is something more than a "*quid pro quo*," when he argues from the temple and the altar, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14; when he calls it an acceptable sacrifice—an odour of a sweet smell, Phil. iv. 18; when he received his "wages" from Macedonians, and rendered the service to Corinthians, 2 Cor. xi. 8. This conduct would be rather strange on the principle of mere compensation for services. These Philippians sent not only to Corinth but to Thessalonica, once and again, for his support, Phil. iv. 16.

It is rather remarkable that the church which Paul commends so highly for their care of him, and their acceptableness to God, in this particular, is one that had both bishops and *deacons*.

3. The support of the Priests and Levites was as much a compensation for their services, as the support of the Gospel ministry; yet none will deny that it belonged to the ordinances, and was handled by ordained officers. Numbers xviii. 21. "And 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,"—verse 31,—"it is your reward for your service in the tabernacle of the congregation." In verses 24 and 29, the same things are represented as heave-offerings to the Lord. The support of the ministry is to be viewed in both these aspects; then it will appear suitable for courts to discuss, and officers to administer. Had Paul another reward from the Lord besides his wages? so had the Levites, Numb. xviii. 20. Deut. x. 9.

XIII. *The calling of a minister, and the paying of his salary, should be in the same hands, else the design of the call may be defeated; but the calling of a minister is the work of the people, therefore the paying for his service should be done by the people, independent of official administration.*

The premises in this objection are entirely correct; but the conclusion is not supported by them, for,—

1. The people do not call a pastor, independent of official administration; the call is made in constituted session, and judged, and presented, and ratified by the Presbytery; now, if the paying is to be done by the same people in the same relation, it follows that the officers are to receive it and present it, and that courts should see that it is faithfully attended to. It is the business of the church organic, and not of a voluntary association.

2. The paying is as much in the power of the people where deacons collect, as where any other agency is employed; and is more directly under the inspection of the courts that have sanctioned the call. Through the agency of ordained officers is the only way that the calling and the paying can be put on an equality.

XIV. *If official power is needed about the temporalities, deacons should be members of court, for all official acts are done in court.*

1. This would be a good argument for the modern consistory system, if it were true in point of fact; but unhappily for both extremes, there are many official acts that are not done in court: preaching, administering the sacraments, family visitation, solemnizing matrimony, &c., are all done out of court.

2. The argument bears against the affair of the poor as well as all other departments of the deacon's office.

XV. The civil magistrate should attend to the church's temporalities, and then they would not devolve on the deacons.

Ans. 1. Admitting this, still it would be a divinely appointed officer, and not a mere trustee. We sometimes hear from the objector the statement that there is no divine right about church temporalities; but here we have them assigned to a power ordained of God.

2. The position is not admitted in the sense of the objection, for although civil rulers ought to do much for the church, yet they cannot attend to the internal concerns of every congregation, because, (1.) There is too much compulsion about civil rule, to preserve the idea of a cheerful giver, if all must pass through that channel. (2.) It would make the church too dependent on another institution. (3.) There is no hint in the Old Testament or the New that civil rulers should administer the finances of the church. Civil rulers can provide for the church, and allow her to use the provision as she pleases. They are represented as bringing gifts and presents. This is not holding her property for her.

3. The church and state were as closely connected under the Old Testament dispensation as they can, or need to be, yet they had separate treasures and treasurers. 1 Chron. xxvi. and xxvii. 25. The connexion of the king with the sacred treasures is exhibited in 2 Chron. xxxi. The king commanded, the people brought in, and the Priests and Levites took the charge and administration of what was brought in.

4. The permanent office of the deacons meets every emergency whether civil rulers be friends or foes, they can receive from the people, or from their princes, or from both; and administer it without the interference of any extraneous power.

5. This objection, like most of the others, strikes at the whole office of the deacons; for magistrates should take care of the poor, as well as attend to other temporalities. This would cut off the deacons entirely in a reformed nation, as the trustees have supplanted them with us. And putting the two together goes to show there was never much need for deacons at all, and there would be more peace at present if they had never been appointed.

Does the objector ever pray the second petition as set forth in the larger Catechism, embracing, among other desires, that the church may be "furnished with all gospel officers and ordinances?" Are deacons gospel officers? To what will they attend in the happy days contemplated in the petition? Will the office be a mere sinecure? or should we pray that there will be plenty of poor in every congregation? On the objector's principle, it seems very hard to pray this prayer; but on the principle here advocated, all is entire harmony. We can pray for the blessing on Israel so fully that there may be no poor among us, according to Deut. xv. 4; and yet pray for deacons, as well as all other New Testament officers. In the peaceful days of the Redeemer's kingdom there will be temporalities to attend to, and even more than there are now.

6. The objection, in the form in which it has been urged, borders so closely on the patronage against which Reformed Presbyterians have constantly testified, that the writer is unable to distinguish them. If the civil authorities have the management of all the temporalities of the church, they will need no more, in order to control her spiritual concerns. Take from the church the right of holding her own property, and you may as well deny her assemblies the right of meeting, for they must have a *place* to meet.

R. H.

NOTE TO FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

I have frequently alluded, in the course of my letters, to the improved state of agriculture in Britain, particularly in Scotland—to the hardships of which the farmers just now complain so loudly—and to the exactions of the landlords as the real source of those hardships, and of the poverty of the labouring masses. I am now able to furnish, from the pages of Blackwood's Magazine, proof of all this, in the following statements, prepared by tenants occupying some of the large and highly cultivated farms in the best districts of Scotland. They are interesting to all as illustrating the truth that the landlord-system is the monster evil of the *economical* state of the British islands,—and so indirectly, at least, chargeable with a large proportion of the evils of its social and moral condition. Statistics are dry reading, but these will repay examination. These statements are made upon the basis of present prices, and under free trade:

Statement of Returns of Produce from a 500 acre farm in Strathmore, county of Forfar, on a five-shift rotation of crops, with an improved stock of cattle and sheep.

Rent of the farm, as fixed for 19 years, assuming former average price of corn and cattle, &c.,	£800	0	0
Invested capital of £6 per acre at entry, £3000. Interest upon this sum, at rate of 10 per cent.,	300	0	0
Floating capital of £4 per acre, £2000. Interest thereon, 5 per cent.,	100	0	0
Expenses of management, wages, tradesmen's accounts, insurances, grass seeds, &c., at the rate of 20s. per acre per annum,	500	0	0
Annual loss by casualties on live stock by disease and accidents,	100	0	0
Public burdens leviable upon the farmer, including poor-rates,	50	0	0

Sum chargeable against this farm annually, . . . £1850 0 0

To meet this sum there is the produce of 200 acres of corn crop, and the profits on live stock, (the whole grass and green crop being consumed on the farm.)

2400 bushels of oats, at 2s. per bushel,	£240	0	0
1120 bushels of wheat, at 5s. per ditto,	280	0	0
2020 bushels of barley, at 2s. 9d. per ditto,	277	15	0

£727 15 0

Live stock, 640 0 0

Net return, £1437 15 0

Sum chargeable as above against the farm, 1850 0 0

Leaving the farmer *minus*, for rent, capital,

£412 5 0 £412 5 0

Statement of the average Produce of a farm in a full state of productiveness, managed agreeably to the five-shift course, as usually adopted in the south-eastern Borders of Scotland, where the returns of stock form a very considerable means of remuneration, and the price of which, of course, is a material element in the calculation as to the rent to be given.

Thus, then, assuming the rent of 500 acres of useful land for this purpose—upon the estimate of the price of grain and stock, as warranted by their value previous to the introduction of the new corn law and tariff—to be, £800 0 0

This farm has been put into good productive condition by means of the tenant's capital, at a cost in draining and lime, (sunk,) of £2500. It is well known that nearly twice this amount has in many instances been thus expended; but we assume this as a fair average on a farm so rented.

Interest upon which sum, to enable him to recover the same during an ordinary lease of from nineteen to twenty-one years, at 10 per cent., £250 0 0

Interest on capital invested in stock, &c., yielding an annual return of £1500, at 5 per cent., 75 0 0

Expenses of management—wages, tradesmen's accounts, extra manures, &c., 550 0 0

Casualties, loss on stock, &c., 50 0 0

Public and parish burdens, 45 0 0

£970 0 0

£1770 0 0

To meet this sum, there is the produce of 200 acres of grain.

Returns upon stock, estimated to yield £750 0 0

Bushels.

2380 oats, at 2s., £238 0 0

1800 wheat, at 5s., 450 0 0

1390 barley, at 2s. 9d., 191 0 0

£879 0 0

Net return, £1629 0 0

Leaving the farmer *minus*, £141 0 0

Statement of the Annual Charge against, and Returns from, a 400 imperial acre farm in Mid-Lothian.

Rent of farm, 400 acres at 45s. per acre, £900 0 0

Interest on sunk and floating capital, 240 0 0

Expenses of management, wages, tradesmen's accounts, extra manures, grass and clover seeds, and miscellaneous expenses, 817 0 0

Casualties in stock, and fire insurance, 40 0 0

Public and parish burdens, 40 0 0

Total yearly charge, £2037 0 0

To meet this sum there is the produce of 230 acres corn crop, 10 acres potatoes, and the profits from live stock, as follows:

2796 bushels oats, a 2s. 4d.,	£326	4	0
2020 " wheat, a 4s. 9d.,	479	15	0
1340 " barley, a 3s. 0d.,	201	0	0
1090 " beans, a 3s. 3d.,	177	12	6
10 acres potatoes,	100	0	0
Add profits from live stock,	550	0	0
	<hr/>		
Total returns,	£1834	11	6
Sum chargeable as above against the farm,	2037	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£202	8	6

Leaving the farmer short, for rent, capital, and expenses of management, £202 8 6

In the first of these the entire annual expenses of the farm are £1850, of which £800 (\$4000) are *rent*; in the second, £1770, of which £800 (\$4000) are *rent*; in the third, £2037, of which £900 (\$4500) are *rent*. In other words, nearly one-half of the entire annual charge of these farms, and fully half the income, go into the pockets of the landed gentry! In a few instances the rent does not bear quite so large a proportion to the expenses and income, but in none of the statements that we have seen is it less than one-third. Now, need we look any further for the cause of the misery of the masses in Britain? A few thousand proprietors, some residing in England, some on the continent, and nearly all worthless members of society—"nati consumere fruges"—spending their resources in the most profuse and profligate manner; these are the men who gather *all* the cream of the land, leaving a small pittance to the tenant, and putting it out of his power to give the actual cultivator any thing but the most scanty wages. Take off these recurring rents, and, with all his other burdens, the British farmer could distance foreign competition: give him these hundreds of pounds annually to expend on the soil, and in his own neighbourhood, and every member of the community, to the very lowest, would feel a new impulse.

These statements, moreover, show that the Corn Law question drains deep. It is a question between the feudal and the modern systems. If Britain is to meet the agricultural competition of other countries, rents must come down. With the fall of rent, the aristocracy will begin to sink, and other classes to rise in even greater proportion. No wonder the different parties become highly excited. This is in all men's minds, and yet it is rarely spoken out. The time has not yet come for the open declaration on the part of the great liberal leaders that the landed system must fall. The Chartists have said it, but the Chartists are despised. Others of name and influence will soon say it. They are even now saying it respecting the system in Ireland; but all are linked together. If the aristocracy were wise, they would submit with decency to their inevitable absorption into the mass of the community. If they long resist, their end, and that of the system, will be brought about by a fearful revolution. The issue is certain.

J. M. W.

TRUTH THE BOND OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.*

It is not mere defect of love that is the true hinderance to Christian union. There may be between believers, in different communions, greater intensity of mutual and holy affection, than they cherish to any member of their own respective churches. To impute all disunion to deficiency in Christian love, may be to touch on a prevailing evil, but it has only an indirect tendency to heal the breaches of Zion. For how is the love so wavering and defective to be kindled into new vividness? You cannot by authority command the mind into love—you cannot by reasoning persuade it into love—you cannot by warnings threaten it into love. Love springs from agreement in conviction. The more we are agreed in our views of truth, the more endearing and unreserved will be our Christian fellowship. If it is under the power of a common belief that we cherish any measure of Christian love, that we unite and form a church at all; the more we approximate to unanimity of conviction, our love to the brethren will be the deeper in its secret fulness and swell higher in open flood. Truth, therefore, is not only the basis but the means of union, in fostering through identity of conviction the exercise of sanctified affection in the household of faith. It is clear that this is the unity which the Scriptures enjoin: ‘Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the *same mind*, and in the *same judgment*.’ 1 Cor. i. 10. ‘That ye stand fast in *one mind*, with one spirit striving together for the faith of the gospel.’ Phil. i. 9, 27. ‘Be of *one mind*.’ 2 Cor. xiii. 11. ‘Finally, be ye all of one mind.’ 1 Pet. iii. 8. Let truth, therefore, be enthroned in rightful supremacy, as the magnet that attracts—as the spiritual gravitation that binds—as the polar star that guides us amid the thousand uncertainties of this world’s theories and speculations. Received into the heart, and embodied in the life, it will knit Christians together by a tie which will last and be of force when the heavens are no more. Union, prompted by an impulse of feeling, irrespective of the claims of principle, may dissolve at a breath, for a breath has created it. Union, on the basis and through the means of truth, is alone worth the name—alone likely to be permanent—alone fitted to engender deep and lasting affection.

It follows, that we can have no sympathy with any union founded on a compromise of truth. It is but a semblance and phantom. The men so associated are in reality no nearer than when they stood disunited and apart. How often do men affect to despise the peculiarities of creeds and testimonies, and to scorn them as things of minor importance! He who sees in truth, however, as realized in Christian experience, the germ of the outward church—the spring of our visible unity, will cultivate a wiser spirit, an humbler reverence for the majesty of truth. He will not undervalue a single ray that emanates from the full orb of revelation. It is because I deem my neighbour a conscientious man, that I pant to be one with him in conviction. If it were not so, it would be small advantage to have any connexion with him.

In accordance with these statements, the whole history of the church is replete with evidence, that the church is to be built up, and souls ga-

* An extract from a discourse by Rev. Wm. H. Gould, at the opening of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, Scotland. Edinburgh, 1849.

thered into the unity of the faith, not so much by the refutation of error, not by the compromise of truth, but by the inculcation of positive doctrine. The instrument that is so powerful for converting sinners, when wielded by the hand of the Spirit, is of equal power for uniting saints. Luther preached the doctrine of justification by faith. It was in his age 'the present truth,' and he declared it to men with a quenchless enthusiasm as the anchor wherewith his own soul was moored within the veil. The Protestant churches sprung up as by miracle around him; such value lies in positive truth as the rallying point of believers, the centre to which the convictions tend that soon ripen into fellowship. But the history of the German church suggests another lesson that may well deter us from the folly of diluting, under the specious guise of liberal professions, the claims of any principle, however subordinate, which revelation may have commended to our love and belief. An age of formalism ensued after the first love of the churches of the Reformation had grown cold. The school of the Pietists arose—Arndt, and Spener, and Franke at the head of it—attributing to keen discussion upon minor points the decay of godliness in the church of Christ. They cut rather than untied the knot, by the resolution to dismiss from their creed entirely these minor truths—to distinguish between truths essential and circumstantial, and to shun the consideration of the latter as generating only the fierce spirit of sect and party. They were good and holy men, and lived in a warm atmosphere of Christian love, so that the fragrance of their memory and the echoes of their praise yet linger in the churches of Christ. Alas! they knew not what they did! The distinction on which they insisted might be valid, but can the line be surely drawn? Assuming the power to discriminate between essential and non-essential truth, in a spirit *that stripped the latter of all obligation on the conscience*, for in this last circumstance lay the evil and the danger, they gave birth to a heresy that ate its way by a corroding march into the vitals of the faith. The distinction on which they acted was beyond all question the origin of Rationalism.* And we need not wonder at the

* See Rose's "State of Protestantism Described." In regard to the Pietists, the religious school of which Spener was at the head, he mentions, that "their grand tenet, that every thing not immediately connected with the practice of Christian virtue is useless, had, beyond all doubt, a great influence in forming the character of Semler, who was a member of the *Collegia Pietatis*," (special meetings for edification,) "to whose charge a great portion of the evil now felt in the German churches is to be attributed."—P. 50. "Semler," he afterwards states, "was brought up in the bosom of the Pietists; and though his character manifestly unfitted him for the reception of their more enthusiastic tenets, he was certainly deeply impressed with two of their opinions. He had learned from them to undervalue every thing which had not a direct tendency to promote the practice of virtue; and their dislike to controversy had given him a distaste to all the doctrines which served as a foundation for it. * * * As the historian of religious doctrines, it was his constant attempt to show that a large portion of them rested entirely on human authority; but his hardest task was to treat of those to which he could not refuse the authority of Scripture, but which, because he could not discern what he called their utility, he rashly and impiously pronounced to possess none. He contended that we are not to take all the declarations of Scripture as addressed to us, but to consider them as in many points purposely adapted to the feelings and dispositions of the age when they originated, but by no means to be received by another and more enlightened period. This was the origin of that famous theory of accommodation, which Semler carried to great length, but which, in the hands of his followers, became the most formidable weapon ever devised for the destruction of Christianity."—Pp. 72—75. The substantial accuracy of this statement is not to be challenged; and its importance is

circumstance. Let a man in the mere pride of intellect pretend to determine what in Divine truth he requires to believe, and what he may discard as needless for his salvation, and the authority of revelation is sapped and undermined. While we endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, let us prize and seek the truth more and more, and so shall we come into the *unity* of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, whom to know is life.

A mere protest against error does not imply the positive reception of truth. The abuses of ecclesiastical administration may constitute a sufficient ground of separation, but still there are evils connected with such a position to which no wise and thoughtful man will be blind. The feelings of deepest intensity within him may thus be made to run in a narrow channel. The essential tendency of the religious influences that operate upon him most strongly, must be to warp and contract his feelings. His mind is more occupied in the detection of evil on the part of other men, than in extending his own knowledge of positive truth—deepening the strength and testing the sincerity of his love to it. His soul feeds upon a negation. We cannot be too thankful, that in the peculiar testimony which our own church has been honoured to raise, she has not only ground to identify herself with the founders, and fathers, and martyrs of the Scottish church, so closely that to dispute our title to be their best representatives, their legitimate successors, would savour of hardihood; but all the convictions by which we differ from other communions, revolve and cluster round one central and commanding truth in the Christian system—the truth of the Redeemer's headship, not only over the church, but over all things to the church. We are under no sad temptation to prune and pare away the amount of obligation due by the nations to the Prince of the kings of the earth. We accept the declarations of the universality of his reign in their full and obvious significance. We are under no necessity to invent refinements and distinctions to explain them away or dilute their precious import. The mind is accordingly transformed by the blessed influence of this great positive doctrine into a kindred expansion of hope and purpose, and glows with a generous eagerness of anticipation till this truth be realized and rendered into glorious fact, the kingdoms of the world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. The great truth of our Redeemer's universal headship has been of late exposed to several assaults. It is too strongly sustained by evidence from Scripture to be altogether evaded or controverted. When, however, it is made to bear on existing systems and interests, the effect of the application is neutralized by the allegation that the Headship is only susceptible of a spiritual reference, and that it affords no rule of duty, in regard to the external arrangements and relationships of the church of Christ. On the other hand, the doctrine is sometimes admitted in its full extent, but we are told that not until Christ come to occupy the literal throne of David in the enjoyment of a personal reign upon the earth, will Christ be actually Head over all things. Both these views arise from interpretations of the prophecies in reference to the millenium with which we cannot accord, but into the refutation of which this is not the place to enter. It

the greater, if it be known that the Pietism referred to was really evangelical sentiment. The origin of rationalism has been erroneously ascribed to the philosophy of Kant. Several rationalistic works appeared long before 1781, when the first production of that philosopher issued from the German press.

is deserving of consideration, how far they tend to weaken in Christian minds the sense of present duty, and to paralyze all religious efforts for the purity and extension of the church. Nor is it going too far to inquire how much these principles necessarily abridge the fulness of the Gospel message. The Headship of the Saviour is remarkably connected with the invitations of the Gospel—so connected with them as in truth to be essential to them. ‘The Lord is our king, he will save us.’ Isa. xxxiii. 22. ‘God is my king—working salvation.’ Ps. lxxiv. 12. ‘All things are delivered unto me—come unto me.’ Matt. xi. 27, 28. ‘All power is given unto me in heaven and earth, go ye, therefore, and teach all nations.’ Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. ‘Exalted to be a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.’ Acts x. 31. If we consider the evangelical bearing of this doctrine, it is impossible to feel its value too strongly. It is the foundation of the hope we cherish for the spiritual recovery of the world.

And are we on the eve of the crisis that precedes the consummation of this hope? If we glance at the moral history of the world, since the Saviour rose to his glory, there are three sifting tests which the church has undergone. Satan came to her with the demand that she would abandon all Christianity. She refused, and the billows of pagan persecution rolled over her in fierce and quick succession. He came again at the Reformation, with the demand, that adhering to the empty and lifeless forms of Christianity, as it was then known, she would renounce all love for evangelical principles—for the Gospel of grace—for the doctrine of justification by faith. She refused, and Rome, in a series of persecutions, rioted in the slaughter of the saints. Satan renewed his demand in a modified shape, willing that any doctrine should be taught and preached, provided that the rule of the church should be in his hands, that the civil ruler should usurp dominion over her in subserviency to his own designs, that Christ should be no more her head. But despite of all temptation, there were men who would surrender life itself rather than compromise the honour of the King of Saints. We fear a struggle has yet to come, when the assertion of the claims of Jesus to universal supremacy, to the obedience of man in his associated as well as his individual capacity, to the homage of civil government, will expose the saint to a like jeopardy. ‘He that is not with me is against me,’ is a statement that applies to men viewed in their national relationship, as well as to man individually. To imagine that religious liberty is secured merely by the separation of the church from the state, is a theory that is written on water. It is true that the church, in alliance with the state, has been corrupted. It is as true that the church, in separation from the state, has been oppressed, and in certain attempts at legislation, happily for a time defeated, it has been shown that the conscience of a nation can be aggrieved, altogether apart from the question whether the church should be established or not. It is on other and higher principles that the relationship between the church and the state must be adjusted. The difficulty is great—the problem encompassed with perplexity, but if the subordination of both church and state to Christ and the law of Christ be once admitted, we would not despair of the right solution.

Finally, the tendency of our peculiar views to promote *unity*, is some proof of their excellence, as well as of their power to raise us above all feelings of prejudice and partisanship. We are encouraged to

hope for a time when, over all the earth, the sway of Christ shall be obeyed and owned. There is a basis in this doctrine for the union in a common bond and brotherhood of all that love Christ, and for the regulation of every branch of our private duty, and every manifestation of social life, in harmony with the will of Him whose will is law, and whose law is love. It is Christ's to gather all things into one, and unto Him, shall the gathering of the people be. We are not asking men to pronounce our Shibboleth, or to range themselves under the banner of a sect. An increase to our own denomination may be no increase to the church of the living God. But we do ask them to submit to the rule of Christ in the universality of its application to existing systems and interests around us. If their hearts be true to Him, there should be no repugnance to consider any new extension of his claims on their regard and obedience, and whatever views are most honouring to the Saviour, are precisely the views which they will most eagerly prize and most steadfastly maintain. On the basis of our common love and loyalty to Christ, Christians of every name may surely be prepared to unite. Such a union is to obtain on earth, if the predictions of the millennium have been interpreted aright. And what is the *rationale* of the millennium, if we may so speak, but the perfect establishment on earth of the right of Christ to universal dominion? On earth, where he was crucified, he is yet, on a coming day, to be glorified by a spiritual reign, in which the saints are to reign with him. 'The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.' And what heart does not glory over the magnificence of the results which prophecy encourages us to expect—the works of the devil destroyed—the world, the proudest trophy of his vaunted success, won to Christ—all men blessed in Jesus, and in the requital of grateful hearts calling Him blessed in return? In the picture we should form of millennial blessedness, it is right to accustom our minds to dwell more on the moral and spiritual renovation which the world is to undergo, than the outward changes that may precede it, stupendous though they be—the fall of Papal Babylon, the upheaval and ruin of ancient systems of civil rule—the threatened judgment on Mahometan imposture. Chief in all the splendours of the scene, shall be the development of spiritual excellencies, till earth becomes the very antepast of heaven:—Faith that finds a heaven in Christ, and soon to find Christ himself in heaven—Hope leaving the blessedness of her smile on earth, ere she clap and poise the wing in steady flight to the regions of glory—Love never withdrawing her eye from God, or her fingers from the harp that sounds his praise—Truth seated on her old throne of adamant—Peace clad in her rainbow of promise—Holiness quickening with the breath of her fragrance all earth into more than the beauty of Eden. O blessed vision! and thrice blessed the name, exalted by the Father, and dear to the saint above every name, through whom these high anticipations are no vision of the fancy, but the inspiration of God! How high the privilege of labouring to turn that vision into reality! How high the privilege of already grasping that central truth—the supreme and universal headship of the Saviour, to which all millennial anticipations converge and point, as the source to which hope looks for the fulfilment of its longings—the germ soon to swell, and open, and expand into the manifold glories of the latter day!

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

The pro-slavery elements of the United States Constitution are being pretty well developed by the discussions in Congress. We are glad of this. We will now see whether there is Christian conscience enough in the country to repudiate an instrument so deeply imbued with the *spirit* of tyranny, under republican forms and an appearance of the highest regard for liberty. We have already quoted from the speeches of Mr. Clay and Gov. Seward. We now furnish an extract from a speech of Mr. Giddings—a speech designed to rebut, and which does successfully rebut—the interpretations of the extreme Southern section. On the article relative to fugitive slaves, Mr. G. says:

“We cannot, under the Constitution, protect or secrete the slave from his master.”

On the article apportioning representatives, he says:

“The next compromise of the Constitution to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] refers, is that of the slave representation as provided in the 3d clause, 2d section, of the 1st article of the Constitution. In regard to this article, it would appear that no difference of opinion could possibly exist. There can be no doubt that it was intended to give the slave States an advantage over the free States. The slaves are not represented in this hall, nor can we legislate for their benefit; but the slaveholders have a representation here, in proportion to the number of slaves they hold in bondage, counting five slaves equal to three freemen. South Carolina has now three representatives on this floor more than she would be entitled to, according to the number of her freemen; and twenty members from the slave States are admitted here solely by virtue of this superior advantage which the slave States possess over the people of the North. It gives to the South an influence over our rights and interests, not according to their love of freedom, but proportioned to their disregard of liberty. The holder of five slaves exerts an influence in this hall and in the Federal Government equal to four citizens of the free States; and the owner of a thousand slaves possesses political powers equal to six hundred citizens of the North.

“I know of nothing more humiliating to the pride and dignity of our people than this inequality of our political influence. We are placed in a political position between the supercilious master and his crouching menial; superior to the one, and inferior to the other. It was a compromise of Northern honour. It gave a bounty to oppression; bestowed privileges upon those who disregard ‘self-evident truth,’ and trample upon the inalienable rights of man; it has taught Northern men to regard slaveholders as politically entitled to superior consideration; it has taught us subjugation to slaveholding dictation. It was the force of this feeling which constrained Northern members on this floor to surrender up their own independence, and for years to unite with the South in excluding from consideration all petitions in relation to freedom; passed your gag rules; struck down the freedom of debate; sealed the lips of those who advocated the doctrines of political equality; and for many years held the national government subservient to the slave power. It was this principle which for half a century caused Northern men to tremble at Southern threats to dissolve the Union; which now calls together the timid and the irresolute in our commercial cities, to pass resolutions against the maintenance of our own rights. The same feeling of servility is also manifested by a portion of the Northern press, which is always ready to advocate every slaveholding policy. Yet, sir, we abide by the compact. The slave States, from the adoption of the Constitution to this day, have enjoyed this privilege of a superior representation in this hall and in the elections of President and Vice President. No Northern man has objected to carrying out this provision, which, of all others, is the most destructive to our interests and wounding to our pride.”

So Covenanters have all along said; and on these grounds, in part, they have refused to swear the oath of allegiance—to vote or hold office. They will not *make* any such unholy compact. They will not bind themselves, as the great mass of professing Christians have done, to violate the plain dictates of the divine law—to refuse shelter and aid to the fugitive from oppression, or to give stability to the horrible oppressions of the South by acquiescing in any such unholy compromise as that which gives “the South an influence, not according to their love of freedom, but proportioned to their disregard of liberty.” To do so, is the highest treachery to the great principles of human liberty.

These discussions appear to be bringing some New Light Covenanters to their senses. The Banner says in its last number:

“We have been much interested in observing the manner in which the advocates of the extension of slavery appeal to the *Constitution*. The permission which it includes for the delivery of fugitive slaves is assuredly one which ought never to have been made, *being in direct opposition to the Word of God*; but, certainly, in making it, the North had no idea that slavery was to exist *indefinitely*. It was the general, probably the universal, opinion, that in the course of a few years slavery would not be found in any part of our land: had it been supposed that any desired to continue it, we feel sure this proviso would not have been acceded to. But, as it exists in the Constitution, it is the duty of all who love liberty, and desire to obey God, to use means for its removal: certainly it should be expunged from a document, with the design and general character of which it is so entirely inconsistent. In the mean time a higher law than the Constitution, a law written on the heart of every man, and recorded in the Revelation which God himself has given in his holy Word, forbids concurrence with it. Just on the same principle as if the Constitution contained some article sanctioning and supporting idolatry, we would feel bound to resist it, so do we feel in regard to this. No act of our fathers, or of our own, can bind us to do what we conscientiously believe to be sinful. The idea has prevailed in the minds of many that the Constitution is the *supreme* law, irrespective of any higher authority, human or divine. We have been glad to find that such an opinion, as unreasonable as enslaving, has been denied on the floor of the Senate, and the true principle stated and maintained. Human laws can have no obligation on our obedience, unless they are in accordance with the law of God.”

We are glad to see these admissions, which the Banner, propped up by a growing sentiment against so iniquitous a compact, feels *now* free to make. It can make them without being in much danger of any reproach of Christ. And yet the Banner is for swearing the oath to maintain this very document. But what does it mean by all that about not being bound to “support,” but to “resist” the provision for restoring fugitive slaves? Does the writer believe that when he *swears* to do this, that there is no meaning in it, because the oath is against the law of God? If it can evade the charge of guilt in this way, we do not see how any man could ever contract guilt by promising, or even swearing to do any wicked thing. The Banner’s excuse would sanction any engagement to support error or commit a crime. He “wipes his mouth,” and says, “I have done no evil,” because, forsooth, the law of God forbids his oath, and of course, he has come under no obligation! Still, we are glad to see this concession in the pages of the Banner. There is some difference between its admissions now, and the Jesuitical reasoning of M’Master’s Four Letters—sanctioned by the New Light party—on this same matter.

NEW YORK PRESBYTERY.

This Presbytery met April 9th, in the Sullivan Street Church, N. Y., and was opened with a sermon by the Moderator, R. Z. Willson, from 1 Tim. iv. 16. All the ministerial members were present, and ruling elders, Messrs. Stewart, Whitelake, Samuel Arnot, Coldenham, W. Brown, Newburgh, J. Nightingale, 1st, New York, J. A. Long, 2d, New York, A. Knox, 3d, New York, J. Evans, 1st, Philadelphia, R. Sterret, 2d, Philadelphia. During the two days that Presbytery sat, a large amount of routine and other business was transacted, generally with unanimity. C. B. McKee was appointed Moderator, and J. M. Willson, Clerk, for the ensuing year. J. M. Beattie, Assistant Clerk.

Calls.—Two calls were laid upon the table; one from Topsham congregation, the other from the congregation of Whitelake, both upon Rev. R. Johnson, which were severally sustained as regular gospel calls, and forwarded to the Rochester Presbytery, within whose bounds Mr. J. now is.

Students of Theology.—Neither of the students who had received appointments for this meeting were present, satisfactory reasons being assigned for their absence; and J. R. Thompson was allowed to deliver pieces this spring and next fall before the Presbytery of the Lakes. John i. 1—5 was assigned to Mr. Wm. Thompson as subject of lecture at next meeting.

Restoration to the Ministry.—Rev. Mr. Henderson, from the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, Scotland, who was at the last stated meeting restored to the enjoyment of church privileges, was, after expressing his approval of the Testimony of the Church; and his cordial assent to the recognised application in every particular of the principles of the church to the civil institutions of this country, restored to the exercise of his ministry, and then, on motion, admitted to a seat in court as a constituent member. From this latter resolution, admitting Mr. H. to a seat, Rev. A. Stevenson dissented, and intimated his intention to complain to Synod.

Presbyterial Mission Fund.—Upon inquiry it appeared that nearly all the congregations under the care of Presbytery had either taken up collections for this Fund, or contemplated doing so soon: the greater part, however, being in the latter class. The Treasurer reported as follows:

James Wiggins in account with the New York Presbytery.

1850.

Jan. 31. From Craftsbury Congregation, per Rev. R. Z. Willson, .	\$7 50
April 10. From Ryegate and Barnet Female Missionary Society, per Rev. J. M. Beattie, .	20 00
From Bovina Congregation, per Rev. J. Douglas, .	6 00
From Conococheague Congregation, per Rev. J. Kennedy, .	10 00
Total,	\$43 50

JAMES WIGGINS.

The statements of members of Presbytery were very encouraging in relation to the interest taken by their congregations, generally, in the Home Mission. We have no fears of lack of funds when the subject comes to be properly understood, and our missionary operations are fairly under weigh. Rev. J. Kennedy was directed to visit Octorara,

Pa.; and if his health permit, to preach there with a view to the formation of a missionary station. Rev. A. Stevenson was appointed to visit the city of Boston and vicinity, where it was stated to Presbytery there are some of our people earnestly desiring the attention of this court—to preach there, if opportunity can be had. This also with a view to form a missionary station there. Both to report to Presbytery.

Supplies.—J. B. WILLIAMS, 3d and 4th Sabbaths, April, and 1st Sabbath, May, *Whitelake*; 2d, 3d, and 4th Sabbaths, June, *Argyle*; all July, *Topsham*; 1st Sabbath, August, *Faiston*; 2d and 3d Sabbaths, August, *Argyle*; 1st, 2d, and 3d Sabbaths, September, *Whitelake*.

REV. MR. HENDERSON.—2d, 3d, and 4th Sabbaths, July, *Whitelake*.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be dispensed in *Whitelake* on the 2d Sabbath of September, by Rev. S. Carlisle, assisted by J. B. Williams; and should their call not be accepted, Mr. Carlisle to moderate a call there when requested by the session and congregation. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be dispensed in *Argyle* on the 1st Sabbath, June, by Rev. J. W. Shaw, assisted by J. B. Williams.

Sessional Books.—The Committee on Sessional Books reported that the records of the congregations of Craftsbury, Coldenham, 1st, 2d, and 3d Congregations, N. Y., 1st and 2d, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Bovina, had been put into their hands: which, with a few slight exceptions, were approved.

Next Meeting.—The next meeting is to be held in the 3d Reformed Presbyterian Church, N. Y., on the 2d Tuesday of October next, at 7½ o'clock, P. M.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The Board of Inspection of the Theological Seminary met in Geneva Hall, Monday, March 25th, 7 P. M. Present—J. B. Johnston, Chairman, W. L. Roberts, James Wallace, A. M. Milligan, A. Stevenson, W. Wylie, and M. F. Glasgow; with Dr. Willson, ex officio. Josiah Dodds, and R. J. Dodds, ministers, being present, were invited to take seats as consultative members, which they accordingly did. A. Stevenson was appointed Secretary.

The Professor submitted his report, from which it appeared that during the sessions the students had read, and had been examined upon two hundred and thirty-four pages of Turretin, (Carter's edition,) commencing with the chapter "De Creatione," and ending with that entitled "De Libero hominis arbitrio in statu peccati:" that in Hebrew they had read critically nineteen chapters of Genesis, and in Greek the Epistle to Titus; that sixty-six lectures had been delivered by the Professor—twenty-two on Biblical Criticism—fourteen on Church History—sixteen on Church Government—sixteen on Pastoral Theology.

The receipts of the Seminary to this date are as follows:

1849.

Dec. 12.	James Reed, per N. Allen,	- - - -	\$1 00
"	Daniel Reed, "	- - - -	1 00
"	Nathaniel Allen,	- - - -	1 00
" 21.	1st Congregation, Philadelphia, per Rev. J. M. Willson, for half year,	- - - -	35 33
" 24.	J. Neil's Congregation, per Rev. J. B. Johnston,	- - - -	6 75
"	Brush Creek Congregation, per "	- - - -	6 00

1850.		
Jan. 9.	Lisbon Congregation, per J. B. Johnston,	7 00
" 10.	2d Congregation, New York, per Rev. A. Stevenson,	72 00
" 22.	Newburgh Congregation,	15 50
"	Salt Creek Congregation,	5 50
"	Craftsbury " " " " " "	5 33
Feb. 2.	Beech Woods " " " " " "	5 00
" 20.	Walnut Ridge, per Rev. J. J. M'Clurkin,	4 00
" 27.	Elkhorn Congregation,	20 00
"	Sandusky, per Rev. J. C. Boyd,	1 28
Mar. 2.	Little Beaver, by Rev. Mr. Sterritt,	9 00
" 25.	Sterling, per Rev. Dr. Roberts,	15 25
"	Harriet Duke, for Children's Society, Newburgh, New York,	1 00
"	Nancy Amerman, Newburgh, N. Y.,	5 00
"	Xenia Society, by D. Willson,	8 00
" 27.	Old Bethel Congregation, per Rev. J. Wallace,	10 00
"	William Wylie and others,	3 30
Jan. 12.	New Alexandria, per J. S. Milligan,	7 00
1849.		
Dec. 25.	Miami Congregation, per Rev. J. B. Johnston,	6 37
1850.		
Mar. 26.	Adam Willson, Xenia,	1 00
" 27.	M. T. Glasgow,	1 00
March 23, 1848.	William Karnahan, Londonderry, per Wm. Aikin,*	1 00
"	Antrim Society,*	3 31

Since the meeting of the Board there have been reported the following sums:

April 8.	Mr. Kennedy, Chicago, per J. M. Willson,	\$1 50
" 10.	Barnet Congregation, per Rev. J. M. Beattie,	1 80
"	J. Houston, being contribution of persons in Orange co., N. Y., not in the membership of the church,	6 00

Making a total of - - - †\$266 62

In consequence of the decease of Mr. Finlay, late Treasurer of the Seminary, it was resolved that Thomas Hoosack, ruling elder, be appointed Treasurer until meeting of Synod. His address is Belle Centre, Logan county, Ohio. James M. M'Donald having completed his four years' course of study in the Seminary, a diploma to that effect was signed by the Chairman and Secretary.

In conclusion, we are happy to state, in reference to the difficulties in the Seminary, that at the close of a long and laborious session of some days, the members of the Board, the Professor, and all the Students, had a meeting, when, after a full and free expression of feeling by all concerned, the whole of their difficulties were amicably adjusted to the satisfaction of all—thus, as we confidently hope, securing in future a still larger measure of peace, and a still greater degree of prosperity and of usefulness to the institution.

The Board adjourned to meet in Geneva Hall, on the last Monday of March, 1851, at 7 o'clock, P. M.

* These items should have appeared in the report of the late Treasurer at the last meeting of Synod, but were overlooked.

† This is a better report than that of March, 1848.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Tahiti.—We have been at a loss to know the condition of the missions and missionaries in Tahiti and its dependencies under French rule. This information is supplied in the following paragraph from the *Evangelical Magazine*, (English,) and shows a state of things fully as favourable as we had been led to expect.

“There are eight missionaries in connexion with the London Missionary Society, upon the two islands of Tahiti and Eimeo. There are 9,500 natives and 400 Europeans on the islands, not including the French troops and Civil Establishment. The missionary who labours here writes, that of the natives, there are about 800 in church membership, and 1000 children are under instruction in the schools; but of the Europeans not more than five or six have joined themselves to our churches. At present, we enjoy full liberty in the discharge of our duties—we have every where free access to the people—the education of the children is in our hands, and no restriction is placed upon our press. In addition to the people of Tahiti and Eimeo, there are about 5000 natives of smaller islands in a group, called the Paumotu Islands, who are under our charge.”

India.—Our readers are already aware that the Government School or College at Allahabad, was, some time since, put into the hands of the missionaries of the Presbyterian Board. It is prospering under their management. Mr. Owens says:

“We have now upwards of one hundred and fifty in actual attendance in the English department alone; more than we ever had before, and about twice the number that attended when it was a government seminary. . . . In the vernacular department are one hundred and forty; total in the institution, two hundred and ninety. These are twice every day assembled in the large hall for religious instruction and devotional exercises, at ten in the morning, and three in the afternoon.”

This appears to be a Christian College—an example, in this respect, to similar institutions in more favoured countries.

Turkey.—We have no political news of any interest from Turkey. As to religion, we learn that there are now *eight* congregations gathered by the American missionaries—exclusive of those in Syria. Some of them are small, but the accounts from all are encouraging. From Aintab, Mr. Schneider writes:

“Our congregations are large and attentive. Yesterday the house was crowded to overflowing. Quite a number were unable to find a place within doors; and there must have been some twenty new hearers. There have been several additions to our congregation within a few days; and the prospect of further increase is of the most cheering kind.”

Of the Church at Broosa, another missionary says:

“The church here now numbers fifteen members, nine males and six females, one of the latter being a subject of the revival this year in the female seminary at Constantinople. I am happy to say that they all seem to be united in brotherly love. There has not been the least difficulty, thus far, with any one of the church members. There has been no complaint respecting any one; nor has there been any difficulty in any church meeting, or in relation to any matter pertaining to the church. And at present there appears nothing like opposition on the part of the Armenians. There is secret opposition, no doubt, and about as much of it as ever; but the Armenians generally seem disposed to treat the Protestants with civility; and many are

ready to hold friendly conversation with them in public places. The fact is, great numbers of them are intellectually convinced that the truth is with the Protestants; and it only needs the influences of the Holy Spirit to impress the truth upon their hearts, in order to the gathering of many into the fold of Christ."

Every thing portends the speedy downfall of the Ottoman. They expect it, and know the hands that are to accomplish the work. On this subject we quote from the *Edinburgh Review*, a well-written and interesting paragraph:

"It is a remarkable feature in the history of the Ottoman and Russian Empire, that the destinies of both should be matter of long-descended tradition and common acceptance in the minds of the people. Though the establishment of the Turks in Europe is now of such respectable antiquity that its fourth, and perhaps fated centenary draws nigh, and though their rights of dominion have acquired a title beyond that of mere prescription, yet the nation itself, as has been observed by an historian not often distinguished by such felicitous brevity of expression, is still only '*encamped*' on its conquests. They have never comported themselves, either politically or socially, as if they anticipated in Europe any continuing home. Ottoman legends relate how a belief arose, even in the very hour of conquest, that the banner of the Cross would again be some day carried to the brink of the Straits; and it is said that this misgiving is traceable in the selection of the Asiatic shore for the final resting-place of true believers. It is certain, too, that from the first definite apparition of the Russian Empire, they instinctively recognised the antagonists of Fate. Europe had hardly learned the titles of the Czar, when the gaze of the Porte was uneasily directed to the new metropolis on the Neva; throughout the whole century, notwithstanding its chequered incidents, the impression was never weakened; and to this day the inhabitants of Constantinople point out the particular gate by which the Muscovite troops are to enter the City of Promise. Nor are the traditions less vivid on the other side. Although the visible ambition of the Imperial Court may have been generated by the creations of Peter and the conquests of Catharine, yet the impressions popularly current flow from an earlier and a less corrupted source. The ancient relations of Russia with the capital of the Cæsars, the early hostilities, the subsequent alliances, and the presumed inheritance of Ivan, are all matter of national legend; and combine, with the appeal to religion and the incitements of pride, to make the recovery of Constantinople from the Ottoman appear an obligatory as well as a predestined work. The spirit in which the Russian legions would appear to the Bosphorus would, probably, differ little from that in which Grenada was invested by the levies of Castile."

Germany.—As to politics, every thing appears to be in confusion. Prussia, which has, notwithstanding its constitution, relapsed into a monarchy nearly as absolute as before the great movement of 1848, is bent upon establishing a confederation of German States, of which she is to be the head. Austria stands in the way; some of the smaller States have all along refused to join, and some have withdrawn which had at one time given in their adhesion. The democratic party keeps itself aloof in all the larger States from every public movement. It "bides its time." As to religion, all accounts concur in showing that never was a reformation more needed. A Scottish magazine is authority for the following summary:

"The religious state of Germany is calculated to rouse the energies, and call forth the united prayers of every minister and layman in it, who has the interests of his country and of Christianity at heart. Hundreds of the clergy are blind leaders of the blind. Under the garb of heralds of the gospel, and

assuming the name of "Friends of Light," they are the greatest enemies to the light and life of Christian faith and practice. Pantheism and socialism, accompanied by unparalleled profligacy and blasphemy, are deluging the land, and loosening all the bonds of order. A mock charity, which confounds all right and wrong, truth and error, has enervated the exertions of professing friends of evangelical truth."

The church is in a state but little better. Dr. Kuntze, of Berlin, and the celebrated Dr. Tholuck, use the most striking language in describing the spiritual derelictions of the church. The former says:

"We, alas! have no congregations rooted and grounded in the faith to call for aid. *Ninety-nine hundreds of our people have either fallen away from us, or gone over to the enemy!*"

The latter gives some details:

"The absence of all true religion in our people is enormous, and truly frightful. You can form no conception of the deplorable influence, in this respect, which political movements have exercised upon them. In Halle, all the churches, with the exception of the small chapel of M. Aulfield, are every Sabbath almost deserted. My own congregation is considerably diminished. In the great city of Magdeburg, you will scarcely find a single church, during morning service, having more than twenty or twenty-five hearers!"

The Rongé Secession has finally assumed a definite character, and that a most painful one, as will be seen in what follows, which we take from a foreign source:

"That its deluded votaries, under the radical leadership of Blum, Ronge, and Dowait, have repudiated all Evangelical faith may be inferred from the recent instructions issued by the Superior Consistory of the Protestant Church in Bavaria to the inferior Consistories in that kingdom. The latter are warned, that there can exist no communion in spiritual matters between the German Catholics and the Protestants, inasmuch as the 'former reject the Word of God and denounce the Holy Scriptures.' 'Neither can the baptism of the German Catholics be recognised as valid, since they do not baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Lastly, 'no German Catholic is admissible to the sponsorship at any Protestant baptism.' The seceders from Rome, who came out from the numerous body of German Catholics at Berlin in the earliest stage of the secession, and by way of distinction designated themselves 'Apostolical Christians,' form the only flock which has come to the light of the gospel, and has, to this day, maintained its allegiance to the banner of the cross. We are glad to learn, by a late communication from the Rev. Dr. Jettmar, its faithful pastor, that in spite of its poverty, and the persecution which it has been called upon to undergo, its numbers continue to increase, chiefly from amongst the adherents of Rome."

May their efforts be successful!

It was in view of these facts, that the evangelical ministers of Germany, in the late Conference at Wittemberg, resolved to institute a Home Mission.

Italy. 1. *Florence.*—The restoration of the old civil regime in Tuscany has been signalized by the revival of priestly power, so that even in the most liberal of the Italian States the persecuting spirit of anti-Christ displays itself with great rigour. The correspondent of the Presbyterian thus describes some of their doings:

"One of the first steps taken by the Tuscan Government, soon after the restoration of the Grand Duke by Austrian bayonets, was to put a stop to

the sale of the Holy Scriptures, in the vernacular tongue. A large edition of the New Testament was about to be issued from the presses of the printer, Benelli, of Florence. The version selected was the Catholic translation by Martini. Captain Pakenham, of the British Royal Navy, a zealous Christian, had made a contract with the printer, and was to superintend the disposal of the copies. But the whole edition was seized at the instigation of the priests. Captain Pakenham appealed to the civil courts, and the case was tried on the 19th January. The principal charge was brought against Benelli, the printer, defended by the advocate, Mari.

"Mari, the advocate, made a noble defence, which, at several times, called forth the approbation of a numerous audience. But this defence could not obtain victory to the cause of liberty. Benelli was condemned to a fine of fifty crowns, (about fifty dollars,) and the confiscation of the Bibles was confirmed. The same day, Mr. Pakenham received orders to appear before a delegate of the police; the latter accused him of having distributed tracts in the hospital. 'These tracts,' replied the captain, 'were printed at Florence, with the permission of the censorship.' 'That is no concern of ours,' replied the police-agent; 'you wish to make proselytes; please to sign this paper, by which you declare that in ten days you will go out of Florence; if not, you will be made to leave it immediately by force.' Captain Pakenham, as was proper, refused to sign, and next day accompanied by the British minister, he went to the residence of the minister of the interior, to protest against the manner in which he was treated. Meanwhile, the English sent a petition to their minister, and a complaint to London, which will be brought before the parliament."

It is hoped that the appeal will not be in vain. 2. *Sardinia*.—This kingdom is not so priest-ridden as its neighbours. Here, indeed, as elsewhere, the disciples of Loyola have endeavoured to avail themselves of the reaction against liberty to reinstate themselves in their old ascendancy. They are likely to be defeated. So says the correspondent of the N. Y. Presbyterian:

"But the other day, the Minister of Justice and of Worship presented to the Chamber of Deputies a bill to abolish most of the Church fasts in the year, and the temporal penalties attached to the violation of them; another for the abolition of ecclesiastical Courts of Justice; and another for the suppression of all ecclesiastical asylums, or places of refuge for criminal offenders. By-and-by another bill will be brought in, for the recognition of marriages by civil contract; another for the abolition of perquisites for the performance of certain religious ceremonies; another for a more equitable distribution of Church property; and another for the suppression of certain ecclesiastical corporations. A law is now in preparation to compel all ecclesiastical establishments to account yearly to the Government for the administration of their property; and another to abridge the swallow of *mortmain*. And, as all these bills have been received by the Chamber of Deputies with shouts of applause, and by the people with unbounded manifestations of joy, there is room to believe the Government will not stop, in the business of Church reformation, and much less listen to the claims or complaints of the bishops."

He adds:

"The people, the generality of the Italians, do not care a fig for the Pope, the bishops, the priests, &c., nor a fig for the Church. Nay, that they have them in utter contempt. Newspapers have done much to affect the public mind: but they do not support themselves. It would be long to tell all the reasons. Only one paper pays its expenses in all Italy; and that is the *Gazzetta del Popolo*, a copy of which I send you. Even books and pamphlets of all kinds, even political, rarely pay their own expenses. Here reading is not in the power of every body. Perhaps, taking the kingdom of Sardinia as a

whole, sixty persons in a hundred cannot read. Of the forty readers, how many, do you suppose, can understand or relish books? Mr. Angelo Javo, superintendent of the common schools of this kingdom, has got up, and ready for the press, a translation (and an admirable translation by the way) of the book of Job, with philological notes, &c. But he has not been able to find a publisher bold enough to assure himself of the chance of publishing it."

Still, there is encouragement in the fact that such books are written: the publication will come in due time. 3. *Rome*.—The Roman question seems to be but little nearer its solution. The Pope has not yet returned to the Vatican. Why not? A contemporary says:

"The hitch lies here, even in the presence of the French army at Rome. If the Pope return to Rome while the city is garrisoned by France, the Papacy is subject to Paris; and if the French leave, the Papacy is menaced by revolution. The Pope, no doubt, could solve the difficulty by obtaining an Austrian garrison; but in that case the French would have to relinquish their commanding position in the Italian peninsula, to obtain which they sacrificed so liberally both their money and their honour. Thus both the Pope and the French are in a fix—the former how to get into Rome, and the latter how to get out of it. The position of both has been of their own choosing; and it is impossible to say which of the two situations is the most ridiculous, or which of the two powers cut at this moment the poorest figure. Even in these days, things begin to look serious, as far as regards the temporal power of the Pope. If he remains away, he forfeits his crown; and if he returns, he will become the servant of a military power, ever vacillating between the extremes of anarchy and despotism."

Switzerland.—In our last we laid before our readers an encouraging statement regarding the Theological Seminary at Geneva. Before the number was issued, we were pained to learn that most serious errors respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures have been imbibed and taught by Prof. Scherer, resulting in his resignation of his Professorship. It is to be hoped that this unhappy event will not interfere with the prosperity of the Seminary. But few of the students have imbibed his errors, and D'Aubigné and his colleagues have taken occasion from this event to renew their declarations of adherence to their former sound profession; and, as a public pledge of their continued fidelity, and as a means of repairing any injury that may have arisen from the erroneous instructions of Prof. S., have commenced a course of lectures on the subject of Inspiration, to which the public is admitted.

There is now some prospect of a peaceful settlement of the political relations of Switzerland, which have been for the last few months in a very threatening position.

France. 1. *Political*.—France is in a ferment. The three days of February—the anniversary of the revolution of '48—passed off, indeed, without any outbreak. The Red Republicans had another object—they were looking forward to the elections in March, held for the purpose of filling the places in the Assembly of the thirty-six members condemned for their participation in the affair of June, 1848. The result has justified their forbearance. In Paris they have chosen their candidates—Carnot, Vidal, and Le Flotte—all Republicans of the highest grade, the last implicated in the June revolt. A large number of votes were polled—about 260,000—of whom the highest on the Socialist ticket had over 132,000, the lowest over 126,000. All parties were astonished—the Conservatives in France and throughout Europe alarmed. The reaction, of which so much had been said, was not so

great after all. One hundred and thirty-two thousand vigorous republicans in Paris! They found themselves standing upon a mine which might at any moment explode, and bury them in the convulsion. An ominous fact is, that the majority of the soldiers voted for the Socialist candidates. This election has already made itself felt in the Assembly and in the Cabinet of the Executive—throwing aback many fine plans laid and about to be executed for the re-establishment of some form of monarchical government. The English Tory papers comment very freely, and with vehement denunciations of the Parisians. We quote from *The Britannia*:

“France is doomed. Frightful catastrophes are near at hand. Picture to yourself Barbes or Blanque at the head of a government, decreeing universal war and the pillage of the rich—Louis Blanc condemning every body to eat out of the same earthen dish—the Fourierists doing away with marriage, proclaiming universal prostitution, and shutting people up in barracks—Proudhon acting on the principle that property is robbery, and condemning every man who owns any thing not only to abandon it to the community, but to be treated as a thief—Carnot insisting on having the laws made by men who can neither read nor write, and De Flotte standing up stoutly for the right to throw up barricades, and to shoot his fellow citizens like dogs.—‘Anarchy is inevitable—no human power can prevent it—impossible?—but mark my words, the impossibility will come to pass.’—‘Perfect consternation has been caused among all the respectable classes of society by the terrible result of the elections. Hundreds of wealthy families have precipitately left Paris—there has been a heavy fall in the public funds, and trade, which had become tolerably brisk, has been suddenly paralyzed.’”

In all this, it must be admitted, there is truth—particularly in the foreboding of approaching revolution—a dreadful revolution; for, after all, while it is true that they are struggling against tyranny and corruption in one form, what can be expected—we use the language of another English paper—“from people whose principles may be summed up in three propositions—property is theft, marriage is bondage, and religion is beastly folly.” Still, there must be a breaking down before real reformation can be looked for. 2. *Religious*.—Here the accounts are still encouraging. Amid all the din of political strife, the church labours on against all opposition, but not without success. The opposition comes from the government—which is evidently operated upon by the priests. We have seen detailed accounts of the efforts made by the authorities in the provinces—and sometimes successful—to arrest the labours of colporteurs and preachers. In Paris, M. Pilatte has encountered a series of attempts made upon him by the police. His meetings have been forcibly closed—and when re-opened elsewhere, closed again. He has appealed in vain to the chief of police. He is charged with teaching Socialism—with establishing clubs, and not worshipping societies. It is under the same pretence that the colporteurs have been impeded in their work. However, the people are accessible; and wherever liberty of speech can be had—and such opportunities often occur—there is no difficulty in finding hearers. Moreover, pastors are not interfered with—the various societies carry on their work freely—Bibles are circulated by thousands—Tracts are carried far and wide by intelligent and diligent colporteurs. This is indeed but the “handful of corn,” compared with the outpourings of error; but the promise may be pleaded in faith that it shall yet “shake with prosperous fruit.”

Great Britain. 1. *The Gorham Case.*—The decision in this case has been published, and is a little different from what we had supposed. After stating his doctrine—the council proceed to show that it has been maintained by many of the most eminent theologians and dignitaries of the church, and, hence, arrive at the conclusion that there is a liberty on this subject allowed by the articles and formularies, and that has been actually enjoyed by the members and ministers of the Church of England. This decision is, of course, very gratifying to the Evangelical party, but not so to the Tractarians. Just the reverse, and new trouble is likely to arise from that side of the divided house. The Bishop of Exeter is a very determined man, and is prepared—so it is reported—to refuse obedience to the mandate, enjoining the induction of Mr. Gorham. Many Tractarians appear to be ready to sustain him, and certain it is that they are endeavouring to concentrate their forces, so as to attain, even yet, the ascendancy. It is a significant fact, that Lord John Russell has given up a seat which he has heretofore held in a Tractarian Church or Chapel. 2. *The Scottish Establishment.*—The following is from the pen of Sir George Sinclair, an adherent of the Establishment, but not a blind one. It reveals even greater feebleness, as it regards members; than we were prepared to learn. He says:

“At Glasgow, in the ten parochial churches, which are the property of the congregation, [Corporation,] it is stated that the total number of sittings is 12,630—of which 5854 are let, and 6776 unlet; that in Edinburgh, out of a population of 130,000, 8300 constituted the whole of the church-sitting adherents of the Establishments; that in the three town churches in Paisley, at March, 1848, the total sittings belonging to the community are 2883; let 850, unlet 2033; rents received £18 3s. 7d., and it is not expected that for the whole year, the revenue will exceed £50, being not more than sufficient to pay insurance, precentor’s fees, &c., and nothing for repairs. At Dundee, out of 4981 seats, owned by the town, in 5 churches, 1098 were let, and 3883 unlet. The revenue derived from these churches from Whitsunday, 1848, to Whitsunday, 1849, was £283 10s. 9d. The ordinary expenditure, for the year to pay stipends and other expenses was £1100; and in a newspaper sent to me from Dundee, I find the following graphic paragraph:—‘The financial position of St. David’s, with its 201 sittings, annually decreasing 17 per cent., is peculiarly miserable. The revenues of that church amount to £33. The minister is paid £200; other expenses amount to £50. So far from being able to support itself in a respectable way, St. David’s can with difficulty pay its precentor and door-keepers! When the little patch of ground in front of the church wants delving, St. David’s must apply for pecuniary assistance to pay the gardener. Such is the dilapidation of the Established Church in Dundee, and such its utility and costliness.’ I have not received any detailed accounts as to the state of matters at Aberdeen, but I am told that it is no better, or rather worse; the truth being that it is threatened with bankruptcy, in consequence of the annual draught made on the revenue for paying stipends, interest of debt, &c., and it is stated that Perth, and several other towns, are in a condition precisely similar.”

Ireland.—The process of decay is still going on, and with accelerated velocity in unhappy Ireland. So great has the weight of public burdens become, that in parts of the South, almost the entire produce of the soil is swallowed up by them. Take the following facts: we find them in the North British Review:

“On a farm in Castletown division, fifteen tons of well-saved hay were sold by the poor-rate collector for £7 10s., leaving £4 of the rates due, and nothing to pay the county cess or rent, the tenant having fled with his corn

and cattle. On a farm in Kilmeeady, containing 62 (Irish) acres* of prime land, 22 Irish acres of well-saved meadowing, and 2½ acres of wheat, were sold by the poor-rate collector for £20, leaving over £6 of the rates due, and only some unripe corn to meet that charge and the county cess. Within seven miles of Limerick, on the lands of Court, some of the richest in the kingdom, 9 acres of fine oats have been sold by the barony collector, and 20 acres of the richest and finest meadowing, for £6 14s. Such facts are of daily occurrence. Several hundred acres of excellent meadowing remain uncut, and will be left to rot on the land. The collectors seize on the hay the moment it is cut; the farmers consequently think there is no use in their cutting it when they cannot hope to use it. I know a respectable farmer who wants meadowing; his next neighbour has it lying waste, and would gladly dispose of it to him for a mere trifle; but there would be no use in cutting it—the poor-rate collector would at once sell it.

“The collection of these exorbitant rates is attempted at a time when the price of every description of agricultural produce is unprecedentedly low. Butter is only 63 shillings per cwt.; it used to range from 90 to 100. Oats sold to day (Sept. 15) in the Limerick market at from 5d. to 6d. per stone. Wheat, average price, 10½d.; barley, 6d. Last year oats brought from 9d. to 10d.; wheat, 16d.; barley, 10d. At these prices the entire produce of the land, cattle and all, in the greater part of Upper Coneloe (Co. Limerick,) *would not pay the rates now in the course of collection.*”

And even in the North land is, in some places, scarcely worth the holding. We have heard of farms in desirable locations of twenty, thirty, and even eighty acres, that have been abandoned, and that cannot find tenants. Of course, this state of things affects all classes. Landlords are as badly off, in many instances, as the tenants. The same Review says:

“The destitution among all classes in Ireland, except those supported by official income, is every where increasing, and in every department of public business the offices are crowded with applicants for employment. Men, often of the highest rank, by the exigencies of the times, have been forced into what a few years ago would have been regarded as unbecoming solicitations, for offices, too, that a few years ago they would have regarded it as an indignity to have offered to their acceptance.”

In the neighbourhood of Dublin, *five* baronial residences are now used as poor-houses, and the former owners are holding places in their superintendence. We append, on the authority of the Edinburgh Review, the following curious statement of the origin of what are now termed *Irish* families. It appears that a considerable proportion of these are not at all Irishmen, but the descendants of foreigners, chiefly English:

“It could be shown that above *half the names of Ireland, which are now of the language, customs, religion, and interest of the Irish*, were old English who came over to subdue them. Such are all the old names of the pale: such are, in the county of Waterford, the Powers, Welches, Pendergrasses, Sherlocks, Geraldines, Nugents, Condons, Browns, Dobbys, Heys; such in the county of Cork, beside some of these, are the Barrys, Roches, Courceys, Meaghs, Fitz-Edmonds, Carons, Waters, Russels, &c.; and thus I could run through all the other counties of Ireland, were it not tedious. Many old English names there are which have been changed into the mere Irish *Mac's* and *O's*. The MacQuilins in the county of Antrim, who, in the reign of King James the First, were destroyed by the M'Donnells, were anciently Welshmen, and the name was Williams. The O'Relys in the county of Cavan some say were Ridleys. The MacSwynes in Ulster were formerly Veres; and the MacMahons, FitzUrsulas. In Connaught, MacMorrice was formerly Pendergrass; MacAvile was Stanton; and MacJordan, Dexter;

* The Irish acre contains one acre and three-fifths of the English statute acre.

MacQuistolo was Nangle; MacPhadin, MacPieke and MacTomin, were all Barretts; O'Dowd, Dowdall; MacDolphin, Dolphin; M'Granel was Nangle; M'Thomas was Joyes; M'Orish was Birmingham; O'Naughton, Snow; M'Koch, Gough; M'Namara was Mortimer; M'William, Eughter; M'Philipine, Burghs, and a vast number of other names which I could reckon." If this be true, it is conclusive evidence that the recklessness and improvidence, and turbulence of the native Irish, as they are called, are not owing to any peculiarity of race, but to the operation of causes arising out of their condition—religious and social.

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

Congress.—To this date—April 30—Congress has taken no definite action on the question of slavery. The South—joined by a few Northern recreants—are determined that California shall not be admitted, unless, at the same time, and in the same bill, territorial governments are provided for the remainder of the new territory without the Wilmot proviso. Arrogant as this demand is, and impudently as it is pressed, we have our fears—we almost believe—that it will be carried. The South has always governed the country, and we see in the present aspect of public affairs little encouragement to think that the North has got spirit enough to declare independence of Southern dictation. No Wilmot proviso can pass the Senate; and the contest now turns upon this Southern demand,—and the plan of the administration being, to leave the territories without any government, with the understanding that the Mexican law forbidding slavery in them, is still in force. The death of Mr. Calhoun has, probably, extinguished the plan of a Southern Confederacy.

Delaware and Slavery.—The report of the Anti-Slavery Society of this State contains a well-written statement of the evils, especially in relation to education, inflicted upon that state by slavery. It says:

"In several districts of our own State, one-third of the white men and women know nothing of reading or writing; to the friends of education language cannot exaggerate their deplorable condition. One-third of the white men and women!

"The white population of the State was, in 1840, 58,561; 4,832 of these, over twenty years of age, could not read or write. In the different Hundreds of Sussex county, the number of ignorant whites is very generally proportioned to the number of slaves. Broad Kiln has 104 slaves and 104 ignorant whites. North-west Fork has 364 slaves and 368 ignorant whites. Of the whites of Sussex, one in eight, over twenty-eight years of age, is unable to read and write; and in New Castle one in forty-eight. In regard to the statement that one-third of the white men and women in several of the districts of our State know nothing of reading or writing, the statistics will substantiate it. It must be remembered that one-half of the population are under twenty years of age, and that the census only gives the ignorant who are over that age. Thus Little Creek, of Sussex county, has 2,368 whites. Only one-half of these are over twenty years of age. 1,184, divide this by 398, the number of ignorant whites, and we find that more than one-third of the grown up white population of this district is in a state of darkness."

Cholera.—This scourge is again making its appearance, following the same course as last year—ascending the Mississippi river. There is a probability, that, as in its former visit, it will re-appear in most of the localities where it raged in 1849. One thing is certain: no evidence has appeared of the *practical* acknowledgment of the hand of God in it, with suitable reformation of manners. Sins of all kinds are even more rampant than heretofore.

THE
COVENANTER.

JUNE, 1850.

THE DEACONS.*

Amidst the many steps of defection from a covenant work of reformation, which abound in all parts of the church, it is pleasing to see even a few efforts to restore the house to its former glory. The effort to restore *Deacons*, now making in some churches, is of this class; an effort which is, to some extent, crowned with success. It is much to be regretted that the discussions on this question have not been conducted with the calmness and moderation which become the house of God. There is certainly need for discussion; there are some questions that need to be answered, in order to show the consistency of our profession and our practice. Those who are familiar with the Bible find the *Deacons* there; those acquainted with the standards of the presbyterian churches find the *Deacons* there; the readers of church history find the *Deacons* there, in the purest churches of the reformation; but when they look around on the churches now, they find many congregations and some entire churches without this order of officers. If it is asked why is this? let the celebrated Brown of Haddington answer. He says:

“It is both sinful and shameful that these officers, the divine institution of which is so plainly marked in scripture, should be so often wanting in Christian congregations, under pretence that ruling elders have their whole power resident in them.”—*Bib. Dic., Art. Deacons.*

“There is no hint in scripture that the offices of RULING ELDER and DEACON were designed to be temporary. Both of them were appointed on moral grounds and necessities, respecting every church and period. The rules concerning them both are to be observed till the end of the world. 1 Tim. iii. No congregation can therefore answer to Jesus Christ for *dropping* of deacons, any more than for *dropping* of ruling elders.”—*Body of Div., Book 7, chap. 3.*

Yet it is true that the Reformed Presbyterian church was long without deacons, and although something has been done in returning to the old paths, there are many congregations still without them. The “dropping of deacons,” is easily accounted for, and when the circumstances are carefully weighed, little blame can be attached to her. Those acquainted with the settlement of new congregations, and the embarrassments they have to encounter, especially among Covenanters, will pass no harsh censures on them for overlooking this matter for a time. It is well known that the entire dropping of the deacons occurred simultaneously with the dropping of the gospel ministry, when the flock of the Lord was scattered by persecution.

* This is the first of that series of essays on this subject, of which we have already published the subsequent ones.—Ed. Cov.

After peace was restored, their great anxiety was for the enjoyment of spiritual things, and temporalities were consequently thrown in the shade. This enjoyment they found in their societies, in the preaching of the word and other ordinances. Being nearly all alike poor, they assisted one another as best they could, and cared little how they were accommodated with temporalities, beyond what was barely necessary for enjoying ordinances. It mattered little to them whether they heard the gospel in an upper room, in a hovel, or around the tent under the canopy of heaven. In this situation they had little need for any kind of agency to manage fiscal concerns.

Ministers and ruling elders *must* be had in order to the enjoyment of divine ordinances; but in congregations, young and weak, deacons could easily be dispensed with. Their growth was slow, and hence there was no sudden demand for fiscal officers, and their minds were little turned to the subject; thus the church seems to have arrived at the paradox of maintaining the divine right of the deacons, yet not having one within her pale. Under such circumstances, it is not strange that doubts and mistakes have arisen in relation to the extent of the deacons' power and duties; but it is rather strange that any who entirely oppose the office should claim to be Reformed Presbyterians. It is a fact, that there is clearer evidence for the office of deacons than for that of ruling elders, distinct from gospel ministers; and arguments have been urged against the eldership and gospel ministry both, with as much plausibility as against the deacons. We propose briefly to consider the divine warrant for their office, the distinction between them and other officers, and the nature of their office, as exhibited in the scriptures, and the footsteps of the flock.

The office of the Deacons is a permanent office by divine right.

1. This appears from the institution of the office recorded in Acts, sixth chapter. Almost every thing in this transaction goes to show that it is the establishment of a permanent office. The reason assigned for it is applicable to all ages. "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables." Now this applies to the standing ministry as well as to the apostles; it is as unreasonable this day as it was then; ministers now need to give themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word, and they will to the end of the world.

Their election by the people shows that they were not extraordinary officers. "Look ye out among you seven men," &c. Prophets were not chosen by the people, apostles were not, evangelists were not, but these seven were chosen from among the people, as the permanent officers, the elders of Israel, had been chosen, both civil and ecclesiastical, from the days of Moses.

Their being ordained when chosen, argues the permanency of their office. This was done by the apostles, whose business it was to ordain the standing officers, "whom we may appoint over this business." "Whom they set before the apostles." They were ordained with almost all the solemnity that is known in New Testament ordinations. "When they had prayed they laid their hands on them." As far then as the institution of an office can go in making it permanent, we have the divine warrant for the deacons.

2. Wherever they are afterwards mentioned, it is in connexion with the permanent and ordinary officers. Phil. i. 1, "bishops and dea-

cons." 1 Tim. iii. 2, "A bishop must be blameless;" verse 8, "Likewise must the deacons be grave," &c. Some have made it a matter of scruple that we have not the three offices together in any part of scripture; this is easily removed by the consideration that the term bishop, or overseer, as that word means, includes both the teaching and the ruling elder.

3. The laying down definitely the qualifications of deacons, proves the permanency of their office. The direction given Acts vi. 3, to choose men "of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," might be supposed to extend no farther than that special case; but the manner in which the qualifications are laid down in 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12, should settle the question that the office is perpetual. Why should the apostle—rather; why should the Spirit of God, lay down in this manner, and commit them to writing, if they were not to be used afterwards? Qualifications are here given so specific as to particularize their wives and families; in relation to which the candidates are to be tried and proved, before they are admitted to the service. Verse 20, "Let these also first be proved, then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless" All these given as directions to Timothy that he might know how to proceed in settling the affairs of the church on a permanent basis: verse 15, "That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." To deny the perpetuity of the diaconate, is to abrogate this portion of the New Testament.

Still, there are some who being constrained to admit the perpetuity of this office, destroy it by confounding it with other offices. Some say, they are ministers of the gospel, others say they are ruling elders; and we have seen an attempt made to prove that they are both ministers and elders! In opposition to such views we will endeavour to establish the following proposition.

The Deacons are distinct from other church officers—Ministers and Ruling Elders.

That the scripture deacons are not ministers of the gospel, appears from the following considerations: 1. It is no where hinted in the scripture, that preaching, administering sacraments, or any other service peculiar to the gospel ministry, belongs to their office, which is designated by the phrase "serve tables." This point has been so long maintained by Presbyterians, that it really seems absurd, for any one who denies it, to claim the Presbyterian name. Yet the distinct office of the deacon has been denied as a remnant of popery, while the arguments brought against it have been borrowed from papists and episcopalians. We have but a single case in scripture of a deacon preaching and baptizing—the case of Philip, and that some time after his ordination, and at a considerable distance from the place where he was ordained a deacon. Acts viii. 5, 38. The advocates of the preaching deacon are aware that one example is not enough to establish a rule; hence, in order to prove that every deacon preaches and baptizes, they usually associate Stephen with Philip; but there is no intimation in scripture that Stephen either preached or baptized. He wrought miracles and disputed successfully with the enemies of the gospel, which any man may do who has ability, without ordination of any kind. Thousands have argued against the enemies of truth, even to

death, who never thought of preaching officially; and every professor of religion is bound to do so according to his ability. 1 Pet. iii. 15, "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear," &c. Jude 3, "Ye should earnestly contend for the faith," &c. But such contending does not *make* men preachers nor *prove* that they are such. Philip's preaching and baptizing are easily accounted for, when he is styled "Philip the evangelist," Acts xxi. 8. But the "seven" were not ordained to be evangelists, because,

2. The "business" over which they were appointed would have required the apostles to leave the word of God. "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables." How absurd to suppose they were ordained to preach and baptize. Try to accommodate the words of the apostles to this view. It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and go and preach the gospel. Deacons are not required to leave the word of God, as it is the means of their own salvation; neither are they to leave it as the rule of their official duty; but they are required to attend to other things than the continual study of the word, the continual prayer, and the travelling and preaching that are required of the gospel ministry.

3. It was not deficiency of preaching that was complained of when the deacons were ordained, but the neglect of Grecian widows in the daily ministrations. In the preaching of the word, all who attend receive alike, whether widows or not; but in a business that admitted of a different treatment, some were overlooked; hence it could not be the preaching of the word. Had Grecian congregations been neglected while supplies were given largely, or ministers settled in Hebrew congregations, the complaint would not have been made in the name of *widows*, but of the whole assembly of the Grecians. We cannot suppose that the apostles would obviate the difficulty by ordaining men to another business than that which was the subject of complaint. That the deacons were distinct from ruling elders appears,

1. We never read of the deacons *ruling* any but their own households, which every man is required to do, whether he be ordained or not. But we read of the elders ruling. 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." This text, moreover, answers the inquiry already adverted to: Why do we never find the three offices of minister, elder and deacon, in one place of scripture? Plainly, because ruling and teaching elders are to have the same qualifications, and equal authority in ruling in the house of God. Here both classes are designated elders, and we will see elsewhere that both classes are often called by a common name.

2. When the "seven" were ordained, we hear no complaint about misrule, nor about want of rule; the complaint was made to the rulers concerning the *ministration*: hence we infer that it was not rulers that were needed, neither were they rulers that were ordained.

3. Their official name, deacons, (*diakonoi*), indicates nothing of ruling—but serving, the reverse of ruling. A few years ago an essay of this kind would have required a number of examples to establish this point, but it has been so well exhibited of late, that either illustration or proof here would be superfluous.

Other arguments bear equally on both the positions above discussed, showing that the deacons are neither ministers nor elders; as,

1. The deacons are distinguished from bishops. Phil. i. 1, "Bishops and deacons." 1 Tim. iii. 2, "A bishop must be blameless," &c., verse 8, "*Likewise* must the deacons be grave," &c. That the bishop spoken of here includes the minister of the gospel, no Presbyterian denies. If he be not intended here, then we have no particular description of the character of the gospel minister, for, in the Epistle to Titus the same designation is given, chap. i. verse 7. The same, taken in connexion with verse 6, proves that *bishop* and *elder* are synonymous. Tit. i. 5, 6, "Ordain elders in every city, . . . if any be blameless, . . . for a bishop must be blameless." The apostle's reason here can have no force, unless bishop and elder be convertible terms. To the same effect is the well known passage, Acts xx. 17, 28, where Paul having sent for the *elders* of the church at Ephesus, says to them, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*," in the original, *episkopous*, bishops. Now whether these elders of Ephesus were ruling elders only, or whether, as all Presbyterians acknowledge, they were ruling and teaching elders both, it proves the point that bishop and elder mean the same office; but the deacon is distinguished from the bishop; therefore the deacons are neither ministers nor ruling elders.

2. There was a *deaconess* in the church at Cenchrea. Rom. xvi. 1, "I commend unto you Phebe, our sister, which is a servant of the church, which is at Cenchrea; that ye receive her in the Lord: literally, a deacon of the church. We argue here by analogy, that as we have in scripture no female elder nor minister of the gospel, but have a female deacon, it follows that the diaconata is something different from the elder and the minister. Paul writes, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35, "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." This means official teaching, for elsewhere he allows them to teach privately. Titus ii. 3, 4, "The aged women—teachers of good things. That they may teach the young women to be sober," &c. In ancient time the women laboured in the gospel; Phil. iv. 3. Acts xviii. 26, Priscilla assists her husband in instructing Apollos; and 2 Tim. i. 5, Timothy instructed by his mother and grandmother. But yet we have no female preachers—no female bishops or rulers of any kind in the church. Although a woman may guide the house, she may not be a ruler in the church. Now if deacons were rulers, by analogy, deaconesses would possess some authority in the church; but this the apostle will not allow; therefore, deacons are distinct from the rulers of the church.

3. The Reformed churches agree in distinguishing the deacons from ministers and ruling elders. We should not oppose rashly the best churches in their united maintenance of any point of doctrine or order. Our own solemn vows ought to restrain our wanderings from acknowledged standards, or bring us back when we have strayed; but the solemn command of the Redeemer should deter the thought of wandering. Song of Sol. i. 8, "Go thy way forth by the footsteps of the flock." The arguments brought against the distinct and perpetual office of the deacons would deprive us of all officers in the church. They have all been used either by Episcopalians or Independents, and fully refuted two hundred years ago.

The nature of their office, remains to be considered.

1. They are subordinate to the rulers of the church—merely executive officers. The name [*Diakonos*] intimates this; we find no account of their ruling, and superior officers set them over their business. This, however, having been argued at length on a former occasion,* we pass for the present.

2. Their office relates to temporalities only. This is easily inferred from what has been said. An office which consists neither in teaching, ruling, nor administering the seals, can have nothing else of importance except temporalities; accordingly we find the “seven” were set over the daily ministration, and it was in relation to this that the complaint arose. What this daily ministration was is plainly indicated, Acts ii. 45, 46. “And sold their possessions and goods; and parted them to all, as every man had need; and they continued daily in the temple,” &c. Chap. iv. 34, 35, “Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses, sold them and brought the price of the things that were sold and laid them down at the apostles’ feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need.” Owing to the great number of believers in Jerusalem, and the constant accessions making to the church, this distribution required a great deal of attention—a daily ministration. To relieve the apostles of the care of this money laid at their feet, were the “seven” chosen and ordained. For what purposes this money was brought, whether a community of goods from which every man drew his daily sustenance, or whether for strictly ecclesiastical purposes, is left for after discussion; it is enough for the present argument, that they were set over money matters.

3. Their first and special concern was with the poor.

1. The neglect of the widows was the occasion of their being ordained. They would, of course, be expected to remedy this defect first, and guard against its recurrence. 2. The poor can do less for themselves than others who may have a claim on the ecclesiastical funds, and the distribution was made according to the need. The poor have special claims to attention, on many accounts;—they have not credit, and cannot wait a tardy distribution; the *present* need is to them every thing; widows, especially, have not boldness to urge their own necessities; they did not in this case: the Grecians murmured because “their widows were neglected.” 3. In a dispensation of mercy it is a special part of the system to elevate the poor. Hence, so much is said in the law about giving to the poor, and lending to a poor brother; even the labourer must be paid before the sun goes down, “for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it,” whether of the brethren or of strangers. God has made special provision for the poor. Ps. lxxviii. 10, and cxxxii. 15. 4. The apostles were anxious to promote this special care, in all places where they sent and travelled; Gal. ii. 10, “Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was *forward* to do.” 5. All other temporalities could be dispensed with in cases of extremity. Ministers could live by tent-making for a time; congregations could meet in an upper room, in a cave, on a mountain, or on the sea-shore, below tide-water mark,

* Reformed Presbyterian, Vol. xi. Nos. 1, 2. “The Consistory or Deacon’s Court.”

as lately in Scotland; but the poor *must* have ministrations for every day, in order to sustain life.

4. Their business extends to all ecclesiastical temporalities. Although the care of the poor be the only matter of absolute necessity, there are other things which approach necessity, and many other things which are convenient. Among these we may reckon, 1st. The support of ministers, "for so hath the Lord ordained," 1 Cor. ix. 14. 2d. Bread and wine for the sacrament; no one in a congregation is bound to provide them, more than another. 3d. A place of worship, whether a ceiled house, a tent in the field, or pulpit of wood in the street, Neh. viii. 4, Hag. i. 8. 4th. Travelling expenses, Acts xv. 3, Rom. xv. 24. 5th. Support of missions, Phil. iv. 16. 6th. A fund for theological education, and studies preparatory, 2 Kings iv. 38, and vi. 1. Some of these can and have been supplied by individual munificence; much or all of them could be supplied by the civil ruler, if he were what he should be, [*Diakonos Theou,*] God's deacon, Rom. xiii. 4; but the church must live in all situations, and maintain her own independence against all the rulers of earth. For this she needs officers of her own, to attend to her fiscal concerns, and her Head has graciously furnished her, in this particular, with the DEACONS.

Even when the nations will bring their glory into the church, when they shall bring their silver and their gold with them, and their kings present gifts, there will be need for a suitable and orderly agency to receive it. The argument showing that such service belongs to the deacons, is reserved for a future article. R. H.

THE LAW OF MARRIAGE.

Attempts are making to alter the law of marriage in England, so as to allow the marriage of a deceased wife's sister. The North British Review, in opposing this change, presents the following Scriptural argument. Ed. Cov.

"The proof-passage on this question, is the 18th chapter of Leviticus, verses 6—18, although much light is also cast upon it by other portions of the Divine Word, as well as by those general principles applicable to the subject which the whole tenor of Revelation suggests. In interpreting that chapter; an amount of hair-splitting verbal criticism and ultra-refined special pleading has been expended, chiefly by lawyers turned divines, that would do credit to the most expert practitioner in the courts of Old Bailey. By exactly parallel reasoning to that of many of these gentlemen, we would undertake to prove from Scripture that women have no souls, and do not sin and will not die. A world of pains is taken, for instance, to show that wife in these verses does not mean widow; and that the connexion forbidden is not matrimonial. Any plain common-sense reader, unwarped by prejudice, may see through the fallacy. 'Thy father's wife' means the woman married to thy father, whether still his wife, or divorced, or a widow; and the connexion with her that is forbidden is sexual intercourse, whether covered with the cloak of marriage or not. Again, it is argued by some, though they are very few, that the law in that chapter is not moral, and therefore universally binding, but municipal or ritual, and therefore peculiar to the Jewish economy. Let any one peruse calmly the first five and the last seven verses of the chapter, and if he has a

spark of reverence for holiness and the Holy God, let him say if language more express and solemn could possibly be used, to mark the unalterable Divine hatred of one and all of the practices prohibited in the intervening section, whether committed by heathen nations or his own people, by Gentile or by Jew. Driven from this refuge, our ingenious friends betake themselves to an analysis of the prohibited degrees in detail; insisting much on our adhering to the exact letter of the statute, and protesting against any constructive interpretation of it. Even here they break down; for, if their way of reading the statute is the right one, then the only degrees prohibited are those expressly specified, and all other marriages are lawful;—a conclusion somewhat too broad even for them, inasmuch as it would legalize sundry monstrous incests which they would hold it to be a foul imputation on their character to be supposed for one moment to tolerate.

“But what is this principle of constructive interpretation, or ‘parity of reason,’ to which they object, as stretching the Divine prohibitions so much farther than the letter of the enactment warrants, and so restricting unduly the liberty of marriage? Let a plain tale put down a hundred sophistries.

“The general law is announced broadly at the sixth verse: ‘None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him,’ &c., I am the Lord.’ Then follow instances or examples of the nearness of kin intended. Instead of an abstract description or definition, which might be open to cavil, the Legislators, with far greater wisdom, gives a few cases, sufficient, with every honest man, to remove all doubt. Of these cases, seven, or about one-half, are cases of relationship by affinity. Marriage is forbidden with a step-mother, a father’s brother’s wife, a daughter-in-law, a brother’s wife, a wife’s daughter, her son’s daughter, her daughter’s daughter. Thus evidently affinity is treated as equivalent to consanguinity. But farther, if it be admitted that these prohibitions are addressed to both sexes equally, or that what is forbidden in a man, implies the corresponding connexion forbidden in a woman,—and any other principle of interpretation is simply monstrous,—then the 16th verse, directed against a man’s intercourse with his brother’s wife, is directed just as emphatically and unequivocally against a woman’s intercourse with her sister’s husband. Nor is it of the slightest relevancy here to bring in the law of the Levirate, or the special and exceptional provision made for a man marrying his brother’s childless widow, in order to raise up seed to his brother. Let a similar provision be found, making it not merely lawful, but obligatory, that a woman shall marry her sister’s childless husband, and for a similar reason. Until then, however, we venture humbly to acquiesce in the Divine prerogative of dispensing with his own law, for a special and temporary purpose, under a national dispensation of his covenant; and we firmly protest against any dispensing power being usurped on earth, whether by Pope or by Parliament.

“There is yet another consideration to which we must advert. In these prohibitions the reason is frequently given, particularly where it is a case of relationship by affinity; and the reason is very significant. Let our readers turn to verses 8 and 16, and also to the twentieth chapter, verse 20, and mark the ground on which intercourse, in these instances, is forbidden. Plainly it is this, that marriage makes a man and his wife so intimately one, even in some sense physically, that to have

connexion with the one must be viewed as amounting virtually to the same thing as if it were connexion, if that were possible, with the other. The idea is conveyed, according to the Scriptural language applicable to the subject, with remarkable delicacy, but with not less remarkable force; and it is an idea, the bare hint or suggestion of which, from such a quarter, is well fitted to startle any mind in which there remains any thing at all of a right fear of God and a right horror and hatred of evil.

“Here, indeed, we touch the principle on which this whole law proceeds. It is the principle indicated in the beginning, at the original institution of marriage—‘Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.’ (Gen. ii. 24.) That principle is emphatically recognised by the Prophet Malachi, when he indignantly reproves the cruelty of Jewish husbands parting lightly with the wives of their youth. (Mal. ii. 15.) It is sanctioned by our Lord, and assigned by him as his reason for abridging, or rather annulling that liberty of divorce which had been conceded to the Jews for their hardness of heart, and which they had so hard-heartedly abused. (Matt. xix. 4—6.) And it is applied by the Apostle Paul, with tremendous power, as an argument against impurity, and again, with admirable tenderness of spiritual feeling, as a motive to conjugal love. (1 Cor. vi. 16; Ephes. v. 31.)

“Nothing surely can be plainer than this principle pervading all Scripture, that marriage makes husband and wife, to all intents and purposes, one person; certainly, so far at least as ‘the flesh’ is concerned, and therefore specially with reference to all relationships of ‘the flesh.’ And if this be true, the conclusion is irresistible that affinity and consanguinity are, to all intents and purposes, identically one and the same thing. To all the wife’s relations, according to ‘the flesh,’ or by consanguinity, the husband is as the wife; they are ‘one flesh.’ To all the husband’s relations, according to ‘the flesh,’ the wife is as the husband; they are ‘one flesh.’

“We have by no means exhausted our Scriptural proof. We omit the evidence furnished by the Baptist’s reproof of Herod, and the Apostle Paul’s stern censure of the crime tolerated at Corinth; although we hold it to be as clear as day, that in both cases, whether the intercourse was adulterous or not, it is mainly as being incestuous that it is stigmatized: and in both cases, the incest turns upon a relationship by affinity alone. Nor can we spare time for meeting the many objections urged against these views; of most of which objections the capital fault is, that if they prove any thing, they prove rather too much. Thus, sage counsellors in America have discovered, that affinity ceases altogether on the dissolution of a marriage by death; so that a widower is in no sense related to his mother-in-law or to his step-daughter, but may marry either, if he pleases, or both, in due succession. And the Supreme Court of Massachusetts has, it seems, found this to be good law! But really, after all, why should we be surprised? Our transatlantic friends are only, as is their wont, ‘going the whole hog.’ Having got a principle, they go through with it. For either affinity is equivalent to consanguinity, or it is not. But if not, then what precisely is it? And what restrictions can be imposed upon marriage between relatives by affinity that are not purely arbitrary and capricious—based on shifting views of taste or of expediency, but without one single steady element of consistency to give them weight? Why should sisters, by

affinity, be marriageable, more than mothers, or daughters, or nieces? We pause for a reply.

“Meanwhile we return, with a feeling of relief, to the simplicity of Divine legislation. Take that chapter in Leviticus, fully and fairly, as the basis of the law of incest, and interpret it by the ordinary rules of common sense. What results does it give? Chiefly these two: *first*, that beyond the first degree in collaterals all marriages are lawful; and, *secondly*, that relationship by affinity and relationship by consanguinity are identical. Or otherwise, let there be two columns formed, the one consisting of myself in the centre,—my father, my grandfather, and so on, upwards,—my son, grandson, and so on, downwards; and let the second column, placed alongside the first, contain the sisters of all these parties respectively. Within all the relations thus indicated, marriage is unlawful; that is, no man in the first column may marry any woman in the second. And if we add the rule, that I and my wife are one, and that all related to her are in the same degree related to me, we have the Levitical law of marriage and of prohibited degrees clear and complete.

“Is there nothing in the very simplicity and completeness of this law fitted to prove at once its divine authority and its perpetual obligation? Have we not here the wisdom of God? Is it safe to prefer to it the opinion of man?

“But we may be reminded that we have not touched the vexed question of the 18th verse, and the sanction apparently given there to a widower’s marriage with his sister by affinity; and our reason is, that we have not founded at all on that verse as favourable to our views, and therefore we are the less bound to deal with it, as it may be alleged to be adverse. We believe it to be entirely consistent with the law as given in the previous verses, and indeed corroboratory of it. Still we have not taken advantage of the text at issue, because it is confessedly one of most difficult and doubtful interpretation; so much so, that there is scarcely a sentence in all the Bible whose meaning may be said to be so uncertain. This is partly owing to its own obscurity—partly to our ignorance of many of the domestic details of Jewish life—but still more to the dust raised by the very controversy we are now discussing. Various glosses have been suggested, all of them more or less liable to difficulty. One thing, however, is clear. The reason of the prohibition in the 18th verse—whatever that prohibition may be—is different from the reason assigned for all the previous ones; it is not nearness of kin at all, but the risk of family vexation. Whoever it may be that a man is forbidden to marry in the 18th verse, the ground of the interdict is peculiar. He is forbidden to have intercourse with the women previously indicated, because of their nearness of kin; he is forbidden to have intercourse with this woman upon a totally different consideration. This remark might suffice to withdraw the text altogether from the argument; it clearly is not a text legislating upon the formal ground of relationship at all. For our own part, we think that by far the most natural interpretation is that suggested in the margin of our authorized version, making it a prohibition of polygamy: ‘Thou shalt not take one wife to another, to vex her.’ We see nothing whatever against this view, either in the law or the history of the Jews. That in point of fact polygamy was practised, though far less generally than is often assumed,—nay, that Moses may have referred to it in some of his enact-

ments, though that is very doubtful,—will not prove at all that polygamy among the Jews was lawful. We believe it to have been the reverse; and we rather lean to that of the verse before us which brings out an express prohibition of that sin.

“There is indeed one view of this text, as it stands in the authorized version, which seems to us consistent and tenable; but it lends no support to the doctrine we are opposing. It is this. Let it be granted that it is marriage with a sister by affinity that is here forbidden, and that the lawgiver, without sanctioning, assumes the practice either of polygamy or of divorce. Knowing the possibility of a man allowing his wife to be supplanted in his affections, by a younger, perhaps, and fairer sister, and so being tempted to make way for her, either by a deed of divorce, or an act of polygamy,—the law interposes a stern and summary interdict; and without at all superseding the reason already sufficiently given, founded on nearness of kin, adds another specially applicable to the case on hand, founded on an appeal to the generosity and good faith and good feeling with which a husband should regard the wife of his youth. All this, however, is very short of a permission to marry the sister after the wife is gone. On the contrary, we are thoroughly persuaded that every right-thinking man and woman will instinctively feel that the very reason which is so affectingly urged against the one arrangement, should equally prevent the other also.

“But we must hasten to close our argument. The view we have given of the law, as fixed by the 18th chapter of Leviticus, apart from the criticism on the 18th verse, may be fairly said to have the sanction of the universal Church, almost without a dissentient voice, down to very recent times. The great body of the Jews interpreted the law precisely as we do; for it is a late after-thought of the Talmudists to insinuate doubt in regard to it. The Church of Rome has always held clearly that affinity and consanguinity are equivalent, and has admitted, that the only degrees prohibited by the Divine law, are those which we have enumerated. The universities of Europe, in the days of Henry VIII., gave forth no uncertain sound. The Reformers were of one mind, with scarcely any, if any exception. The law in England and in Scotland was framed accordingly. Public opinion has, beyond all question, ratified the law. And yet now, all is to be unsettled, all is to be changed.

“On many questions of practical duty, men are now affecting to be wiser and better than the Bible. Plans of social progress and improvement are rife, that have an air of transcendental refinement about them, unknown to the homely morality of the Word of God. We are becoming too sentimental to endure that even the murderer shall be put to death. And now we are for bettering God’s ordinance of marriage itself; and we see a fine, romantic, tender charm, in an alliance of brothers and sisters, on which God has stamped his curse. What may such things betoken? Are they ominous of such unbridled lawlessness and lust as marked the days before the Flood? Are they signs of the days not unlike those that are to precede the coming of the Son of Man?”

 PRAYER.

“What conception have we of *believing prayer*, before which mountains depart? What of *persevering prayer*, which causes us to ‘stand

continually upon the watch-tower in the day time, and which sets us in our ward whole nights?' What of *importunate* prayer, which storms heaven with its 'violence and force?' What of *united* prayer, 'gathering us together to ask help of the Lord?' What of *consistent* prayer, which regards no iniquity in our hearts? What of *practical* prayer, which fulfils itself? Let but such prayer be understood; let our spirit but 'break with such longing,' and the expectations of our bosoms shall not be delayed. 'And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear.'"

REFLECTIONS OF A CANDIDATE FOR THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.*

Dost thou, my soul, desire the office of a bishop of souls, a minister of Christ? Examine with deep concern thy preparation for, thy call to, and thy end in offering thyself to this important work.

Am I a real Christian; or am I a devil—a dissembler with God and men—an entertainer of sin, of Satan, in my heart? Am I circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, having my corrupt nature renewed; old things passed away, and all things become new? Do I worship God in spirit; read, meditate, pray, converse, under the influence of the Holy Ghost? Do I certainly know what Christ is to me? Do I rejoice in what he is in himself, and what he is to, and hath done for and in me? Have I no confidence in the flesh—in my righteousness, my learning, my address? Hath the Holy Ghost emptied me of self, in every form, till he hath made me poor in spirit, less than the least of all saints in my own sight? Hath he with a strong hand instructed me, to count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus as *my* Lord, and to count them but dung to win him, and be found in him, not having my own righteousness, but the righteousness which is of God by faith? Do I earnestly desire to know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings—and press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus?—What furniture of gifts hath Christ bestowed on me? what aptness to teach? what knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom? what skill to instruct others, bringing out of my treasures things new and old? what ability to make the deep things of God obvious to the weaker capacities? what proper quickness of conception? what proper inclination to study, as one devoted to matters of infinite consequence? what peculiar fitness for the pulpit, qualifying me to commend myself to every man's conscience, preaching not in the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and with power?—With what stock of self-experience, texts, and principles of inspiration, am I entering on the tremendous office? Of what truths, relative to the law of God and its threatenings; relative to sin, to Satan, and to divine desertion; hath my saddened soul felt the power, tasting the wormwood and the gall?—Of what declarations and promises of grace have I tasted, and seen that God is good? What cords of infinite love have caught and held my heart? What oracles of

* This is from the pen of the excellent Brown of Haddington; and, while peculiarly adapted to those who are named in the caption, will be found not unworthy the careful and prayerful study of the private Christian.

heaven have I found and eaten; and they have been to me the joy and the rejoicing of my heart? Of what truths, what texts, could I now say, "I believe, and therefore I speak." "What I have heard with the Father, what I have seen and heard, and tasted, and handled of the word of life, that declare I unto you."

Suppose my connexions with the great, my address to the people, should ever so easily procure a license, a charge; yet, if I run unsent of Christ, in my whole ministration I must act the part of a thief, a robber, a traitor to Christ, and a murderer of souls, not profiting them at all. If, without his commission, I enter the office, what direction, what support, what comfort, what acceptance, what reward, can I expect in and of my work? Say, then, my conscience, as thou shalt answer at the judgment-seat of God, am I taking this honour to myself; or am I called of God, as was Aaron? Is Christ sending me, and laying a necessity upon me to preach the gospel? While he determines me to follow providence, and take no irregular step towards thrusting myself into the office, is he breathing on my soul, and causing me to receive the Holy Ghost? Is he endowing me with deep compassion to the souls of men; and with a deep sense of my own unfitness, and earnest desire to be sanctified and made meet for the Master's use? In the progress of my education, am I going bound in the spirit, with the love of Christ burning in my heart, and constraining me; rendering me cheerfully willing to suffer poverty, contempt, and hatred of all men, for Christ's name's sake;—willing, if possible, to risk my own salvation in winning others to Christ? What scriptures have directed and encouraged me to this work? In what form doth Jesus seem to be giving me my commission? Whether "to open the eyes of the Gentiles, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified?" or to "Go, make the heart of this people fat, and their ears heavy, and shut their eyes?" What promise of Christ's presence with, and assistance in, my work, have I received from above?

What is mine end in my advances towards this work? Dare I appeal to him that searcheth my heart, and trieth my reins—to him who will quickly be my judge—that I seek not great things to myself; that I covet no man's silver, gold, or apparel; that I seek not theirs, but them; that neither of men seek I glory; that I look not on mine own things, but on the things of Christ; that I seek not mine own honour, but the honour of him that sends me?

Have I considered diligently what is before me; or am I running blindfold on the tremendous charge? Have I considered the nature and circumstances of the ministerial work, or that therein I am to be an ambassador for Christ, to beseech perishing souls, on the brink of hell, to be reconciled unto God?—A steward of the mysteries and manifold grace of God;—that, at the infinite hazard of my soul, it is required of me to be faithful;—that in my ministrations I with all humility, and many tears, serve the Lord with my spirit, in the gospel of his Son;—keep back no part of the counsel of God—no instruction, no reproof, no encouragement; that I testify repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ; not moved with reproach, persecution, hunger, or nakedness; nor even count my life dear unto me, if so I may finish my course with joy;—ready not only to be

bound, but to die for the name of Jesus:—willing rather to be ruined with Christ than to reign with emperors;—that I labour with much fear and trembling, determined to know, to glory in, and to make known, nothing but Christ and him crucified;—not with enticing words of man's wisdom as a man-pleaser, but with great plainness of speech, in demonstration of the Spirit and with power;—speaking the things freely given to me of God by his Spirit, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, and having the mind of Christ;—always triumphing in Christ, and making manifest the savour of his knowledge in every place; being to God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved, and in them that perish; as of sincerity, as of God in the sight of God, speaking in Christ; through the mercy of God, not fainting, but rebouncing the hidden things of dishonesty; not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by the manifestation of the truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God;—not preaching myself, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and myself a servant to the church for Jesus's sake;—always bearing about the dying of the Lord, that his life may be made manifest in me.—Knowing the terror of the Lord, and his future judgment, I must persuade men, making myself manifest to God and to their conscience;—constrained with the love of Christ, must change my voice, and turn myself every way, to bring sinners to the tree of life;—jealous over them with a godly jealousy, and espousing them as chaste virgins to Christ;—travailing in birth till Christ be formed in them;—must take heed to my ministry which I have received in the Lord, that I fulfil it;—give myself wholly to reading, exhortation, and doctrine; taking heed to myself and doctrine, that I may save myself and them that hear me;—watching for their souls as one that must give an account;—rightly dividing the word of truth, and giving every man his portion in due season;—faithfully warning every man and teaching every man and labouring to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus;—and warring, not after the flesh, nor with weapons of warfare that are carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, and casting down of imaginations, and subduing every thought and affection to the obedience of Christ. Having Christ Jesus for the end of my conversation, and holding fast the form of sound words in faith and love, which is in him.—I must go forth without the camp, bearing his reproach, and feeding the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost hath made me an *overseer*, and which God hath purchased with his own blood; preaching to the congregation sound doctrine in faith and verity;—taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being a lord over God's heritage, but as an example to the flock—exercised unto godliness; holy, just, and unblamable;—an example to the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, in purity;—fleeing youthful lusts, and following after righteousness, peace, faith, charity; avoiding foolish and unlearned questions;—not striving, but being gentle to all men;—in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves;—fleeing from perverse disputings and worldly-mindedness as most dangerous snares, and following after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness;—fighting the good fight of faith, and laying hold on eternal

life;—preaching the word in season and out of season; reproving, rebuking, exhorting, with all long-suffering and doctrine;—keeping the trust of gospel truth and office committed to me; and committing the same to faithful men, who may be able to teach others. And, in fine, to try false teachers; rebuke, before all, such as sin openly; restore such as have been overtaken in a fault, in the spirit of meekness; and, having compassion on them, to pull them out of the fire, hating the garment spotted by the flesh.

PRIVATE CHRISTIANS CALLED TO LABOUR.*

“Our land is but partially evangelized. When the Word of God shall have free course here and be glorified, there shall no longer be suffering from penury—no longer be intemperate, and licentious, and defrauding tens of thousands—no longer be so many, high in civil esteem and social worth, turning a deaf ear to the invitations of Jesus. Plainly, then, the removal of extreme poverty, of drunkenness, and sensuality, and dishonesty, and general indifference to piety, are the legitimate objects which the Gospel in our country must add to its successes, before its work will be done, and our Saviour reigns here, as he reigns above—as he *will* reign here when the millenium is come.

To do these things, we need preaching and praying indeed; but, perhaps even more than all, we need *LIVING*. And this is something *laymen must do*. Every man can do it, whether he have many talents or one talent. God needs that every man should say to his neighbour, “Know thou the Lord,” and prove (the while) by a blameless and fragrant life, that the knowledge of the Lord is a good knowledge for inward quiet and for outward use and loveliness. He needs that some merchant should daily demonstrate to other merchants, that buying and selling thrive best when shaped by the golden rule of equity; that some lawyer should prove to other lawyers that “the fear of the Lord is the beginning,” even of legal “wisdom;” that some young clerk should silently dissolve the hardness out of the heart of his employer, by so gracefully, and genially, and conscientiously, and Christianly speaking every word and doing every deed, that by comparison with the most honourable of his unregenerate fellows, it shall be as clear as the day that piety has its value here as well as in the life that is to come. God needs that some old man tottering toward the grave, and, to his own anxious sensitiveness, seemingly past use and joy, should win the soul of some daily looker-on, by showing, in all its attractive and unusual power, how “the hoary head is a crown of glory if it be found in the ways of righteousness.” God needs that some wife should allure her wandering husband back to the cross, by the manifest, light and heat of a warm and comfortable Christian heart. God needs that some daughter should touch the chords of her worldly father’s heart, as a daughter only can, and evoke from harsh and discordant strings celestial harmonies. God needs that some poor and obscure female, whom the world knows not and will never know, upon the bed of pro-

* The above, somewhat abridged, we take from the columns of the “Independent,” and ask the attention of those to whom it is addressed to its plain and true admonitions. Ministers have their field of labour; but every Christian should consider himself, and so act, as the servant of Christ.

tracted languishment, should illustrate to some single eye the power of grace to soothe the petulance, and sweeten the bitterness, and comfort the despondence, and beautify the gloom of the sick chamber. God needs some faithful, earnest, sympathizing souls to go forth, with unselfish heart, and a sense hardened to the loathsomeness of the labour, in many of its details, into the highways and by-ways, the hiding-places of sin, the fostering places of moral decay, to pour the oil and wine of Christian sympathy and alms into the wounds of the wretched who have neither home nor friend;—to show them, and the world through them, that the Gospel still contemplates an imitation of the life of its illustrious founder, in that he *went about doing good*.

God needs—no man can tell how many thousand such lay-labourers as these God needs—that even our moral and evangelical land in a single one of its cities or villages, may become his dwelling-place of righteousness. The preacher must preach all the time, indeed; and the pastor must all the time shape, as best he may, the energies of his church to the right direction; but the preacher and the pastor, gifted though he should be, like the very apostles, can never rightly and wholly take the place of these labourers. *He must do his work, and they, theirs*. If he does his only, while they neglect theirs, he is as powerless for noble and high results, as the general would be whose cavalry and infantry, by a sort of indolent and good-natured mutiny, should thwart his plans, by leaving unexecuted all his commands. God excepts nobody from his laws, excuses nobody from his vineyard; but his great precept of Christian labour includes a separate voice to every disciple. “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel unto every creature.”

If we mistake not, then, God has just as much work, and just as truly (though not as obviously) piously professional work for shoemakers and sailors, and merchants, and teachers, as for preachers; and when one accepts either of these professions as his life-business, he is no more absolved from serving God in it, and by it, every moment, than he would be if he had become a minister. He says to the one as clearly as to the other, *work while the day lasts*. “He that hath ears to hear let him hear!”

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.*

Matt. xxv. 33, 34: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

John x. 14: I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine.

1 Pet. i. 20: Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you.

Eph. ii. 8: For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.

1 John iv. 10: Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.—19: We love him, because he first loved us.

* A friend has furnished us with an extended list of Scripture proofs of this doctrine, upon which we will occasionally draw. It is well “to be put in remembrance.”

Mark xiii. 20: And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.

1 Thess. v. 9: For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ.

John vi. 39: And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.

John xvii. 12: While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled.

Eph. i. 4: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.

John x. 28: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.—27, 29: My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.

Acts iv. 28: For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.

Ps. cxxxv. 6: Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places.

Heb. xii. 14: Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

John vi. 29, 45: Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.

John ix. 23: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory.

Matt. xii. 18: Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles.

Gal. iii. 13: Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.

2 Tim. ii. 10: Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.

Titus i. 1, 2: Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness; in hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.

Luke xxii. 29: And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me.

Luke xvii. 34, 35, 36: I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

POLITICAL NECESSITY.

The following is from the pen of C. M. Clay. It occurs in a communication to the National Era, in which Mr. C. comments upon the notable proslavery speech of Daniel Webster. We commend attention to the clauses that we have italicized. Plain as their truth is, we are in no little danger,

under the compromising constitution of the country, of forgetting them. The "defence" to which he refers, is "the plea of necessity." (Ed. Cov.)

"As much as I abhor slavery; I abhor the defence more. One strikes down the liberty of the African—the other, mine. One enslaves a people—the other, the human race. The one avowedly prostrates only political rights—the other saps the foundations of morals and civil safety, also. This "political necessity" is the father of murder, of robbery, and all religious and governmental tyranny. This is the damnable doctrine upon which was built the inquisition, the star chamber, and the guillotine. No, sir; that which *is a fault in individuals, is a crime in governments.* We can guard against the danger of a single assassin, but a government is irresistible and immortal in its criminal inflections. The doctrine that *individual honesty is compatible with political profligacy, or that individual and governmental responsibility are distinct,* is one of the boldest sophisms that was ever allowed to linger among the shallow falsehoods of the past."

This "political necessity" which Mr. Clay so earnestly and so justly repudiates, is the main apology with great numbers for swearing to the constitution, voting, &c. They ask—"How, if we do not vote, can we aid in reforming what is wrong?" To such—to Mr. Clay among them—we would commend this honest and faithful condemnation of "political necessity."

THE BANNER OF THE COVENANT, AND THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

In the March number of the Banner a communication appeared on the "Inspiration of the Scriptures," which deserves a passing notice, inasmuch as it contains doctrines contrary to the established faith of the Church of Christ, and, as we believe, of highly dangerous tendency. In the outset, the acknowledgment of the authority of the Scriptures as a divine revelation, is put on the following *low* and unworthy ground:

"On entering upon a consideration of this subject we may expect difficulties, and we need not suppose that *all* of them can be removed. All we should require is to have more reasons for *receiving* the Scriptures, than for *rejecting* them. If the arguments are stronger on the one side than the other, on any question, we are bound to assent to that view which has the greater weight of evidence. If we find that there is far more reason to believe that the Bible *is* of God, than that it *is not*, can we reject it without feeling that we are doing what our understandings and consciences condemn?"

And is this all?—a mere balance of testimony? "Reasons for rejecting!" Alas for the faith of the Church, if this be its foundation. It is well enough, in our reasonings with the infidel, to show by some proposition of this kind, that his state is by no means a safe one—and his course by no means a wise one—in refusing to admit the authenticity of the Scriptures, until *every* objection is answered; but never before have we known the faith of the Church fixed upon so narrow a foundation—and one so dishonourable to the Bible: as if there were "reasons for rejecting" its claims!

But, we pass this. A more serious error claims attention. The writer denies the *verbal* inspiration of the Word of God. We quote his language:

“Inspiration, we have already stated, we consider to be essentially imbuing the mind with *divine ideas*. When we consider that the same ideas may be expressed by many different words, when we notice the great diversity of *style* in the sacred writers, corresponding so far as we can observe to their natural dispositions, when we observe that the same event is recorded by different writers, and even, when repeated by the same writer, in very different terms, the relation of words which were spoken being various, we are constrained to believe that while the divine writers were preserved from error, and overruled and guided in their choice of words by the clearness of perception which they possessed from the influence of the Spirit,—we are constrained to believe that not the *words* and *letters*, but only the *ideas* of the Bible, are inspired. And this seems to be confirmed by the fact, that there have been great corruptions and variations in the sacred text; so that if its inspiration were *verbal*, it would be almost impossible for any one to say what actually was inspired.”

On the admission of this writer, that there have been “great corruptions and variations”—corruptions, of course, that, in his view, cannot be detected—we only remark, that, in this, he has gone over bodily to the Papists! This was one of the points of controversy during the Reformation; and hence, the *Tenth* Question of Turretin, *Second* Chapter, or *Locus*, is thus stated:—“Have the originals of the Old and New Testaments come down to us pure and uncorrupted? Affirm, *against the Papists*.”

Nor do we intend to enter into any argument on the subject of the *verbal* inspiration of the Scriptures. We merely print a few extracts from standard writers, for the purpose of showing that the Banner has taken a downward step. *Turretin* says:

“God, who dictated each and every word to inspired men.”*

Ridgely discusses the subject in detail:

“Having considered that the penmen of Scripture have faithfully transmitted to us what they received by divine inspiration, we must now take notice of some things which are alleged by those who endeavour not only to depreciate, but overthrow the divine authority of the Sacred Writings, when they allege that they were only inspired, as to the substance or general idea of what they committed to writing, and were left to express the things contained therein in their own words, which, as they suppose, hath occasioned some contradictions, which they pretend to be found therein, arising from the treachery of their memories, or the unfitness of their style, to express what had been communicated to them. This they found on the difference of style observed in the various books thereof; as some are written in an elegant and lofty style, others clouded with mystical and dark expressions; some are more plain, others are laid down in an argumentative way; all which differing ways of speaking they suppose agreeable to the character of the inspired writers thereof: so that, though the matter contains in it something divine, the words and phrases, in which it is delivered, can hardly be reckoned so.”†

“*Ans.* If this account of Scripture be true, it would hardly deserve to be called the Word of God; therefore, that we may vindicate it from this aspersion, let it be considered,

“1. As to the different styles observed in the various books thereof, it does not follow from hence, that the penmen were left to deliver what they re-

* *Loc. II., Quest. V., § 7.*

† We do not design to charge the Banner with denying, for *all* these reasons, a verbal inspiration; but we cannot abridge, without spoiling the quotation; and, besides, we think *Ridgely's* opponents only carried out their principle to its results.

ceived, in their own words; for certainly it was no difficult matter for the Spirit of God to furnish the writers thereof with words, as well as matter, and to inspire them to write in a style agreeable to what they used in other cases, whereby they might better understand and communicate the sense thereof to those to whom it was first given; as if a person should send a message by a child, it is an easy matter to put such words into his mouth as are agreeable to his common way of speaking, without leaving the matter to him to express it in his own words: thus the inspired writers might be furnished with words by the Holy Ghost, adapted to that style which they commonly used, without supposing they were left to themselves to clothe the general ideas with their own words.*

Dick also enters at some length into the examination of this subject:

“There remains a question which has engaged a considerable share of attention, Whether inspiration is to be understood as extending to the language as well as to the sentiments? In answering this question, it is necessary to distinguish one part of Scripture from another. In those parts which are delivered in the name of God, which are commands, messages, and communications from him, we cannot suppose that the writers were left to choose their own words, but are necessarily led to conceive them to have adhered with equal strictness to the words as to the thoughts. This must have been the case when they announced heavenly mysteries and new doctrines, of which they could have had no conception, unless the words had been suggested to them; and when they delivered predictions which they did not understand; for it is plain that here the inspiration consisted solely in presenting the words to their minds. They were much in the same situation with a person who sets down a passage in an unknown tongue, at the dictation of another. And that they did not always understand their own prophecies, is obvious from the words of Peter, who represents them as studying them, and trying to discover their meaning,—‘searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.’ 1 Pet. i. 11. Thus far, I do not see upon what ground it can be denied that inspiration extended to the words.”

“With regard to other parts of Scripture, consisting of histories, moral reflections, and devotional pieces, I would not contend for the inspiration of the language in the same sense. It is reasonable to believe that the writers were permitted to exercise their own faculties to a certain extent, and to express themselves in a natural manner. At the same time, when we consider the promise of Christ to his disciples, that when they were brought before kings and governors for his sake, it should be given them in that hour what they should speak, (Matt. x. 19,) and recollect the affirmation of Paul that he and the other apostles used not the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost taught, (1 Cor. ii. 13,) we cannot suppose that, when they were most at liberty, they were in no degree directed by a secret influence in the selection of words and phrases. It was of the utmost importance, that the facts and observations which God intended for the instruction of mankind in all ages, should be properly expressed; and there was a danger that errors would be committed by such persons as the penmen of the Scriptures, the greater part of whom were illiterate, and ignorant of the art of composition. If we had nothing to depend upon but their own skill and attention, we could have no certainty that the statements are always accurate, and our piety would be frequently disturbed by the suspicion, that what is only a difficulty might be a mistake.”†

* Vol. I., pp. 110, 111.

† Theol., p. 62. We would have quoted more largely, but this work is accessible to most of our readers.

We might quote other writers; our purpose, however, is answered. The Banner has need to revise its doctrines and its teachings on this subject, if it would find itself again on the Church's platform. These are not times to tamper with these fundamental principles. Those who do, will soon reap bitter fruits.

NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY AND THE TRINITY.

The Independent, the organ of the Congregationalists in the city of New York, edited by New England men, in commenting upon the case of Dr. Bushnell, who has published some novel, and, as generally thought, heterodox doctrines on the subject of the Trinity, uses the following language. It is in reply to Dr. Tyler, Professor in the Old School Seminary at East Hartford:

"As to Dr. Tyler's most confident assertion that Dr. Bushnell's book contains fundamental error, we do not intend to be drawn into any dispute with him. We will only say that if Dr. Tyler himself holds the doctrine of the Trinity in manner and form as defined in the Nicene and Athanasian symbols, and in the *Westminster and Larger Catechism*, he holds a doctrine which the prevalent theology of New England has rejected as unscriptural and absurd."

Can this be so? We were aware that many of the New England theologians are greatly in error in reference to the Eternal Sonship of Christ; but, except the Unitarians, of course, we hoped they were untainted in regard to the proper Divinity and Personality of all the Persons in the Godhead.

MEANING OF THE TERM SERVANT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The following extract from Bishop Potter's great work, "The Antiquities of Greece," which was first published in the year 1697, may help to a more intelligent reading of many passages in the New Testament:

"Slaves, as long as they were under the government of a master, were called *Oiketai*; but after their freedom was granted them, they were *Douloi*, not being, like the former, a part of the master's estate, but only obliged to some grateful acknowledgments, and small services, (Chrysippus de Concordia, lib. ii.) such as were required of the *Metoikoi*, to whom they were in some few things inferior; but seldom arrived at the dignity of citizens, especially if they had received their freedom from a private person, and not upon a public account; for such as were advanced for public services, seem to have lived in great repute, and enjoyed a larger share of liberty than those that had only merited their freedom by the obligations they had laid upon particular persons."—*Potter's Antiquities of Greece*, vol. i., p. 78, Edinburgh Edition—1813.

This testimony is the more valuable as it is the conviction to which the author had arrived after a calm and patient investigation of ancient authorities. He had no temptation when he wrote either to favour or retard the cause of emancipation. One hundred and fifty years ago the whole of England believed that it was right and proper to hold men in slavery. The venerable bishop is simply aiming at the true meaning of the Greek word *Doulos*—and in the above extract he has given his decision.

Oiketes is only used four times in the New Testament: Luke xvi. 13; Acts x. 7; Rom. xiv. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 18.

Doulos is used in the New Testament one hundred and seventeen times.

Apply this word as Bishop Pötter affirms it was used by the ancient Greeks, and it will elucidate Paul's Epistle to Philemon concerning Onesimus, v. 16: "Not now as a *doulos* (who at most was not a part of the master's estate, but only obliged to some grateful acknowledgments and small services) but above a *doulos*, a brother beloved."—*N. Y. Independent*.

PRESBYTERY OF THE LAKES.

The Presbytery of the Lakes held its last meeting at Miami, April 22. All the ministerial members were present, and elders from nearly all the congregations. The sessions were protracted. A great amount of business was transacted; much of a local character. A call from the congregation of Cedar Lake upon Mr. John French was presented, and by him accepted. His ordination is to take place the fourth Monday of September. The candidate for ordination was assigned as trials: Lecture, Isa. xlii. 1—4; popular sermon, Isa. viii. 12, first clause. Rev. J. Dodds was appointed to preach the ordination sermon, Rev. James Neill his alternate. Rev. J. C. Boyd to deliver the charge to the pastor, and Rev. A. M'Farland the charge to the people.

Candidates for license, N. R. Johnston and James M. M'Donald, delivered their remaining pieces of trials, and, after the usual course of examination, were licensed to preach the everlasting gospel.

James R. Thompson, student of theology from N. Y. Presbytery, was, on certificate, allowed to deliver pieces of trial before Presbytery this meeting and next.

A. Montgomery was taken under the care of Presbytery as a literary and theological student.

James R. Sloane was also received as a theological student. Wm. F. George, Boyd M'Cullough, and Robert Reid, students of theology from Pittsburgh Presbytery, were, on certificate, received under the care of Presbytery; and the certified action of the Pittsburgh Presbytery, in their case, was approved.

J. C. K. Milligan, J. S. T. Milligan, J. M. Armour, D. Shaw, A. Montgomery, B. M'Cullough, and James R. Thompson, delivered pieces of trial, all of which were sustained as highly satisfactory.

The following pieces of trial were assigned students of theology: William F. George, candidate for license, for an exercise and addition, Gen. vi. 5—8; lecture, Phil. ii. 1—4; historical essay, 70 years of the Babylonish captivity.

J. C. K. Milligan, Jude 1—4. R. Reid, John i. 1—5. J. S. T. Milligan, John i. 14, first clause. J. M. Armour, Rom. v. 18, first clause. D. Shaw, Eph. i. 4. A. Montgomery, John xiii. 13. B. M'Cullough, John vi. 33. James R. Thompson, Gen. iii. 15, last clause. James R. Sloane, Eccl. xii. 13.

The following scale of appointments was made:

1. James M. M'Donald, first Sabbath in May, Xenia; second Sabbath in May, Cincinnati; then, at his own request, to be certified to Illinois Presbytery.

2. N. R. Johnston, first, second, and third Sabbaths in May at his own disposal; fourth Sabbath in May, and first Sabbath in June, Macedonia; second Sabbath in June, Cincinnati; third Sabbath in June, Xenia; fourth and fifth Sabbaths in June, Cincinnati; thence till the third Sab-

bath in August at his own disposal; third and fourth Sabbaths in August, Cincinnati; first and second Sabbaths in September, Xenia; third Sabbath in September, Macedon.

3. J. French, one Sabbath at Walnut; first and second Sabbaths in August, Macedon; and stated supply at Cedar Lake and Lake Elizabeth till the next meeting of Presbytery.

4. A. M. Farland, two Sabbaths at Lake Elizabeth in the month of June; and, with Adam Duguid, elder from Cedar Lake, to hold a session to regulate affairs there.

5. J. B. Johnston, with an elder or elders, to ordain elders, and organize a congregation at Xenia in the month of June.

6. James Neill, first Sabbath at Flint, and first Sabbath at White Lake.

The connexion of the Presbytery with "Geneva Hall," was dissolved; and the affairs of the institution left with the fiscal board. The following presbyterial visitations were appointed to be performed before the next spring meeting of Presbytery:—

A. M. Farland, with an elder, to visit Brush Creek congregation.

J. C. Boyd, with an elder, to visit Utica congregation.

R. Hutcheson, with an elder, to visit Jonathan's Creek congregation.

J. B. Johnston, with an elder, to visit Smithfield congregation.

J. Dodds, with an elder, to visit Cincinnati congregation.

R. Hutcheson and J. B. Johnston, with two elders, to visit Beech Woods and Garrison congregation.

Presbytery adjourned to meet at Cedar Lake, fourth Monday of September next, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

By order of Presbytery,

J. C. BOYD, *Clerk.*

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Sandwich Islands.—The mission establishment on one of these islands—Kohala—has been visited with a heavy stroke; their church and school-houses have been destroyed by a hurricane, and the population has been thinned by disease. The missionaries are desponding. One of them writes:

"The prospect never looked so dark to me as it does to-day. My tour saddened me, for disease and death reign among us. Sickness follows hard upon sickness, as it has done the entire year, so that all we have done has not actually enabled us to retain our own. Besides, great numbers of our people have left, and are leaving as fast as they can, for Oahu and Lahaina, and hence the dark prospect. The children dying; the teachers dying; schools thinning off before your eyes; the people sick, sick! Oh, my heart aches; and were it not that I had vowed to the Lord to be His and do His work, wherever sent, I would leave Kohala ere the new year should shed its light upon us.

"Every thing about the Hawaiian race seems fated to speedy and unavoidable destruction. The mildew of death has seized upon every thing."

From other districts accounts are more encouraging. In one congregation in Honolulu two hundred and three new members were admitted in October last.

Turkey.—Diplomatic relations have been resumed between Turkey and the Russian and Austrian empires. For the present, therefore, the storm has blown over, and the Ottoman enjoys another reprieve.

The gospel is still freely preached among the Greeks and Armenians, and makes some progress.

Germany.—We have endeavoured in our late numbers to furnish our readers with authentic information in regard to the religious condition of central Europe. We now add, from the North British Review, a more detailed account than any we have before seen, of the characteristic features of the various classes of German theologians. The extract is rather long for our pages, but cannot be abridged:

“We would divide, then, the whole of the German theologians of our day, including those lately deceased, into three classes, which we may call the Left, the Middle, and the Right. Among the Left we rank the *Deistic* rationalists, whose leaders were such theologians as Bretschneider and Paulus, now becoming rare and unimportant; and supplanted by popular chiefs such as Uhlich and other champions of the Friends of Light and the German Catholics; and the new school of *Pantheistic* rationalists, whose principal support is in the Hegelian philosophy, still widely diffused through all Germany, though long past its zenith; whose literary stronghold is the University of Tübingen, the seat of Baur, the Coryphæus of the party, and the *alma mater* of Strauss, its finished type, in all but hypocrisy; and whose boast is to exalt Christianity to the sublimity of speculation, as that of the deistic rationalism is to bring it down to the level of vulgar comprehension. Of both these modifications of doctrine, rationalism is the proper name, since reason, the lower and the higher, is all-in-all; and the Bible is at once its product and its subject of criticism.

“At the opposite extremity from this party stands the Right, whose watchword is adherence to the symbolical books, for the most part the Lutheran, (for it is a curious fact that orthodoxy has preserved itself better in the Lutheran than in the Reformed section of Protestantism,) and who, after a dreary night, and the breaking of a cloudy and dark day, if indeed the day be come, are again laying open to view the Augsburg formularies, and demanding unconditional subscription to them as the law of the Church. With this party the orthodox in this country have of course most sympathy, and it deserves all honour for its intrepid protest for the common faith. But it is not without its faults, among which may be mentioned an undue exaltation of Lutheran peculiarities, so as even to imperil the union with the reformed in Prussia; a certain sectarian harshness which refuses to look genially upon the manifold Christian phenomena beyond its own camp; an unwillingness to conform in tone, if not in doctrine, to the prevailing style of philosophy, and thus to become all things to all men; and what is not the least lamentable, a blind Church and King conservatism, which has exposed it to the merciless blasts of democratic fury in the late commotions.

“We next turn to the great Middle party, which, like all composite formations, is most difficult to describe. The other schools have each one principle—the one, Reason—the other, the Bible. This has two, the Bible, and Christian consciousness. This great body may be said to owe its foundation to the extraordinary though erratic genius and fervent piety of Schleiermacher. He had no sympathy with dogmatic Christianity in its confessional form, and was willing to surrender much of it to the lower rationalists; on the other hand, he wanted to retain what he considered its essence, the personal glory of Christ as the Word made flesh, and his office as the Redeemer of the world; and despairing of reaching this with the higher rationalists by speculative deduction, he made it an immediate datum of Christian consciousness, furnished and guaranteed by pious feeling, and that feeling awakened by Christ in the Word, and Christ in the Church. He thus equally refused to accept the moral religion of Kante and Fichte, and to excogitate for himself a logical religion like Hegel; but took his stand upon traditional Christianity as a fact, with liberty, however, to deal with its most sacred documents according to critical rules; and to mould and fashion all its doctrines in accordance with the above-named central principle,—the validity, importance, and mutual relations of all to each and of each to all, being decided upon by that inward oracle, Christian consciousness.

“There are two groups of theologians still to be provided for; and we cannot do better than adjust them to the meridian of Schleiermacher thus ascertained. The first is intermediate between the Left and the Middle party, though with a greater approach to the latter, and contains such names as Hase, De Wette, Ewald, and

others, who adhere in the main to the theology of feeling, but with even less positive and satisfactory results than Schleiermacher himself—not to speak of his more progressive disciples. The second lies somewhere between the Middle party and the Right, though with a greater leaning to the Right. On them the influence of Schleiermacher is visible, though it is not predominant, and is even opposed and overmastered by powerful sympathies that link them to the orthodox Church system. It is somewhere in this quarter that we fix such names as Harless, the author of "Christian Ethics," and of the "Commentary on the Ephesians;" Tholuck, who is of living German theologians the best known and most influential in this country; and with more confidence than either, because a more decided and intrepid thinker, do we assign to this place Julius Müller. In him we see the more speculative element, which in spite of its professions to the contrary, has always appeared in the believing theology, tending to reconcile itself with the dogmatic products of past ages, and to build up out of the data of Bible interpretation, no longer overruled, but only counter-checked by Christian consciousness, a system which may harmonize with the philosophic spirit of the present day."

It is gratifying to know that of all these classes, the best are growing in numbers and in influence. Rationalism—the despotism of Reason—is on the wane; and great as is the darkness, light has begun to dawn upon Germany. As to politics, there is much ill-feeling between Prussia and Austria, and the settlement of the question as to which shall be the leading German power is as distant as ever.

Italy. 1. *Rome.*—The Pope has returned to Rome. He was duly installed in the Vatican on the 12th of April, amid the acclamations—so it is said—of thousands of his subjects. Great precautions are taken to guard against his assassination. On the day of his entry the republicans posted in public localities a vehement protest against his authority: and the impression is general, not only in Italy, but in France and Austria, and even in the courts of those countries, that the power of the cardinals must be, if not abolished, greatly restricted. Vigorous and wisely conducted efforts are making for the diffusion of the gospel. The following occurs among the proceedings of the American and Foreign Christian Union:

"Italians, who have renounced the Papacy, are ready to engage in this work; and, in almost every town of Italy, are now employed in the distribution of fly-sheets assailing the Papal system with facts, history, argument, and apt quotations of Scripture, which produce a powerful impression on the masses of the people. Already the cities of Italy are thoroughly indoctrinated with anti-Papal sentiments; and her leading patriots are convinced that the country can be emancipated only by a thorough religious reformation. Now is emphatically the seed-time for truth in Italy. The door is widely opened; the agencies are already in existence; the system of colportage or propaganism is thoroughly organized, and gratuitously furnished to our hand, and is under the supervision of faithful men."

In confirmation of the statement respecting the views of the leading Italian patriots, we present a brief extract from a letter addressed to the priests by Mazzini, the prime actor in the Roman revolution:

"For a long time, a divorce has existed between the Catholic church and humanity. This divorce is most fatal; since, without Christianity, no state of society founded upon brotherly love and charity can exist; without Christianity, there can be neither peace nor true liberty; without Christianity, our corrupt nature will always resist every important reformation, and we shall have neither a country, nor any thing whatever that is good. Besides, it is absolutely necessary to re-link earth to

heaven—to re-establish harmony between this world and eternity—between man and God, the Father and Instructor of all men.

“What are the demands of the people? Nationality, freedom, the general good of all mankind. Liberty of speech and of conscience. Protection of just laws, instead of the arbitrary caprice of a usurpation. We will select our own rulers from the most conspicuous for their virtues and intelligence. We will have education for all. Food for the mind—bread for the body. ‘That the will of God be done on earth as it is in heaven.’”

Sardinia.—The anti-jesuit enactments of the Sardinian legislature, mentioned in our last number, have awakened the ire of the priesthood and of the papal court. Protests have been entered against them, but, we venture to prophesy, in vain. Sardinia is awake to the evils of Jesuitism, and, as a further demonstration of the fact, greater liberties have been granted than heretofore to the Waldenses.

England.—1. *Political.* The Russell cabinet is in danger. The opposition have lately succeeded in defeating the government in some points, of minor moment, indeed, but sufficient to indicate that it has lost much of the confidence of a large portion of its supporters. The establishment of a tory ministry would be the signal for a more earnest agitation on behalf of the people, than even the anti-corn-law league. If we do not greatly mistake, Britain is on the wane. She is rapidly losing the advantages of skill and capital which have hitherto given her the command of the markets of the world. Her population, loaded with debt, and, drained by the exactions of the landlord interest, will soon find themselves unable to contend with the comparatively untaxed labour of other nations. When that time arrives, she must repudiate, remodel her social arrangements, or sink.

2. *Religious.*—The decision of the privy council in the Gorham case has aroused the indignation of the Puseyites. The Bishop of Exeter refused to obey the order of the council, and appealed to the court of Queen’s Bench. The decision was against him. He and his friends are now endeavouring to revive the Convocation, which has not met since the reign of Anne. What they demand is, and so far they are right, that the church should decide in all questions relating to the faith of the church. It is apprehended, or hoped, that the effect of the decision will be a rupture in the establishment.

France.—The election in Paris has resulted in favour of the Socialists. Eugene Sue, a vehement opponent of the Jesuits, has been elected by a majority of 8000, one-half of the army voting for him. The Monarchists are discouraged—the Republicans find themselves in a strong position. As to religious matters, we have nothing new except that the anniversaries of the benevolent societies have passed off peaceably, and that their reports are encouraging.

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

Congress.—The question of Slavery still hangs in Congress. Mr. Clay is chairman of a committee of thirteen, and has reported to the Senate a series of resolutions designed to effect a settlement of the entire points in controversy—admit California—establish government in the territories, without the Wilmot Proviso—give Texas a part of New

Mexico, and pay her for surrendering the rest—abolish the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, and enact a law to facilitate the recapture of fugitive slaves. This is the scheme. It is called a compromise, but in fact it surrenders all to the South. Its passage is doubtful. The ultra southern men are against it; and, of course, the friends of freedom in the North. Still, we have fears. We have no faith in politicians.

Temperance.—The following is from the report of the American Temperance Union. So far as our observation extends, intemperance does not seem to be on the decrease.

“Ministerial and religious action has been greater and better than usual. The risings and upheavings of society against the monster evil, the traffic, especially in its legalized forms, have done much to break its power. In Vermont has been a glorious victory, in a vote of the people. In Massachusetts the popular branch of the legislature have framed, by an overwhelming majority, a most stringent statute. Not a county in the State now grants license. The report of the New York legislature is a document which should find a place in every family, and must prepare the people for bold and decisive action. At the West is a general rising of the friends of the cause. The Wisconsin law has been made even more stringent by the legislature, and is affording good protection to the people.”

Anniversaries.—The reports of the various benevolent societies are more favourable this Spring than usual. Their receipts have been larger than last year.

The Season.—The Spring has been tardy, but the prospect of an abundant harvest of grain and fruits is very good. Cholera has reappeared on the Mississippi, and has entered St. Louis. It prevails mostly among the late emigrants.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

CARDIPHONIA; or Utterances of the Heart in the Course of a Real Correspondence. By the Rev. John Newton. 12mo., pp. 494. *Presbyterian Board of Publication.* Philadelphia: 1849.

This is a good reprint of an excellent work, the letters of John Newton, addressed to correspondents in different circumstances, and most happily combining instruction, consolation, encouragement, and reproof: the whole forming a volume full of interest, characterized by singular Christian simplicity and integrity. The introductory essay by Dr. Russell is appropriate and judicious. The work is adorned with a portrait.

THE CHRISTIAN'S DAILY WALK in Security and Peace. By Henry Scudder. 12mo., pp. 342. *Presbyterian Board of Publication.* Philadelphia.

An eminently practical volume, in which the conscientious reader will find many seasonable counsels, well expressed by an old writer of the seventeenth century, as suitable now as when first written. It discusses such subjects as these:—Beginning the day with God—Walking with God during the progress of the day—Religious fasting—Of the Lord's Day—Walking with God alone—Keeping company—Rules for our conduct in prosperity—Directions for walking with God in adversity—Of uprightness—Of lawful care and freedom from care—False fears—Means to attain the favour of God. These topics are discussed

with all that soundness in the faith, and comprehensive and enlarged experience which distinguished the theologians of the reforming period. We cannot commend it too highly.

CONVERSE WITH GOD in Desertion and Solitude. By Rev. Richard Baxter. 18mo., pp. 143. *Presbyterian Board of Publication*. Philadelphia.

What more important than the subject of this work? and what more needed in Laodicean and worldly times than such a treatise? It is especially addressed to the afflicted—to those who have learned by bitter experience how uncertain and unsatisfactory is dependence upon even attached friends. The forsaken and the lonely will find in the perusal of this volume rich fountains of comfort opened to them.

We find upon our table an excellent collection of small volumes and tracts, issued by the Presbyterian Board—some of them instructing narratives, others containing useful directions—most of them adapted to the young, but not unworthy of the notice of the adult reader. Plain Thoughts about Great and Good Things—The African Preacher, a sketch of an unlettered but remarkable man, who from his conversion to his death laboured in the ministry with no little *unction* and success—The Bedfordshire Tinker, or the History of John Bunyan—Africaner, or Missionary Trials—The Little Jewess—The Saint and the Sinner—Mr. Moffat and the Bechuanas, and the Little Hindoo Boy—The Story of the Samaritans—The Bechuana Girls—Heathen Sacrifices, the Hindoo Girl, and Little George—Scripture Lessons in Verse—The Terror by Night—The Moravian Missionaries, Old Jessie, and Sin Found Out—and Jejana, or the Converted Hottentot. All these should find a place in congregational libraries.

REPORT of the Inspectors of the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania for 1849. 8vo. Pp. 49.

We have looked through this report with interest. It shows conclusively that the solitary system of confinement, with labour, so far from being injurious either to the health or mental soundness of the prisoner, is in most cases conducive to the restoration of the former when broken down previously by vice, and altogether consistent with the preservation of the latter. We have been particularly interested in the report of the Moral Instructor—Rev. A. W. Black. His plan is as follows:

“The *moral instruction* which it is my duty to communicate, embraces the preaching of the gospel, and personal visitation among the prisoners. On each Sabbath throughout the year, and also on the days recommended by the public authorities, to be observed in religious exercises, the gospel of our Lord and Saviour has been preached to all the prisoners. The service is always accompanied with singing divine praise, in which the prisoners generally are heard to join. The glad tidings of salvation have been uniformly heard with respect, and in many cases, it is believed, with spiritual advantage. It has been made a general rule to visit, in regular course, the whole of the prisoners twice in each month—passing from cell to cell, entering each one and conversing with its occupant, as a friend and religious teacher, requires time as well as patience. It is in this way mainly, that the poor and degraded convict is made to feel that for him—a returning and sincere penitent, society has kindness and sympathy. In addition to this, I visit each prisoner every two weeks, for the purpose of changing his books received from the library; thus the opportunity is afforded to speak a word with them on the subject matter of their reading. Besides, all the prisoners who are seriously

ill, and such as cannot read, are visited almost daily—each prisoner is also visited when he writes, or has me to write for him, a letter to friend or relation.”

The results of these efforts are thus summed up:

“Fifty-four have been discharged by expiration of sentence, and fifteen by pardon. All of these were able to read, and most of them to write, when they left the prison. The majority gave encouraging evidence of their future good conduct. They had all received enough of moral teaching to keep them in the path of rectitude, if they felt disposed to walk in it. Most of them too had learned trades, by which they could make for themselves an honest and comfortable living. Letters, some of which the Inspectors have seen, have been received from many of them, giving evidence that the lessons they learned in a prison-house are profiting them in the walks of social life. There are, also, living in and about this city, discharged convicts, known to the officers of this prison, who are industrious and honest in their habits of life, and respected members of God’s church.”

CONVERSATIONS of a Father with his Children. First and Second Series. 18mo., cloth. Pp. 180. *Presbyterian Board of Publication.*

The design of these little volumes is excellent—it is to instruct children to notice and understand common things, works of nature and art. The plan is well carried out. The conversations are short, diversified with anecdotes, and pervaded with sound religious sentiment. Assured as we are that a taste for reading is one of the best aids to family discipline, and absolutely indispensable to any real progress in learning, we look with great favour upon every effort to *interest* youth in acquiring knowledge. We recommend these volumes.

THE PSALMS OF DAVID in Metre, with Verbal Amendments, by H. Connelly, A. M., Minister of the Gospel, and Principal of Seminary Hill Academy, Newburgh, N. Y.

We have doubts of the wisdom, at the present day, of any attempt to amend the metrical version of the Psalms of the Bible by any individual. It is extremely unlikely that even emendations could, under such circumstances, meet with general acceptance. Perhaps we might go further, and express a doubt of the propriety of these attempts. We know that the Church of Scotland, which is by no means an unsafe guide in such matters, revised the book which we now use with great care before authorizing its publication. On another point we have no difficulty in expressing an opinion, and we think we have a right to do it: it strikes us as altogether out of the usual course to take out a copy-right for works of *this* kind: merely making some verbal amendments in a standard manual of praise.

In regard to the merits of the work itself, we hardly feel free to speak. We confess, however, that not a few of the changes do not appear to us to be emendations. In some cases we do, indeed, recognise some improvement; but so far as we have examined—though this is not very far—the exceptions seem to us to be the rule in this case. The last line of Psalm ii. 5, which reads in the common version:

“In rage he vex them shall,”

Mr. C. has altered in this way—

“In anger fierce them chide.”

Now, the original does not signify “to chide” at all: it means to “terrify,” to “confound,” to “vex,” to “trouble.” The last three lines of Psalm iii. 7, we read thus:

“For thou my foes hast struck
All on the cheek-bone; and the teeth
Of wicked men hast broke.”

Now, though the rhyme is not perfect, this is better than

“For thou, with mighty stroke,
Smot'st, on the cheek-bone, all my foes;
The wicked's teeth hast broke.”

In the same Psalm, v. 8, instead of

“Salvation *ever* doth belong,”

which Mr. C. gives us, we would have preferred, if an alteration is to be made—

“Salvation *all* doth appertain.”

The third line of Psalm iv. 7, Mr. C. changes from—

“Than they; even then when corn and wine,”

To

“Than they in times;” &c.

Now, we *much* prefer the former; it is more true to the idea of the original, and far more spirited.

Psalm xviii. 33, Mr. C. has modified thus:

“He made my feet swift as the hind's,
Set me on places high;
Mine hands taught war, mine arms have made
Steel bows in pieces fly.”

Now, we are willing to encounter the difficulty of singing two syllables to one note, rather than lose our own highly picturesque and most spirited version:

“He made my feet swift as the hind's,
Set me on my high places;
Mine hands to war he taught; mine arms
Broke bows of steel in pieces.”

We cheerfully admit an improvement upon that *versed* verse—Psalm xviii. 26. We conclude by saying, in all candour, that we cannot recommend these changes as generally improvements: at the same time appreciating Mr. Connelly's intentions. One sentence in his preface, we would much desire to be retracted. We refer to the statement that “in 1 John ii. 23—‘But he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also,’ are words having no Greek answering to them.” Mr. C. must have made this assertion upon no other ground than the fact that in our translation they are printed in italics. They are a part of the received text, and retained by many critics; although their authenticity has been doubted by others—which our translators have probably intimated was the case with themselves, by printing them in italics: Griesbach rejects them.

REVIEW of Webster's Speech on Slavery. By Wendell Phillips. 12mo., pp. 44. Boston: 1850.

This is one of the most satisfactory reviews we have seen of the remarkable speech of the Massachusetts senator—remarkable for its recreancy to the principles of human liberty, and to all the author's former professions. Mr. Phillips has done ample justice to his work in that style of conclusive argument, and polished satire, which render him one of the most effective of this class of the opponents of slavery. The following passages—the first relating to the surrender of fugitive slaves, the second to the fear of disunion—are eminently true and seasonable:

“The only point in this part of the speech that interests us, is the un-ut-

terable baseness of the slave hunt pledge. It is indeed true, as we have always argued, that all who swear to support the Constitution are bound not only to submit to the return of fugitive slaves, but to aid in it, if necessary. All honour to Mr. Webster's consistency on this point; and as he exhibits none on any other, and very little here, we are the more scrupulous to pay him his due credit, to the uttermost farthing. The difference of conduct of different men on this point of surrendering fugitive slaves has been quite remarkable. Some, with Adams and Channing, cut the Gordian knot, by frankly declaring that, though sworn to the Constitution, *this* they will not do; a course defensible neither in a court of law, nor one of morals. Others, with Giddings and his friends, evade the question, and, while admitting the general constitutional obligation, are very shy of telling us what they themselves would do in the matter. Thanks to Mr. Webster for his plain, unvarnished villany. Villain, gentle reader, is none too harsh a name for a man who professes his readiness to return fugitive slaves. Our glorious old tongue was made for use, not to be laid up in dictionaries. It is rich, indeed, in its capacity for rebuking sin; but, alas! the Saxon race far outdoes it in its capacity for sinning."

"In relation to Mr. Webster's melancholy picture of the terrible effects of 'secession,' we take the liberty of telling him that there are sadder sights than that of 'spheres and heavenly bodies jostling against each other in the realms of space,' 'of a great Constitution melting away under the influence of a vernal sun,' or even of 'a two-fold war.'" Such sights are twenty millions of people, professedly Christian and republican, of whom their oldest and ablest statesman leaves it as his last word, that '*slave-holding, slave-breeding, and slave-trading, form the whole foundation of the policy of their government:*' a war like that against Mexico to extend the accursed system: a speech like his own, volunteering to head the forty thousand underlings of such a government in their hunting of fugitive slaves: three millions of unhappy men and women compelled to be vile, to live in promiscuous concubinage, reduced to the level of brutes. 'I looked, and there was none to help;' for those mighty intellects which God had given as leaders of their age, were either cajoled by the promises or awed by the threats of wicked men, prostituting their gifts 'to make the worse appear the better reason;' grinding voluntarily and gladly in the mills of the Philistines. Compared with such scenes, mere common wars are brave and noble games. What can be a sadder sight, or a greater evil, than beings whom God intended to be great, becoming panders to the lowest vices of others? Nothing, except a nation contented to be led by such. Welcome any storm that is *necessary* to destroy the seeds of such a pestilence!"

ADDRESS to the Students of Divinity in the Theological Hall, Paisley, at the close of the Session of 1848. By the Rev. Peter Macindoe, D. D. 12mo., pp. 12. Ayr: 1849.

We had the happiness of being present on the occasion when this address was delivered. It was the author's aim to impress upon the minds of his youthful auditors the high end of their ministerial calling, and to incite them to arduous and sustained efforts to fit themselves for the discharge of its responsible duties. This is done in that neat and well-balanced style which distinguishes Dr. M.'s compositions.

THE CHURCH AND THE NEW AGE: a Sermon, by William Wilson, A. M., Pastor of the Church of the Covenanters in the City of Cincinnati. 8vo., pp. 76. Cincinnati: 1850.

This is a large pamphlet—of course the sermon is a long one; and, certainly, it contains a great body of truth. Still, we cannot sympathize with its general drift, or agree, by any means, with all its reasonings. This is no "new age" in such a sense as to call for any new modifications of a religious profession. It is as important now as ever

it was that the faithful should hold on to the Word of God, and maintain the entire system of divine truth. If the age is to be reformed, it is not by merging differences. The following is true, and well expressed:

“The electors of a nation exercise a vast ruling power. They rule *out*, by their suffrages, those whom they deem unworthy; and they rule *in* those whom they consider eligible. They, also, are responsible to Christ, for exercising their privileges and power in conformity with his law, with a distinct reference to his glory, and to the glory of the Church. Hence it is of the utmost moment that they be enlightened and Christian men: and that they do not leave their character behind them, when they enter the political arena. They identify with their representatives, and are responsible for the acts of the men whom they elevate to power. How mighty their influence, whether it be cast for good or for evil! If they “exalt vile men, the wicked will walk on every side.” But, on the other hand, if they cast their votes for the virtuous, and for virtue, and against every form of oppression, intemperance, haunts of vice and dissipation, and whatsoever is contrary to the law of God, as it bears upon the Civil State, which is the rule of their conduct, the nation will prosper in all its departments, under his auspices, and the Church be the glory in its midst. Their seeing her glory, not with the eye of sense merely, but chiefly with the eyes of faith and reason devoutly fixed upon it, will contribute to all these ends; and the prosecution of these ends will, in turn, redound to the increase of this glory.”

Obituary.

DIED, of pulmonary affection, Miss ELIZABETH JAMIESON, daughter of Mr. James Jamieson, Newburgh.

This young lady, whose departure her friends have now occasion to mourn, was born 9th March, 1810, in the parish of Donegore, county Antrim, Ireland. In 1824, she, together with other members of the family, emigrated to the United States, America, and settled in the village of Newburgh. Early did she manifest to Christ Jesus and to his cause a strong attachment. She was, indeed, a fearer of the Lord from her very youth. When advanced to years of maturity she connected herself with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, then under the pastoral charge of the Rev. J. R. Johnstone. From that period, indeed from her early childhood, her walk and conversation were such as became a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus. Religion, with her, was not, what it is to be feared it is with many, a mere formal, lifeless thing. Her heart was under the influence of the gospel. Her conversation breathed its spirit. Her deportment, whether in the more private or the more public walks of life, was always such as became her holy profession. When called to endure affliction, she manifested a spirit of true Christian resignation. Though her sufferings were great and lengthened, yet not a repining voice was heard, not a murmuring cry was uttered. As her days drew nearer and nearer their earthly termination, her sufferings increased. But, as natural strength grew weaker, spiritual strength seemed to get stronger,—as the body decreased, faith increased. In reply to an interrogation in reference to the state of her soul, her answer was—Christ Jesus was her only hope and expectation; “for I know,” exclaimed she, in the language of assurance, “that my Redeemer liveth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.” Then, she, as if in communion with her soul, said—“Why art thou, then, cast down, my soul? What should discourage thee? Still hope in God:

‘For him to praise good cause I yet shall have.’”

As she approached her last, her sufferings became more and more intense: patiently, however, did she await the Lord’s time, who, in his Divine Providence, was pleased to call her home at 4 o’clock on the morning of May 1st, 1850.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THE COVENANTER.

JULY, 1850.

THE LORD'S DAY, THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

“Offences must come, that they which are approved may be made manifest.” One end to be accomplished by the permission of error, is the trial of man’s faith, and the establishment of that of the truly and intelligently faithful. In this way, controversy more than compensates for any labour and anxiety to which it subjects the friends of truth. Among the topics of discussion at the present time, the claims of the Christian Sabbath occupy a justly pre-eminent place. The question has become, in all those countries with which we are most closely connected, a matter of no secondary practical moment, inasmuch as both here and in Great Britain, the friends and the enemies of the Sabbath have, of late, come into frequent collision. Indeed, it is plain, that the latter are endeavouring to concentrate and organize their strength, for a great effort, at some future and not distant period, in opposition to the whole of that legislation with which the most enlightened Protestant States have guarded the day of rest.

Into the Sabbath question in this general aspect, we do not propose to enter. We confine ourselves, at present, to that view of it which from circumstances painfully familiar to our readers, possesses a peculiar interest to us, at this time, viz.: Is the first day of the week now, the appointed day of rest, and of special religious observances? is it the Christian Sabbath?

Before we enter on the direct examination of this question in the light of the Scriptures, by whose authority alone it can be determined, it becomes necessary to vindicate the good name of Calvin, the greatest of the Reformers, from the aspersion—for we regard it as such—that he maintained “the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement.” That this eminent Reformer did use some expressions which give colour to these assertions, we do not deny, but this is all: he still maintained the Divine authority of the Lord’s day. In speaking of this institution, among other words, he thus defines its end:*

“First, under the rest of the seventh day, the divine Lawgiver meant to furnish the people of Israel with a type of the spiritual rest by which believers were to cease from their own works, and allow God to work in them. Secondly, he meant that there should be a stated day on which they should assemble to hear the law and perform religious rites, or which, at least, they should specially employ in meditating on his works, and be thereby trained to piety. Thirdly, he meant that servants, and those who lived under the

* Inst., Book II., Chap. viii. 4th Cant.

authority of others, should be indulged with a day of rest, and thus have some intermission from labour."

Having established this statement, he proceeds,

*"There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished. He is the truth, at whose presence all the emblems vanish; the body, at the sight of which the shadows disappear."

"The two other cases ought not to be classed with ancient shadows, but are adapted to every age. The Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room among us, first, to assemble on stated days for the hearing of the word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer; and, secondly, to give our servants and labourers relaxation from labour. *It cannot be doubted that the Lord provided for both in the commandment of the Sabbath.* The former is abundantly evinced by the mere practice of the Jews. The latter Moses has expressed in Deuteronomy v. 14."

"Who can deny that both are equally applicable to us as to the Jews? Religious meetings are enjoined us by the word of God; their necessity, experience itself sufficiently demonstrates. But unless these meetings are stated, and have fixed days allotted to them, how can they be held?"

"But if the reason for which the Lord appointed a Sabbath to the Jews is equally applicable to us, no man can assert that it is a matter with which we have nothing to do. Our most provident and indulgent Parent has been pleased to provide for our wants not less than for the wants of the Jews. Why, it may be asked, do we not hold daily meetings, and thus avoid the distinction of days? Would that we were privileged to do so? Spiritual wisdom undoubtedly deserves to have some portion of every day devoted to it. But if, owing to the weakness of many, daily meetings cannot be held, and charity will not allow us to exact more of them, why should we not adopt the rule which the will of God has obviously imposed upon us?"

In this passage, Calvin vindicates the law of the Sabbath as of perpetual obligation. He then proceeds to vindicate the church from the charge of Judaizing; and in the same connexion asserts that the change was made not by "human arrangement," but by apostolic, and, of course, Divine authority.

† "I am obliged to dwell a little longer on this, because some restless spirits are now making an outcry about the observance of the Lord's day. They complain that Christian people are trained in Judaism, because some observance of days is retained. My reply is, That those days are observed by us without Judaism, because in this matter we differ widely from the Jews. We do not celebrate it with most minute formality, as a ceremony by which we imagine that a spiritual mystery is typified, but we adopt it as a necessary remedy for preserving order in the church. Paul informs us that Christians are not to be judged in respect of its observance, because it is a shadow of something to come, (Col. ii. 16;) and, accordingly, he expresses a fear lest his labour among the Galatians should prove in vain, because they still observed days, (Gal. iv. 10, 11.) And he tells the Romans that it is superstitious to make one day differ from another, (Rom. xiv. 5.) But who, except those restless men, does not see what the observance is to which the Apostle refers? Those persons had no regard to that politic and ecclesiastical arrangement, but by retaining the days as types of spiritual things, they in so far obscured the glory of Christ, and the light of the Gospel. They did not

* Ibid.

† Inst., Book II, Chap. viii. 4th Cant. Beza held the same views. His language is, "Therefore the observance of the Lord's day, which Justin mentions in his Apology, is of Apostolic and truly Divine tradition."

desist from manual labour on the ground of its interfering with sacred study and meditation, but as a kind of religious observance; because they dreamed that by their cessation from labour, they were cultivating the mysteries which had of old been committed to them. It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the Apostle inveighs, and not against that legitimate selection which is subservient to the peace of Christian society. For in the churches established by him, this was the use for which the Sabbath was retained. He tells the Corinthians to set the first day apart for collecting contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem, (1 Cor. xvi. 2.) If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day as Christians now do. It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished; and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace in the church, *another day was appointed for that purpose.*"

For the intelligent and candid reader this will suffice. Calvin needs to be studied. That the infidel should misunderstand him, we do not wonder;—we are surprised that any one taught in the truth and capable of discrimination should do so.

We now advert, as preparatory to our scriptural argument, to some statements of the earliest writers in the primitive church; in which it will be seen whether or not the institution of the Christian Sabbath was due either to the emperors of Rome, as has been asserted, or to Antichrist. We begin with *Ignatius*, a companion of the Apostle John, who says: "Let us no more Sabbatize, but let us keep the Lord's day, on which our Life arose." *Justin Martyr*, who lived, partly in the first and partly in the second century, a contemporary of John, gives this testimony: "On the day called Sunday is an assembly of all who live in the country, and the sermons of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." *Irenæus*, a disciple of Polycarp, the friend of John, says: "On the Lord's day every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God."* *Tertullian*, who lived at the close of the second century, says, that "The Lord's day is the holy day of the Christian church assemblies and holy worship—every eighth day is the Christian's festival." *Dionysius*, of Corinth, also in the second century, says: "To-day we celebrate the Lord's holy day." *Irenæus*, wrote an epistle in which he maintains that the Lord's Supper should be administered "upon the Lord's day." At the close of the second century, a decree was drawn up by some "Synods and convocations" to the same effect. We add that in the second century Melito wrote a treatise on the "Lord's day;" and in the next century Dionysius, of

* This will answer, in part, to resolve the following: "If you can prove that any one man among the millions of Adam's children, from the beginning of the world to the rise of Antichrist, ever called the first day of the week 'the Sabbath,' you will shed a light upon this controversy, for which a host of writers have searched in vain." As also the following: "The first day of the week was not classed by any of the children of men as a *Sabbath*, for three hundred years after the birth of Christ."

There was a sufficient reason for the far more frequent use of the term Lord's day, in the fact that so long as the Christian community were in close connexion with the Jews, who, of course, used the term Sabbath to denote *their* day, the seventh,—because many of the converts were, at first, Jews,—it was necessary to distinguish. That they did so, is an argument substantiating their observance of the first day. When that which "letted" was out of the way, the Sabbath would gradually come into use, and so it did.

Alexandria, an essay on the same subject, entitled, "The Sabbath." And, finally, so well was the observance of the Lord's day known to be a distinctive characteristic of the Christian, that it was made a subject of inquiry by their heathen persecutors—"Do you keep the Lord's day?" Their replies, as recorded by historians, were in substance, "I am a Christian, I cannot omit it."*

But was there no more? Did not the primitive Christians also keep the seventh day of the week? Some of them did, but by no means all; and so, for a time, some of them were circumcised. That the observance of any other than the Lord's day, was not general, is evident from the language of Tertullian, quoted above, "the Lord's day is *the* holy day," and of Irenæus, "on the Lord's day *every one* of us keeps the Sabbath." This observance of two days, whatever there was of it, gradually faded away, and was finally abolished after the empire became Christian. This whole matter is very summarily and satisfactorily presented by Mosheim.

"All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the Apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.† The seventh day of the week was also observed as a festival,‡ not by the Christians in general, but by such churches only as were principally composed of Jewish converts, nor did the other Christians censure this custom as criminal and unlawful."

If in any thing we have clearly marked the footsteps of the flock, it is in this branch of our Christian practice. And we have also the mind of the Spirit.

Of this, we now enter upon the proof, purposing to show, I. that the phraseology of the fourth commandment is such as to admit the change; II. that there are sufficient indications in the Scriptures that such a change was intended; III. that this change has actually been made by Divine authority. And,

I. The terms of the fourth commandment do not put the seventh day of the week beyond the possibility of change, as the Sabbath. Its terms are, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Now, it does not say, "the first six days of *the week* shalt thou labour, &c., but the seventh day of *the week*, is," &c. It fixes merely the portion of time

* This may serve to resolve another inquiry—"Tell me candidly was there ever a martyr who died in defence of the first day Sabbath?" It will be time enough to call for a martyr expiring in this land, when some persecution rises up to put to death expressly for this.

† Phil. Jac. Hartmannus, *De rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apostolis*, cap. xv. p. 337. Just. Henn, Bohmer, *Dissert. i. Juris Eccles. Antiqui de stato die Christianor.*, p. 20, &c.

‡ Steph. Curcellæus, *Diatriba de esu Sanguinis, Operum Theolog.* p. 958. Gab. Albaspinæus, *Observat. Eccles.* lib. i. *Observ.* xiii. p. 53. It is in vain that many learned men have laboured to prove, that in *all* the primitive churches, both the first and last day of the week were observed as festivals. The churches of Bithynia, of which Pliny speaks in his letter to Trajan, had only *one stated day*, for the celebration of public worship; and that was undoubtedly the first day of the week, or what we call the *Lord's day*.

to be devoted to labour and rest respectively, with that order in which they shall succeed each other. The very letter of the commandment is obeyed when we labour six days, as we now do, and then rest upon the seventh—although that seventh day is the first of the week. From this commandment merely, the Jews could not have known what day they were to keep. This must have been, and was, in fact, otherwise determined—either by the unbroken tradition from the creation, or as some suppose, by a fresh discovery in the wilderness. In a word, the terms of the fourth commandment are such that it would be, truly observed, both in the spirit and in the letter, when any day of the week should be observed by *divine appointment* as the day of rest.

II. It is sufficiently intimated that such a change as we vindicate was in contemplation. And, here, we argue, 1st. From the significant phraseology of this fourth commandment. It is so drawn as to guard the reader against the inference that it was designed to fix the Sabbath unchangeably to a particular day. It begins thus, "Remember the Sabbath day;" and closes thus, "and rested on the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the *Sabbath day*, and hallowed it." 2d. A change of day is clearly intimated in Isaiah lxxv. 17, "Behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth: 'and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.'" It is clear that this passage refers to a change of dispensation: the creation of a new spiritual heaven and earth; for it is added, "I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." All this being, in part, accomplished in the removal of the partition wall, between Jew and Gentile in the abolition of the former ceremonial dispensation, and the consequent extension of all gospel privileges to the inhabitants of all nations—its full accomplishment taking place at that period when the kingdoms of the world shall actually receive and enjoy the benefits, personal and social, of the grace and dominion of Christ. The bearing of all this upon the change of the Sabbath is easily seen. The reason, in the fourth commandment, assigned for the observance of the Sabbath is, that "God rested on the seventh day," having made, in six days, "the heavens and the earth." In other words, the Sabbath was instituted as a standing memorial of the creation of the old heavens and the old earth. But the time was even then—under the Old Testament dispensation foretold—when this old heavens and earth should "no more be remembered, nor come into mind,"—that is, their glory should be so obscured by the greater glory of this "new creation," as that they should be comparatively forgotten. But if this be so, is it possible that the church should still be required, to the end of time, to observe a day of rest, the grand reason of whose observance was, that it was a memorial of a work which should "be no more remembered?" This argument is, to us, conclusive, as to the divine purpose to change the day of the Sabbath. It intimates, in language that can scarcely be misapprehended, that the entire system of worship under the new dispensation should be so arranged—including, of course, the time specially set apart for the duties of social religion—as to cast into the shade all other demonstrations of the Divine glory; so as to remind the worshipper, that the great work of God is the work of redemption—a work completed in Christ's resurrection.

3d. Not only was a change foreshadowed—the day was distinctly intimated; viz., the day of Christ's resurrection. And this, (1.) In the

fact that the Jews were to keep the seventh day as a memorial of their escape from Egypt: The fact is plainly stated in Deut. v. 14, 15, "And remember, that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Indeed, it is nearly, if not quite, certain, that this was the very day on which the Israelites came up out of the Red Sea—the day on which their redemption from Egyptian bondage was finally consummated. But whether or not, the fact remains, that they were to remember the seventh day as a memorial of this grand event in their history, by which they received, in a certain sense, new life as a people. This entire transaction was typical. Its antitype was the resurrection of Christ. The inference is very direct, that the day of Christ's resurrection—the day when he came up out of the great waters—the day he lived again, and his people in Him—the day emphatically of the new creation, should be observed under another dispensation as a day of rest and rejoicing by God's spiritual Israel. (2.) This appears, with still greater clearness, in the 118th Psalm 22, 24. The passage refers to Christ. None doubt this. His rejection—spoken of in the 22d verse—was consummated in his crucifixion. He became the "head of the corner" in his exaltation, which began in his resurrection. And hence, in ver. 24, it is declared that "this is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it;" not merely in that one day in which Christ rose—we can hardly suppose the Spirit of inspiration to mean no more than this by terms so emphatic—but in that same day in its ordinary weekly returns. Nor does it avail, for the purpose of getting rid of the plain import of this prophecy, to say that Christ became "head of the corner" when he ascended from Mount Olivet. This phrase comprehends more than his mere investiture with dominion—it includes his entire right to save, as well as to seek his people—He is the corner stone of salvation—of the building of mercy. This passage is equivalent to a direct and specific declaration that the day of the church's spiritual rest and rejoicing, should be changed at and after his resurrection.*

4th. None can question the right of the Lord Jesus Christ to make this change. He claims it, Mark ii. 28, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Indeed, by Him the Sabbath was given to the Israelites in the re-enactment of the moral law by his authority in the wilderness. Hence, the preface to the decalogue is well paraphrased by the Westminster divines, "Because the Lord is our God, and Redeemer, therefore are we bound to keep all his commandments." Now, if we have rightly interpreted the language of the fourth precept, did he, in this re-enactment of the moral law, bind himself to the permanent establishment of the day then observed? So far from this, the terms of the law were so devised, as to leave room for a change then contemplated, and, as we have endeavoured to show, not indistinctly fore-signified to the church under the former economy.

* The arguments, except the first, adduced under this division, are cumulative. They all exhibit, as in a series, the design of God to magnify the work of redemption by making it the prominent object in every part of New Testament worship. There is a text, Ezekiel xl. 27, which can hardly bear any other interpretation than that which regards it as intimating a change of Sabbath: "And when these days are expired, it shall be on the eighth day, and so forward."

Nor can it be said that any obligation lies upon mankind by virtue of the bond of the covenant of works of such sort as to render this change impossible. (1.) It is by no means certain that the Sabbath was revealed to Adam before that covenant was broken. Certainly, the Sabbath—we mean the particular period and day—was not a part of the law written upon Adam's heart. These must always have been matter of positive enactment. We hear of no positive laws given to Adam, except that relating to the tree of knowledge. (2.) We cannot reason, from the covenant of works, in regard to the manner and circumstances of the worship to be observed under the new. (3.) It is absurd that we should now grope among the obscurities of a broken law and covenant for rules of duty, when we have the written word, to which we may appeal. The primitive law of magistracy—the patriarchal—was the mode of civil government contemplated, so far as we can see, in that covenant. Is this to be adopted now? or are we to take the principles and directions of the written word? "To the law and to the testimony." (4.) The change which we maintain accords with the spirit and *order* of the new covenant, and seems to be required for the complete exhibition of that order. Under the old covenant, works preceded rest in God, and this was properly illustrated in the fact that six days' labour preceded a day of rest. Under the new covenant, we first find rest in Christ, and then work for him. And with this accords the order—a day of rest followed by six days' labour. Nor is it any objection to this view, that the Jews were required to observe the order of the primitive law. The development of the scheme of grace, in its entire and adequate illustration by the institutions of worship, was gradual; and besides, the former economy was, in its arrangements, comparatively burdensome. The church was then under age, and was introduced to the full enjoyment of her new covenant privileges at the erection of the present dispensation.* Of this we have a beautiful exposition in the latter part of the fourth chapter of Galatians—the allegory of Hagar and Sarah—Ishmael and Isaac—Sinai, and Jerusalem that is from above. (5.) It is sheer nonsense to refer to the obedience of Christ to the law of the seventh day Sabbath, as if by this he confirmed it as the standing season of rest and worship. This is the same sort of *ad captandum* argument with which Baptists impose upon the ignorant, forgetting, as those who use the same argument in regard to the Sabbath do, that if it prove any thing, it proves that the church should circumcise her members, observe the forms of synagogue worship, offer sacrifices, keep the passover, conform, in short, to the whole Mosaic ritual.

The authority of Christ was, then, unrestricted by any previous enactment. His dominion over the Sabbath was ample to make the change.

We come now, III. To show that this change has actually been made by His authority. This we establish, 1. By the circumstances attending his burial and resurrection. He rose the first day of the week, having lain in the tomb the seventh; and this, as every Chris-

* We will not be understood as intimating that the way of salvation was any other, under the former dispensation, than it now is—or that the Mosaic economy was not a dispensation of the covenant of grace. We refer to the outward aspect of that economy.

tian will admit, according to a deliberate purpose, and with design. Can we fail to see in this a settled intent to bury the Jewish Sabbath, and to institute another day as the day of rest and rejoicing? The Sabbath was to be a "delight." Was the day when Christ lay in the grave a "delight" to the disciples? They were filled with sadness. But the next day—the first day of the ensuing week—was there ever such a day of gladness—of spiritual gladness and joy as this to the church on earth? The day before had been to the disciples a day of fasting indeed; the Bridegroom had been taken away. But now, their sadness is turned into the brightest rejoicing. Could they ever forget either the one or the other? What more natural than the transfer of the emotions of holy delight with which they formerly observed the seventh day, to this new day which "the Lord had made?" This was of itself, at least, almost sufficient to bring about the existing change in the season of worship.

2. Christ eminently distinguished and honoured the first day of the week. (1.) On this day he appeared to his disciples. John xx. 19: "Then the same day, at evening, being the first day of the week, . . . came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." This is not so remarkable; but, ver. 26, "after eight days"—on the ensuing first day of the week—"again his disciples were within. . . . Then came Jesus, . . . and said, Peace be unto you;" Now, in any view of the disciples assembling, this appearance of Christ signalizes the first day of the week. Did they meet every day; then why but to put singular honour upon it, as the day in which he would especially vouchsafe his presence to his people. Did he select this day to meet with his disciples?—then still more the probability is, that they met by design on this day, and that with the expectation of meeting Jesus. Mark the phraseology, "After eight days, again his disciples were within." In the language of Paley, "it has every appearance of a previous appointment." But in any event, the first day is here signally honoured, and begins in the very morning of the new dispensation to hold that place which it has since occupied, as the day of devotion and of Christian enjoyment. (2.) On this day, the Spirit was poured upon the New Testament church. We refer to the great event recorded, Acts ii.—the Pentecostal baptism of the disciples. This was on the first day, for, as we learn from Lev. xxiii. 15, 16, the Pentecost was observed on the fiftieth day after the paschal Sabbath. Now in this occurrence, the whole church, to the end of time, has a direct interest. It stands alone. It marks an era. It was a visible emblem and seal of the superior glory of the New Testament, that it was to be the ministration of the Spirit. Moreover, it constituted, at the time, as Peter afterwards declares, a visible testimony to the exaltation of Christ, that he had become the head of the corner. Christ did most eminently separate, and distinguish, and honour the first day of the week.

3. This day was observed by the apostles and the primitive church. True, the apostles frequented, when among Jews, their synagogues, but merely for the purpose of ministering to these the gospel. But among themselves, the first day of the week was their day of worship and of rest. This appears, (1.) In the meeting of the church in Troas for the dispensation of the Lord's Supper on that day. Acts xx. 7: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together

to break bread, Paul preached unto them." To "break bread" is to dispense the Supper. It is absurd to suppose that they came together to eat a common meal; or that, if they did, it would be solemnly left upon record. The day is mentioned. Why, unless to distinguish it and honour it—to hold it up as the usual season of observing the solemnities of Divine worship? Moreover, Paul would not travel on that day; for it is added, "being minded to depart on the morrow."*

(2.) In the command given to the Corinthians and to the Galatians to make their collections for religious purposes on that day. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Why, we again ask, specify the first day? But one answer can be given, it was a day particularly devoted to the observance of gospel ordinances, of which contributing for religious ordinances is one. Nor is it any objection to this view that the apostle says, "by him in store;" for the following clause, "that there be no gatherings when I come," removes all obscurity, and shows that the contributions were to be put into the public stock on that day: otherwise this very thing would have necessarily followed—there would have been "gatherings" when he came.

(3.) The first day of the week is called expressly the Lord's day. Rev. i. 10: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." This was evidently some particular day. Every day is, indeed, the Lord's; but here this epithet is distinctive: just as the city of the Lord is an epithet of Jerusalem—or as under the old economy, the seventh day was God's day. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." "The Lord's day," Christ's day, as the Lord's Supper is Christ's Supper. But how the Lord's, and why? His, inasmuch as, from his resurrection, made peculiarly his, to be devoted to his service. "This is the day the Lord hath made." If any doubt remains whether the first day of the week be really meant, this is dispelled, when we remember that from this very period, as we have seen in our quotations from the contemporaries and immediate followers of John, it was invariably so used in the primitive church. If the meaning of any term can be fixed by testimony, the interpretation of this epithet must be so regarded.

4. This day has ever since been observed by the Christian church. That it has been, none ever disputed. For a time, as stated by Mosheim in the extract that we have given on a former page, both days, the seventh and the first, were observed by some portions of the Christian church. And this was winked at, as was the observance of circumcision, for a time, in the case of Jewish converts. With this exception, the course of the church has been uniform. Doubts on this subject are of very recent origin. They date no further back than the ages subsequent to the Reformation, and then they arose chiefly among the same people who denied, because there is no command in the New Testament enjoining it, the propriety of infant baptism. Now, let it be observed, we draw no argument from any mere church authority. We lay no stress upon the canons of any council. Our faith rests upon no ecclesiastical dictum. Our argument is, that if the first day of the week be not the Christian Sabbath, then has Christ left the church for more than eighteen hundred years without a Sabbath at all? a divinely

* Could the writer have read this clause, who says that this passage proves that Paul travelled on the first day of the week? The text says, "He was minded to depart on the morrow."

authorized and accepted Sabbath. Our argument here is analogous to that which we use against the Jews. We say, your system is abolished. God has abolished it: for eighteen hundred years, you have had no temple, no altar, no sacrifices of atonement: your ceremonies have been wiped out of existence by the strong and great hand of God, the Governor of the world. Now, so we argue on behalf of our Sabbath. If the first day be not the Sabbath, then has God himself wiped out this institution: there is then no longer any such day or season. Now, the infidel may adopt this alternative: the Christian will not. He cannot believe that the Most High has so bereft his church, as that he has left her for her entire course, as a church of all nations, to run counter to his will; and live in perpetual disregard of one of his express commandments. We add,

5. And lastly, God has blessed the first day of the week, and so put his seal upon it. God has not left his church without a Sabbath, nor without tokens of his approbation in her observance of the first day of the week as the day of rest and devotion. On this day his word has been preached for the conversion of sinners, and the sacraments dispensed for the edification of the faithful, for many hundreds of years. And where has religion flourished, with all the interests of morality, personal and social? Where have religion and good order declined? Any tyro can answer these questions. With Sabbath—first day Sabbath—observance, every spiritual and moral interest has flourished: with Sabbath desecration comes in a flood of all kinds of evil. As religion revives, is not the Sabbath more strictly kept? as it declines, is it not more loosely observed? God has blessed the Sabbath—the Lord's day—the Christian Sabbath. This argument, in connexion with the preceding, amounts to a demonstration: A voice from heaven could hardly make it more evident than does the manifest blessing of God upon this day. And it proves that it is his mind and will that his church and the nations should keep, to the end of this dispensation, the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

THE DEACON CONTROVERSY.

It is well, during the progress of public discussions on contested points, occasionally to pause, and examine with some care, what aspect it may have assumed. Without this, we may become confused by the very din of conflict, or even allow our sympathies with truth and right to become deadened by the frequent iteration and re-iteration of argument, assertion, response, on the one side and the other.

We seem *nearly* to have reached such a period in the Deacon Controversy, and we may, if circumstances permit, attempt at no distant day, such a review of its progress and existing aspects. At present, we allot ourselves a more limited task—an examination of some of the statements, &c., which have appeared on the other side, since the last meeting of Synod. And,

I. A studied attempt has been made to represent the advocates of the deacon's office, as inimical, more or less, to the Westminster Form of Church Government. And hence, in sermons, exhortations, and writings, no little has been said in behalf of adhering to the standards, as if the deacon brethren were endeavouring to wrest some part of the church's inheritance from her. Now, we remark, (1,) that these

charges come with no very good grace from those who are in open array against our Covenant ancestors, in more than one point respecting the office of the deacon. (2.) We ask, how any one, consistently with Christian honesty, can appeal to the proverbial attachment of Covenanters for the attainments of the church, when the very design of these appeals is to induce them to surrender principles and practices warmly cherished by our Covenanted forefathers, as embodied in the Second Book of Discipline? (3.) This alarm is entirely causeless. Any statement to the effect that the friends of the deacon are indifferent to the Form of Church Government, are utterly unfounded: they have been made without any reason: they are mere figments: they are a part of the stratagems of war, to mislead the ignorant, or the credulous, who take upon trust the assertions of those whom they respect. (4.) If any thing has appeared that looks like a disposition to abandon attainments, it is the assertion of T. S., that our fathers would have gone into the revolution settlement could they have only carried with them the Form of Church Government. But we do not recriminate, our purpose is merely to stamp as untrue and calumnious, the assertion that we have ever had the most remote idea of abandoning, or of superseding the Form of Church Government.

2. An attempt has been made—not very directly indeed, but not the less really—to make the impression, that this entire controversy, so far as an appeal to the standards is concerned, has been made to turn upon the position occupied by the Second Book of Discipline, standard or not. This is highly disingenuous. Were this Book out of the account altogether, we would stand upon an impregnable basis. We have the act of the church, and her Testimony, and none will dispute the right of reference to the history of the church, whether in her Book of Discipline or elsewhere, for the purpose of ascertaining the footsteps of the flock on this subject, or on any other. And, in fact, whatever views we may entertain, and have presented, in regard to the Second Book, it has been nearly, if not altogether, in this aspect alone, that we have appealed to it. And we are free to say, that our appeal has not been met or set aside. Attempts, indeed, have been made to do this, but in the judgment of all the impartial, we do not fear to say, without the very beginning of success. Indeed, one of the most prominent advocates of that side of the question, T. S., has made the admission that it may still be appealed to as law in matters not comprehended in the Form. On this question, however, we do not now enter. We merely enter our direct denial of the assertion that we regard the establishment of the obligation of this Book as essential to the fixing of the position of the Reformed Church on the subject of the power of the deacon. But, on the other hand, let it be remembered, that our opponents are put entirely *hors de combat*, if it be ever allowed to have the place of law,—in other words, to maintain their position, they find themselves compelled to repudiate this, one of the most elaborate and cherished of all the works of our Covenant fathers of the Church of Scotland.

3. Since the last meeting of Synod, we have been astounded with the deliberate reiteration of the assertion, in substance, that the church in this country is a kind of new creation,—that it has picked and chosen among her covenanted attainments what it pleased, and by implication, at least, has given the rest the go-by. Now, we hold a very

different doctrine; and we believe and know that the church, particularly in the *third, fourth, and fifth* terms of communion, has professed the very opposite of this. We are the same church of Scotland: that is, we hold ourselves bound to *all* her scriptural attainments. And this connexion we hope not to lose, or be reasoned out of. In establishing a distinct organization on these shores, the church certainly had no intention of denying any of her covenant obligations, and, in her terms of communion has expressly made it obligatory upon her members to do the very thing that some would now brand as absurd, to examine the footsteps of the flock, and adhere to all their "faithful contendings." In this aspect the Deacon Controversy has truly become "far-reaching." If we have cut loose from our forefathers,—if we have no other connexion than such as we choose, in our own arbitrary and independent will, to recognise, then what becomes of the descending obligations of our covenants? We might retort the charge of abandoning that "whereunto we have attained," but we forbear. The time may come when this point will become painfully practical.

4th. An attempt has been made to deduce an argument against us in reference to the power of the deacon, from the want of any express recognition of its extent as we claim it, in the formula of ordination; and a supposed triumphant call has been made to show any such in the church's history. Now, (1.) we have no recorded formula of early ordinations, but we have what is equally valid—the express declaration that the oversight of the ecclesiastical goods belonged to Presbyteries. We have this in the Second Book, chap. vii.: "It pertains to the elderships to take heed—that the ecclesiastical goods be uncorruptly distributed." In the viii. chap., "This they," the deacons, "ought to do according to the judgment and appointment of the Presbyteries or elderships—that the patrimony of the kirk and poor be not converted to private men's uses, nor wrongfully distributed." In the ix. chap., throughout defining the duties of the deacons: and, finally, all this solemnly reiterated by the Assembly 1786.* Now, it matters not what were forms of ordination,—no one will deny that the church of Scotland did solemnly enjoin upon her elderships and her deacons—as of *divine right*—the charge of all the ecclesiastical goods. (2.) If this argument proves any thing, it proves too much; for it would prove that the ordination vow of the minister or of the elder does not bind him to see to the maintenance of the poor; for nothing is said in the formula on this subject!† It would prove that our church courts have all along acted, and do now act, in some other way than by divine right, in taking charge, which they do in constituted court, of public funds—missionary, seminary, &c.! This argument is, also, "far-reaching." We may add, that if the funds of the church are indeed, under church control, the charge of these must be embraced, by implication at least, in the ordination vow. This whole argument, and it is the only one contained in the article headed, "*Trustees, Consistory, and Deacons*," in the March number of the Reformed Presbyterian, is a naked begging the question—a taking for granted the thing to be proved.

5. Great stress is laid by *all* the writers on that side of the ques-

* Cald. vol. iv. p. 567.

† See Formula of Queries.

tion, upon an argument derived from the supposed interference of the doctrine which we hold, with the church's independence of civil control; as if, because she may become a party at a suit at law, that, therefore, she cannot have any right to hold and manage property. Now, (1.) This is bad reasoning. A body of partners are independent of civil law in the management of their business—just as much so, and precisely to the same extent, as a private individual. And yet, if one of these partners undertake to rob his fellows, the law interposes and arrests his proceedings. It can do no more in regard to church property, and to do this is no interference with the church's entire control of her own goods. (2.) In no way that you can fix it, can church officers escape being drawn into the civil courts. No matter by what tenure church property is held, suits at law may arise in which the church will, *per fas aut nefas*—right or wrong—find herself in the very unpleasant situation of a pleading party. (3.) The admissions of the most prominent of those who hold this view, do themselves destroy his own argument, and it is his grand one,—it is the grand one now of the whole of that side. And, (1.) he admits that the church may by *her officers* hold and manage property. He says:—

“I have alluded to this subject because it is due to our venerable forefathers in the Church of Scotland to admit, as I certainly do in general, that there may be circumstances rendering such a trust and claim expedient; so I am entirely willing to admit it may have been in theirs, while property, clearly the just right of the church, made over to her by civil enactments and laws, and necessary to her support, was surreptitiously withheld by selfish and profligate individuals under false and iniquitous pretences; it was proper that she should claim the possession and distribution of her own revenues, that her ministers of religion might be supported, her places of worship kept in decent repair, her literary institutions maintained, &c.”*

That is, he admits that the Church of Scotland was right in holding her property. Had she other rights than the church now? Will not the Millennial Church be in, substantially, the same condition that she was? And, moreover, her claim was of a nature to bring her in direct conflict with the civil power.

(2.) This writer defeats himself again; for he says, in defending the right of the people to manage the church property by *their* own humanly contrived trustees:

“Although therefore it is certain that Christ's officers are his Church representatives, and for her spiritual government, nothing is more evident than that in all these various and most unequivocal forms of expression, the Lord honours his people with the name, and of course with the properties of his “saints,” his “body,” his “flock,” his “Church which he hath purchased with his own blood,” separately and as distinct from his officers whom he bestows upon them, and to whose spiritual charge and oversight he commits them. Certainly, therefore, they are in such sort, and in such measure, “the Church of God,” that their character and actions may not be wholly divested of ecclesiastical reputation and name in such sort, and in such measure as to admit of their retaining in their own possession and direction, the place of meeting in which they hold their assemblies.”†

* Ref. Pres., April, p. 48.

† Ibid. p. 52.

If this is really the view of the writer, how, we ask, can he be at ease when the congregation in which he ministers has a charter that controls most seriously the entire management of church funds—designates who shall be voters and who

Now, to say nothing of the attempt to give a semi-divine sanction to the trustee-system,—though this is suicidal,—what becomes of his entire argument for the “church’s” independency? Acting through Christ’s officers, she cannot, for fear of dishonouring herself as a divine institute, hold property, but this same church has only to appoint, and that in an “ecclesiastical and spiritual character,” another set of officers, who have, of course, a semi-ecclesiastical character, and *presto*, all is right! Better to give it up altogether, and come out on the broad ground of a mere bank, or fire company organization, than this sort of bungling attempt to mix the earthly and the spiritual.

6. The attempt to vindicate their views has led our opponents into the most palpable self-contradiction and contradiction of the standards. As to self-contradiction, we have only to compare the passage which we have last quoted with the following, which, strange to say, *immediately* precedes it.

“But the location or dimensions, or finish, or furniture, or cost of a building for the meeting of the people of God for public worship, falls not within their proper sphere of jurisdiction. The people themselves are the proper, and it may be supposed certainly the competent judges on all such subjects; of the location for their common convenience, of the expense to be incurred in the construction of the building and its interior arrangement they, and not their spiritual officers, ought to be the judges. This is purely a secular, not a spiritual or strictly ecclesiastical concern.”*

And yet, in the next breath, comes the very argument above, for the very purpose of showing that it is not “purely secular.” The truth is, the pious mind of the writer—although bewildered, as we believe, with the notion that there is something degrading to the church, and why not let us say to Christ himself, in taking a cognizance of things temporal, is yet not quite prepared to consider the funds devoted to the service of Christ, as thrown together, as merely so much bank stock. Again, this writer contradicts himself in regard to the office of the ministry. He says:

“Their office relates mainly to the purity of divine truth and ordinances, to the piety and purity of life required of the flock under their supervision, and to a *just and merciful regard to the necessities* and comfort of the poor or afflicted committed to their care.”†

Compare this with the following:

“During the greater part of this time the apostles had the charge of a fund, which, since it is expressly said it was contributed that no man might ‘lack,’ be ‘in need’ or in want, I shall believe was designed for distribution among the poor. But did they hold that charge *ex officio*, or by virtue of their office, or did they so claim it? Not at all. They expressly assert that it was inconsistent with their office and the proper discharge of their duties. ‘It is not reason,’ they say. And then with what reason shall they who profess to be the successors of the true Apostolic ministry of the word, or rulers in the house of God, claim for themselves now what these holy men rejected and disclaimed? While they did hold that charge, it is evident they held it not

not, &c. &c. Now, if the congregation appoints its fiscal agents as a church—as the above quotation maintains—then is that charter a most outrageous imposition upon any people—which we verily believe it to be. If there is such a thing as Erastianism, then, on his own showing, is it Erastian, and we use respecting it his own words. Proh! pudor—Oh! shame.

* Ref. Pres., April, p. 52.

† Ref. Pres. April, p. 52.

as inherent in their official obligations, much less inherent in their official rights, for then they could not have relinquished it, but only as a matter of condescension and indulgence in regard of the exigencies of the church at the time, which they not only cheerfully resigned, but determinately relinquished as soon as an appropriate opportunity offered.”*

Now, mark; in the first extract he admits, and we have no doubt it is his real opinion, that the functions of the spiritual officers of the church relate to a just and merciful regard to the *necessities* of the “poor:” in the latter, he deliberately adopts another view, and argues that the ministry and eldership have nothing to do, by divine right, with even the poor’s fund.† This leads us to notice a third contradiction of this class. As we have seen, he denies, in the passage last quoted, that the spiritual officers have any thing to do even with the poor’s money, and yet he says immediately afterwards,—

“Now while it is freely admitted, and indeed earnestly asserted that the deacon, or office for the relief of the poor, is an integral office in the church of God, (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8.) I hold it to be unscriptural to maintain in the face of all this light of the word of God that it is absolutely essential to the perfect organization of every congregation and in every condition.”‡

That is, there need be no office to take charge even of the necessities of the poor by divine right. The rulers do it as a matter of expediency—to the deacons it belongs by divine right. And yet to hold that “deacons are essential to the perfect organization of congregations” is “unscriptural!” We mean to be entirely respectful; but it is hard to exhibit such statements in their true character and yet *seem* to be so.§

But we have not done. Our largest quotation above contradicts the form of church government. The contradiction is full and absolute—statement, argument and all. The Form says that it “belongs to the office of pastor,”

“To take care of the poor,”

* Ref. Pres., March, p. 21.

† We do not hesitate to say that the last of these is most consistent with the writer’s other views: for surely there is no greater sacredness or spirituality in poor’s money, than in other church funds. But how he reconciles this passage with the universally received views of that side of the church, we do not know.

‡ Ref. Pres., March, p. 21.

§ This writer quotes Calvin. It is well to see what Calvin did teach respecting the necessity of the office of the deacon. He says, Commentary on Acts, vi.—

“Luke declareth here upon what occasion, and to what end, and also with what rite, deacons were first made. He saith, When there arose a murmuring amongst the disciples, it was appeased by this remedy, as it is said in the common proverb, Good laws have taken their beginning of evil manners. And it may seem to be a strange thing, seeing that this is a function so excellent and so necessary in the Church, why it came not into the apostles’ mind at the first, (before there was any such occasion ministered,) to appoint deacons, and why the Spirit of God did not give them such counsel which they take now, being, as it were, enforced thereunto. But that which happened was both better then, and is also more profitable for us at this day, to be unto us an example. If the apostles had spoken of choosing deacons before any necessity did require the same, they should not have had the people so ready; they should have seemed to avoid labour and trouble; many would not have offered so liberally into the hands of other men. Therefore, it was requisite that the faithful should be convict [convinced] by experience, that they might choose deacons willingly, whom they saw they could not want; and that through their own fault. We learn in this history that the church cannot be so framed by and by, but that there remain somewhat to be amended; neither can so great a building be so finished in one day, that there may not something be added to make the same perfect.”

and adduces as proof, Acts xi. 70; iv. 34—37; vi. 3—4; 1 Cor. xvi. 1—4; Gal. ii. 9, 10. The passage above teaches another doctrine. The contradiction is palpable.

In conclusion, we do not hesitate to affirm that the deacon controversy has done good, and particularly since the last Synod. Previously to this meeting, discussion was discouraged. Our opponents were with difficulty drawn out, and when they were, it was generally with a protest against the very thing they found themselves compelled to do. Now, despairing of putting down the deacon cause by any ecclesiastical dicta, they have resorted, and properly to discussion; and while we think we have reason to complain in some particulars of the way in which the controversy has been managed, still we are glad that they have taken up their weapons. Truth seeks the light. And we think we have seen good results, and hope to see more. Our congregations are, one by one, getting deacons, movements are making even in those that have been most distinctly arrayed on the other side. In these latter instances, their power may be unduly limited; but, when ordained, there will be a practical acknowledgment, at least, of the office. In this, we rejoice. It is a sign of good.

MYSTERY OF PROVIDENCE.

How oft, Lord, have I wondered at thy administration of earthly affairs; and to see thy marvellous wisdom, power and goodness, deriving good out of evil! Alas! we are apt enough to bring the worst of evils out of the greatest good, turning the grace of thee our God into wantonness: but how have I seen thee, of lifeless stones to raise up children unto Abraham; of sinners, to make saints; out of a desperate confusion, to bring order; out of a bloody war, a happy peace; out of resolutions of revenge, love; out of the rock, waters; out of a persecutor, an apostle! How can I be discouraged with unlikelihoods, when I see thee work by contraries! It is not for me, O my God, to examine or prejudice thy counsels: take what ways thou wilt, so thou bring me to thine own end. All paths shall be direct, that lead me to blessedness.—(*Bishop Hall.*)

SPIRITUAL JOY.

O my God, how many profane and careless souls do I see spending their time in vanity and pleasure! The harp and the viol, the tabret and the pipe, and wine, are in their feasts. Isa. v. 12. While I, that desire to walk close with thee in all holy obedience, droop and languish under a dull heaviness and heartless dejection. I am sure I have a thousand times more cause of joy and cheerfulness, than the merriest of all those wild and jovial spirits. They have a world to play with, but I have a God to rejoice in: their sports are trivial and momentary, my joy is serious and everlasting; one dram of my mirth is worth a pound of theirs. But I confess, O Lord, how much I am wanting to myself, in not stirring up this holy fire of spiritual joy; but suffering it to lie raked up, under the dead ashes of a sad neglect. O thou who art the God of hope, quicken this heavenly affection in my soul; and fill me with all joy and peace in believing. Make my heart so much more light than the worldling's, by how much my state is happier.—(*Id.*)

DANGEROUS PROSPERITY.

It was a just and needful precaution, O God, which thou gavest of old to thine Israel, "When thou shalt have eaten, and art full, then beware lest thou forget the Lord." Deut. vi. 11, 12. There was not so great fear of forgetting thee, while they were in a dry and hungry wilderness, although even there they too often forgot themselves, in an ungracious murmuring against thee and their leaders. The greatest danger of their forgetting thee would be (thou knewest) when they should come to be pampered in the land that flowed with milk and honey. It was there Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked. Being grown thick and covered with fatness, it was there that he forsook the Lord, and lightly esteemed the rock of his salvation. Nothing is more difficult than to keep ourselves from growing wanton by excess; whereas, nature kept low is capable of just obedience. Like as in the body also, a full feed breeds superfluous and vicious humours; whereas a spare diet keeps it both pure and healthful.

Do not I see, O Lord, even the man that was after thine own heart, whilst thou didst keep him in breath, with the persecution of an unjust master, how tenderly conscious he was, reflecting on himself for only cutting off a lap of the robe of his causeless pursuer; who yet when he came to the full enjoyment of his ease and courtly indulgences, made no scruple of the adulterous bed of fair Bathsheba, or the bloody murder of a faithful Uriah. Who, then, am I, O Lord, that I should promise myself an immunity from the peril of a prosperous condition, under which thy holier servants have miscarried? It was thy goodness and wisdom to foresee not only what shall be, but also what might be, and to prevent the danger of any surfeit by taking away the dish, on which I might have over-fed.

O God, I do humbly submit to thy pleasure, and contentedly rest upon thy providence, which has thought fit rather to secure me in the safe use of my little, than to exercise me with the temptation of a bewitching plenty.—(*Ib.*)

ELECTION.

1 Pet. ii. 6: Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.

John x. 26, 27, 28, 29: But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no one is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.

John xv. 16: Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you.

Romans ix. 15, 18: For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.

1 Corinthians i. 27: But God hath chosen the foolish things of the

world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty. Ver. 28, 29, 30.

Romans viii. 28: And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. Verses 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

Acts ii. 23: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.

Acts iv. 28: For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.

Acts xiii. 48: And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.

Galatians i. 15: But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace.

2 Timothy i. 9: Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.

1 Peter ii. 9: But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people: that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.

2 Timothy ii. 19: Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.

Romans ix. 13: As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. Ver. 14: What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. Ver. 15. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. Ver. 16: So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. Ver. 18: Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Verses 19, 20, 21.

PAGAN LITERATURE.

In our survey of the literary field, we occasionally discover, pretty plainly, the workings of a growing spirit of opposition to the study of the pagan classics, at least as now conducted. The following is from the April number of the London Quarterly Review. We find it in a notice of the works of a distinguished Italian—an eloquent and profound writer, but unhappily, towards the close of his short career, an undisguised infidel. Referring to this, the Review says:—

“In considering, however, a case so remarkable, it will occur to the mind to ask whether the study of pagan antiquity is probably to be reckoned among the causes of this religious desolation? and the question is too nearly related to the dearest interests of England, whose choicest youth are trained almost from infancy to read and to digest both the thoughts and the diction of Latin and Greek authors, to be dismissed without notice; the more so as there is an opinion floating, so to speak, though it can scarcely be said to be current among ourselves, that the religious tendencies of our own system are questionable. In our view the answer may be said to lie in a single sentence, and it is this, *that classical studies require the powerful corrective which Christian studies supply*; that with this corrective they afford not only the most admirable discipline to the understanding, taste, and power of expression, but

likewise the strongest secondary assurances of the truth and the need of the Gospel; *but that without it they are full of danger.* And the corrective lies not merely in the knowledge of Christian doctrine by rote; not merely in being acquainted, as we cannot doubt that Leopardi was in his youth acquainted, with its technical distribution according to the current theology; but in the true and living knowledge of it, in the application of the mind to Christian study *with the same energetic tension with which pagan philosophy, history, poetry, and languages are studied.*"

We have italicised the admissions of this writer, who defends, as is seen, the study of the classics. He is for introducing a corrective—the "intense" study of the Christian religion. Now, does this exist in our schools and colleges? Some attention may be given to studies relating to religion—the Bible may be occasionally read—but is it taught? Is it examined carefully, its history, chronology, geography, style, morality, and doctrinal teachings, in any of our schools or colleges? Is it studied with *any thing like* the intensity with which every faculty is awakened to master the language and to comprehend the beauties of the pagan classics? We answer, unhesitatingly, that we know of no such school among the paganized institutions of this country. The Reviewer adds, and his language comes with a solemn tone as from the grave of the gifted Italian,

"We should shudder for the consequences, if our Christian studies became shackled, dry, and formal, and if thought were to owe its richness, and taste its refined discernment—and, above all, if mental freedom and enjoyment were to refer their recollections either wholly or principally to those heathen sources. And, too plainly, thus it was with Leopardi. It was not from the Genius of the Gospel that he had learned to mould the accents of his mind, to exercise the high prerogatives of his genius; it was on the mount of the Parthenon, and not of Sion; by the waters of Ilissus, not by the brook of Cedron. Homer and Hesiod, and Plato most of all, were to him for patriarch and for prophet; and to those works, which he latterly translated, we are persuaded that he went as with a sentiment of religion, as seeking for a Gospel in their generally high-toned though narrow morality, and recognising in them not only the beautiful dream of his imagination and the food of his powerful understanding, but the whole substance of his inner life. He exactly reversed the Christianized invocation of Tasso, and enthroned the muse of Helicon again."

Now, this we aver, though we are aware, not always to the same degree, is the effect of pagan studies upon the minds of scholars, even when subject to the corrective influence of better teachings, in the family and from the pulpit. These pagans are exalted in the mind's apprehension to the highest place—not even excepting the Scriptures—as models of style and of all the arts of composition. This cannot be, without giving them also a most dangerous position as guides even in matters of moral duty. We conclude with a quotation from the comment of the judicious Scott, upon Acts xvii. 21: "It is scarcely advisable for those who are intended for the ministry, to spend any very great proportion of their time about these indecent fables and corrupt principles and practice, which must employ much attention from those who aspire to proficiency in this kind of learning."

INFANT BAPTISM.

The Rev. Jacob Little of Granville, Ohio, prepares and delivers what may be called a statistical discourse at the beginning of every year. His researches—which are mainly confined to his own township—are very curious, and presented rather quaintly. In one of his discourses, the following important facts, respecting the comparative stability of converts baptized in infancy and those baptized on their own profession of faith, are given from his own knowledge. He is replying to the Baptist view that the latter will be the more stable.

“During the twenty years I have been in Granville there have been added to the church on examination 466, of whom I baptized 135 when they were received, leaving 331, or about three-quarters, who were baptized in infancy. According to the *objection*, these three-quarters produce our unworthy members. In twenty years we cut off 29, one-sixteenth of the 466, for unchristian conduct. The three-quarters who were baptized in infancy produced eleven of those who were cut off, and one quarter who had been baptized as adults, produced eighteen of the twenty-nine who were cut off. Had those baptized in infancy furnished such a proportion of unworthy members as the baptized adults, we should have cut off seventy-two members, instead of twenty-nine. Or on the other hand, had the baptized adults furnished no larger proportion of unworthy members than those baptized in infancy, we should in twenty years have cut off only fifteen. Infant baptism is the true starting-point for training substantial church members. The objection could be still more triumphantly answered, if all children were brought to this rite *with faith*. The objection is not against our *mode*, but against our baptizing infants. If our churches would look on the facts on their records, they would find that it is rather the neglect than the practice of infant baptism which has made their unworthy members.”

We have not previously met with any statistics bearing upon this subject: but from a glance at the past, so far as we have had opportunities of knowing facts bearing upon this subject, we are disposed to think that the largest examination would confirm Mr. Little's statistics. So far as they go, they are certainly calculated to encourage parents in dedicating their offspring to Christ, and also to prompt them to a careful fulfilment of their parental and Christian obligations in regard to their children.

THE ILLINOIS PRESBYTERY.

The business before this Presbytery, at its late meeting, was chiefly of a local character. The only item of public interest was the grant of the moderation of a call to the Iowa societies.

In this connexion, we present the following statement from the pen of a minister of the Presbytery, respecting the settlements in which Covenanters are located in Iowa and Illinois. It may be of use to those who purpose emigrating to the West. “The principal of these settlements, in Iowa, are two, viz. Cedar Creek Society, in Lee Co., containing fifteen communicants; and Honey Creek and Linn Grove Society in Des Moines Co., containing about thirty-two communicants. These locations are forty miles apart, and no doubt, by the labour of a minister a few years, with the blessing of God, they will become large and flourishing congregations. Besides these we have various missionary stations through Illinois, one at Chili, Hancock Co., one near Mount Sterling, in Brown Co., one in Springfield, the capital of the State, and one in Staunton, in Macaupin Co.”

THE ROCHESTER PRESBYTERY.

This Presbytery has now under its care two vacant congregations, both newly organized,—one in Buffalo, the other in Syracuse. It has two students of divinity, Mr. Milroy and Mr. M'Cracken of the first year. Rev. R. Johnson, not being present at the meeting, a commission was appointed, to whom the calls of White Lake and Topsham congregations, both in the bounds of the New York Presbytery, were referred for presentation to Mr. J. They were presented; when Mr. J. declined accepting either.

AFFAIRS ABROAD.

Turkey. 1. *Political changes.*—The Turkish government appears to be in the hands of men unusually intelligent. Great efforts are making to ameliorate the condition of the people—particularly the Christian portion of the population, who are now admitted to share in the municipal governments. Laws have lately been enacted, relieving the inhabitants of some onerous forms of taxation, substituting a direct and fixed tax upon land, which, with the capitation tax, takes the place of all the old government levies. Schools, and internal improvements, roads, &c., are encouraged. While they strengthen the empire, these changes will inevitably weaken the hold of Islamism upon the minds of the Turkish portion of the community. 2. *Missionary efforts.*—As might have been expected, the success of these efforts has awakened new hostilities among the opponents of evangelical religion. Mr. Marsh gives an encouraging account of the steadfastness of the converts. His statements respecting the state of things in *Mosul*,* are summed up as follows:

“He finds the brethren bearing persecution, imprisonment, and the terrors of excommunication with a cheerful spirit. Their enemies seem to realize that the missionaries are resolved to take possession, and have been stirred up by Mr. Marsh’s arrival to let fall the long impending anathema. The blow is struck. Bands long mighty have melted like tow in the flame. The Protestants are free. They stand erect like men, and give glory to God.”

Italy. 1. *Sardinia.*—We have already laid before our readers the late enactment of the Sardinian government restricting the authority of the Popish priesthood, abolishing feast-days, and subjecting the hierarchy to civil control. The archbishop has attempted resistance. The case, which is full of interest, is, in detail, as follows:

“The conduct of Archbishop Franzoni, of Turin, is the prominent topic at present in Piedmont. This ecclesiastic was so outraged, by Sicardi’s law of the ecclesiastical courts, and the rights of convents and churches to shelter criminals from the pursuit of justice, that he issued a circular to the priests, requiring them to refuse to appear or testify in any civil court, without the permission of the bishop of the diocess. This was organizing a revolt against the law of the land. The government attorney cited the archbishop to appear and answer to a charge made against him; the citation was neglected. The judge of the court then offered the archbishop to visit him at his palace, and examine him there; but the archbishop refused to open his doors. No other course was left open to the government than an arrest in due form, which was accordingly made. This energy of the government has filled the people of Piedmont with joy; but the priesthood consider the archbishop a martyr, and have commenced, after their fashion, a war on the government.

* This city lies far to the east.

Their way of carrying on the campaign is this: the churches are hung in mourning, and relays of priests keep up, from morning till night, the doleful chant of *in vinculis* (in chains.) This weeping of the whole fraternity may have the same effect on King Immanuel, as the never-ceasing tears of David Copperfield's acquaintance, Mrs. Gummidge, had on the good hearted Peg-goty, 'She's always a crying for the old 'un,' would he say before giving up."

The government has not stopped with the priesthood—it has attacked the nobles. The same writer—the correspondent of the National Era—adds:

"Second only in importance to this conflict between the spiritual and temporal, is the bill proposed, on the 13th, by the Piedmontese ministry, for the suppression of all existing estates in tail and majorats, a species of trust estate in tail for the oldest son. This will pass the two houses. It is a fatal blow at the nobility, which cannot long subsist under a system of equal division of property among the children, or even of free alienation."

2. *Rome*.—The Pope is very uneasy in his seat, and the Cardinals seem, with all their obtuseness, to share his apprehensions.

"The *Concordia* states that he had thrice attempted to take his flight, but which has been frustrated by the keen eye of the French troops, who watch his every movement. The *Concordia* of Turin of the 25th ult. states that Cardinal Ciacchi, the author of the protest against the Austrians, has sent in his resignation as Cardinal, but it is not known whether the Pope has accepted it. Several other Cardinals, fearing lest some day the vengeance of the people may burst over them, meditate following the example of Ciacchi."

The object now is to get rid of the French, and to supply their place with Austrian troops. France will not recede. Pride forbids it. An outbreak will hardly take place, however, until the other states of Europe are again convulsed. In the mean time, the restored government is busy, by police visitations and searches, and other means, in endeavouring to remove from the hands and houses of the people the Bibles and Testaments which were so liberally distributed during the reign of the Triumvirs.

3. *Evangelical efforts*.—The following is a brief sketch by Col. Tronchin of the efforts made and now making by the Italian committee at Geneva, for the Evangelization of Italy:

"It was resolved to print the first three volumes of the Italian translation of the History of the Reformation by Dr. Merle d'Aubigné. This was accomplished to the number of 3500 copies; half of these copies have been scattered in various bookstores, and are by this time offered for sale. One of our agents has started with the remainder of the boxes for . . . in order to be able to provision . . . and profit by certain circumstances, which permitted us to penetrate into that country. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, by the request of the committee, has composed a very eloquent dedication of his work to the people of Italy; it has been translated by one of the ablest pens of Italy, and spreads at this time to 3,000 copies. The 'Controversy' of Drelincourt, the 'Primitive Catholicism' of Gossner, and a few biographies of Christians of Italy, have been translated into the Italian, and a goodly number of copies published. At the present hour a tract is being printed at . . . on Confession, and another on the celibacy of the priests, composed by a former Dominican of Rome. A colporteur who had laboured in France as a colporteur of the Evangelical Society, was able to sell in . . . in a few weeks, a goodly number of the copies of the Scriptures. Our dear agents have been blessed, and already the circulation of the Sacred Writings is becoming more and more established by means of converted Italians. Unfortunately, upwards of

twenty thousand copies of the Scriptures have been seized by the Austro-Tuscan police. A suit is being carried on with activity against this act of spoliation. The laws of Tuscany authorize the publication of the pleadings; advantage has been taken of this circumstance to circulate among the public an Apology for the Bible."

This suit has been decided on appeal in favour of the publishers. Another appeal has been taken, which is now before the supreme court. The Cardinals and the other papal officials have some work before them in their efforts to extinguish all these publications.

The Waldenses.—We take the following account of this people—a good deal abridged—from an article, one of a series, published in the "American and Foreign Christian Union." It is from the pen of Dr. Baird. It presents them in an interesting light. We are sorry to see, however, that they use a liturgy and hymns:

"Their college* is a handsome, substantial and commodious building of stone, covered with slate, having ample halls, lecture rooms, library, &c. There are three capable professors, of whom one acts as President. The number of students is about fifty, young men and boys, many of whom come several miles in summer. It has a library of several thousand volumes. There is a grammar school at Pomerat, which has fifteen or twenty scholars. The College does not confer degrees, and the students must go to Switzerland or Germany to complete their studies, and to prepare for professional life. Five young men from the Valleys have been educated at the Academy, or University, of Lausanne, at the expense of the institution, and at that of Geneva, for more than three hundred years—in other words, from the time of the Reformation. For several years past, from five to ten of their young men have been receiving their theological training in the new seminary in the latter city, under the instruction of the celebrated Merle d'Aubigné and his excellent colleagues. Until within two years the Waldenses were not allowed to have a printing press, or to publish any thing whatever in their Valleys. At present they enjoy this privilege, and publish a religious journal, which bears the appropriate title of *L'Echo des Vallais*.† The number of their churches is sixteen—fifteen in the Valleys, and one at Turin. Their Doctrines—as set forth in their Confession of Faith, Hymns and Liturgy—are decidedly Evangelical. Their Liturgy is much like those of the Swiss and French Protestant Churches—short, simple and scriptural.

"We have reason to believe that *all* their pastors are sound in the faith, although all may not be equally clear and faithful and pungent in its exhibition. There has been, however, a great increase of vital piety among both pastors and people within the last few years. Poor as these people are, with few exceptions, they are very liberal, and for years have made collections in their churches to aid the good work in France. Of late they have begun to take an interest in missions among the heathen, and we believe that at least one of their young men is preparing to proclaim Christ in unevangelized lands."

Germany.—We have, in some late Nos., presented some outlines of the religious condition of Germany. The accounts are sad indeed. Tholuck confirms the most unfavourable statements respecting the irreligion of the mass of the people. He says,

"Indifference to religion and hostility against it are greatly increased. Attendance at public worship, in many of the Prussian provinces, is grievously neglected. On a Sabbath-day about five weeks ago, at the principal divine

* At La Tour.

† The Echo of the Valleys.

service, the congregation at the Cathedral here in Halle consisted of fourteen persons; at another church, of six; at a third, of five. The following day I went to the week-day service, and was the *only* attendant! The Protestant Churches on the Rhine, and in Westphalia, we do not find deserted to the same fearful extent. The number of free congregations increases proportionably. They are with us either Deistical or Atheistical in their opinions. . . . Wislicen has avowedly cast off all religion; his lectures are simply moral, or an exposure of the impositions and follies of the Christian faith. The Deistical congregations are either German Roman Catholics, who are every where on the decline where the social connexion is not broken up, or Uhlich's Protestant seceders. . . . That the truly regenerate, the awakened and living Christians, both among the clergy and laity, are far more zealous than formerly, is perfectly true; while the slumberers have ever sunk lower, losing even that which they seemed to have."

France. 1. *Politics.*—The result of the late elections in Paris, so far from deterring, has prompted the government and the assembly to new attacks upon their Socialist enemies. They have proposed, and by large majorities have nearly completed, a new Electoral law—intended to cut off a great number of what are regarded as the most dangerous kind of voters—prescribing longer terms of residence, &c., &c., The Republican journals are proscribed with a severity scarcely inferior to that which hastened the overthrow of their royal predecessors. These measures are thought to be designed to force the opposition into violent measures, which the government is prepared, with its army of 150,000 soldiers grouped around Paris, to suppress with a strong hand. Of this, the Socialists are aware, and "bide their time." 2. *Religious movements.*—Vigorous efforts are making to diffuse evangelical principles. An intelligent leader in these measures says:

"Renewed activity in the work of evangelization extends to the departments of La Manche, Charente, Charente Inferieure, La Sarthe, l'Orne and L'Yonne. In the latter department our labours extend in the most rejoicing manner in the neighbourhood of all our stations, Sens, Villeneuve, St. Maurice, Aillant, Auxerre. . . . If the work of evangelization has received a new impulse in the departments, it has not remained stationary in Paris. Besides the schools in the Faubourg du Temple, attended by eight hundred pupils, which we have taken under our patronage since the beginning of the present year, the Evangelical Society has just founded a girls' school in the Faubourg St. Antoine. This school, attended by more than one hundred girls, is under the care of an intelligent and pious mistress. We mean to avail ourselves of these new premises to establish there regular religious meetings, and we are happy to be able to do so without any augmentation in the expense we are at for the school. . . . We had great hopes for a work undertaken about six weeks since in the Faubourg St. Marceau, by our fellow-labourer, the Rev. Mr. Pilatte. We have not yet lost those hopes, though the work is at present interrupted. . . . We held evening meetings, which, from the very beginning, and though they were not extensively known, were attended by two hundred persons belonging nominally to the Roman religion, but who showed by the earnestness and attention with which they listened to the exposition of the evangelical doctrines, how much they were disgusted with and tired of the superstitions in which they had been brought up, and how much they were inclined to embrace the truth."

Belgium.—The legislation of Belgium is taking a direction against the papal clergy. Among the most interesting items that we have seen respecting that kingdom is the following from the pen of the correspondent of the National Era:

“A law for the regulation of the system of public instruction has been passed in the lower house of Belgium, with such conditions as to excite, to a high degree, the wrath of the Catholic clergy. The Bishops and Archbishops have laid before the senate a petition—or to give it its proper name, a protest against the enactment of the law. But it is not probable that the protest will produce any effect. Belgium presents a state of things worthy of study. Though there are only a few thousand Protestants in the whole kingdom, the Catholic clergy have been successively driven from the Cabinet, chased from public employments, and deprived of the direction of education which has been in their hands time out of mind. The secret of this is, that the absolutist tendencies of the Catholic clergy are too great to be tolerated even in Catholic Belgium.”

Austria.—The Austrian government has restored the Jesuits, and has added new and stringent laws respecting the confessional, &c., these laws binding only the papal population. The effect will appear by the following:

“The re-instatement of the Jesuits into their churches and convents increases the discontent. The religious controversy continues to cause great excitement. The attempt to restore the power of the Roman Catholic clergy, if persisted in, is likely to lead to serious consequences. Deputations have already waited on men high in office, and assured them that the excitement, to which the recent edicts have given rise, is of the most dangerous nature. . . . There are many who are of opinion that nothing is to be done but to become Protestants!

“I have been at some pains to learn the opinions of the army on the subject, and have heard many of the officers publicly declare that, as they had not shed their blood to restore clerical omnipotence, they would not do so to support it. Such is as correct a sketch of the present position of affairs as I am able to give you. I learn from a perfectly correct source, that not only the Government but the heads of the church themselves are quite dismayed at the result of a measure, the consequences of which, had they not been blind and deaf to the signs of the times, they might have foreseen. Pastoral letters, calculated to appease the excitement and fears of the people, are being prepared, and ordinances most favourable to the Protestants will be published without delay. In my opinion all this will prove of little avail; and I cannot refrain from thinking that a deadly wound has been inflicted on Roman Catholicism in Austria, should not the laws in question be repealed, either by ministers themselves, or by the future Diet at their instigation.”

*Finland.**—We have not often drawn the attention of our readers to the religious condition of Northern Europe. This we propose to do more frequently hereafter. The following is from the pen of Dr. Baird, and gives good ground to hope for a speedy resuscitation of vital religion in this remote and inhospitable region:

“The Lutheran is the Established Church in Finland, as in all the other Scandinavian countries. With the exception of a few churches of the Greek Communion and one Roman Catholic church, there is not one church in all Finland that is not Lutheran. There are 211 parishes, and as many churches. But as many of the parishes are too large to be adequately supplied by one church, there are between three and four hundred of what would be called *chapels-of-ease* in England—that is, a sort of adjunct or branch churches, each

* It lies on the eastern side of the Gulf of Bothnia, has the Gulf of Finland on the south, and Russia on the east, whilst it has Sweden and Norway on the north-west, and the Arctic Ocean on the north.

sustaining intimate relations with a parish church. The number of parish pastors is 211; but the whole number of preachers—pastors, adjuncts, assistants, &c.—is about 1100. There are two bishops, one of whom bears the title, and executes the office of archbishop. From all we could learn when on the ground, we are inclined to believe that there is more pure religion in Finland, in proportion to the population, than in either Sweden or Norway. There is a goodly number of faithful ministers. Rationalism, we are happy to say, has never prevailed much in Finland. There is much formalism; but this, though it has almost as little spiritual life in it as rationalism, is not near so dangerous in the pulpit; for the words of sound doctrine may, through God's blessing, be the means of benefiting others, even when those who utter them feel not the power of the truths which they teach."

The population of Finland—which previously belonged to Sweden, but now to Russia—is about 1,600,000, mostly poor people, with limited education; all, however, can read, and the National University at Helsingforis, has usually about four or five hundred students; about one hundred and fifty of whom are in the theological department. The temperance cause has made decided progress. Drinking, however, is still one of the greatest curses of the people of Finland, as it is of all these Northern nations.

England. 1. The State of the Nation.—The two great parties, the Protectionists and the Free Traders, are mustering their hosts. The former draw very dark pictures of the condition of the empire in its business relations. Their statements may be comprised in the following account which we find in the pages of Blackwood—High Tory—of the state of things in Liverpool.

"The capital of her merchants is embarked in every clime, and her shipping crowds every foreign port; yet her industrious population is plunged in suffering and embarrassment, and a portion of them—her labouring classes, pressed down by the influx of pauper competition from the hordes of emigrants from ruined Ireland—are continually upon the verge of actual starvation. It is distressing to witness the shifts to which tradesmen are compelled to resort, from time to time, in order to meet engagements, and to stave off, by sacrifices of their goods, the day of ruin. 'Selling off' announcements, under all kinds of pretexts, meet the eye in every direction, and yet tempt in vain. The whole community appear to be economizing; and tardily paid bills, and reduced expenditure in the comforts, and even in some of the necessities of life, is the rule, not the exception. The extent to which this is carried, and the suffering existing amongst the middle classes, may be judged of by the fact that it has already affected the incomes of many of the clergy of the town, by diminishing the numbers of their congregations and the yield of pew-rents. In one instance which has been mentioned to me, the income of a clergyman, universally beloved, has been thus cut down from £600 a-year, to little more than half; and this is far from being a solitary case."

This is partial authority; but we have observed that neither of the Free Trade Reviews—the Edinburgh or the Westminster—touches the subject at all. They seem incapable of meeting the assertions of their opponents. The controversy will be a most vehement one. We repeat what we have said before—England is on the wane. In her foreign relations, she is not just now very happy. Her diplomatic relations with France have been interrupted, and those with Russia are nearly in the same state. This has arisen from the means employed by England to collect some debts due to her subjects by Greece—Greece being under the joint guarantee of England, France, and Rus-

sia. Some have apprehended war. Of this, however, there is no danger from this cause. Still, this is one event, which in connexion with other causes of grievance and alienation, may ultimately lead to a breach of the amicable relations of these powers.

2. *Religious.*—The Tractarians are driving their measures with an uncompromising earnestness, against the decision of the Privy Council in the Gorham case. Another court has been appealed to, but with no better success. The Bishop of Exeter is resolute. He says he will not induct Mr. Gorham. The Tractarian clergy are arraying themselves in great numbers under his banner. If they hold to what they now say, they must either prevail, or leave the establishment. They will, however, recede, and when they discover that they cannot overawe the government, they will draw in again, and so the storm will blow over. They are not the sort of people to make martyrs of.

Hayti.—Though we have not succeeded in our purposes respecting Hayti, our readers still take an interest in its affairs. The following sketch is favourable. And in view of the opening which it presents, the greater shame attaches to the churches in this country, which have overlooked, so remarkably, this interesting field of missionary effort, just at their doors,—while they have sent out their missionaries to the ends of the earth.

“There is, at the present time, entire *freedom of the Press and religious toleration*. The Protestants now upon the ground, (mostly English Wesleyans,) may preach in their chapels, in the streets, and from house to house, without the least hinderance from Government, but on the contrary, with their sanction and approval. They have also the same unrestrained liberty to visit from house to house and distribute the Bible. In regard to ‘toleration,’ the Emperor has the most enlarged and liberal views. Besides this, he has been requested, officially, to prevent the spread of Protestantism, but has resolutely refused to do so, at the same time declaring that the Protestants were among his best subjects. Did time permit, I might state other facts showing the tolerant nature of the Government. The Haitians are far more intelligent and advanced in civilization than is generally supposed in this country. At Port-au-Prince there are—a ‘National Lyceum,’ (answering to one of our colleges,) with a corps of Professors, three large Government free schools, two large schools conducted by the missionaries, and a large number of private schools. Of the rest of the island I only know that there is a ‘National Lyceum’ at Aux Cayes and Cape Haitien, and at least *one* free school in each of the sixty-four arrondissements of the Empire.”

“The labours of the missionaries upon the island, besides being the means of the hopeful conversion of many, have made a *strong impression in favour of the Protestant religion*. Their honesty, industry, and untiring labours for the instruction and elevation of the people, are in such striking contrast with the character and labours of the priests, that the people are filled with surprise and admiration at their course, and they universally speak of them in the highest terms. They understand that it is the Bible that makes them to differ, and hence they welcome it among them. A gentleman in Port-au-Prince, who keeps a large variety store, told me that he had a great many inquiries for the Bible from the Catholics.”

AFFAIRS AT HOME.

The New Light Synod.—This body met at Xenia, May 15. It was composed of twenty-five ministers and fifteen ruling elders—thirteen ministers are reported as absent. We find little in their doings calling

for notice. They report eleven students of divinity in their Seminary the last sessions. The action of the Presbytery of Pittsburgh in receiving Rev. Mr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, and his congregation into communion and under their care, was, after earnest and protracted discussion, declared null and void. Of course, Mr. W. occupies now the same position that he did previously to making his application. The New Lights seem to be quite active in prosecuting missionary work, Domestic and Foreign. We would again take the liberty of suggesting that they should do the work under the right flag—and not under the name and style of Covenanters—for this they are not.

The (Old School) General Assembly.—This Assembly met, in May, in Cincinnati. It was large. The business, which was chiefly of denominational interest, was issued with a good deal of harmony. They can find no time, we are sorry to say, for the rebuke of Slavery. The subject was scarcely touched. Among the evils existing in their churches, they enumerate the neglect of family religion. They say:

“*Family religion* is too much neglected among our people. The powerful and hallowed influence of pious fathers and mothers, is not sufficiently embarked for leading the young to piety towards God. The religious instruction of children by their parents on the Sabbath day, which cannot innocently be committed entirely to other hands, has too much fallen into neglect.”

The evil never will be remedied until the Sabbath School system is radically changed, so as to confine it entirely to the destitute. We are sorry to find so intelligent a body of men congratulating themselves upon having

“A character before the world as a Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, attentive to duties fitly belonging to it, and standing aloof from all mere worldly questions and political agitations.”

This means, that in regard to evils like slavery, which have become embodied in the institutions of the country, they keep a prudent silence. Unlike their professed Master, they will avoid kindling any “fire.”

New School General Assembly.—This body met in Detroit. We find nothing of any interest in its doings, except that it spent five days upon the question of slavery. The result was the following resolutions:

“*Resolved*, That we exceedingly deplore the workings of the whole system of slavery, as it exists in our country, and is interwoven with the political institutions of the Slaveholding States, as fraught with many and great evils to the civil, political and moral interests of those regions where it exists.

“*Resolved*, That the holding our fellow men in the condition of Slavery; except in those cases where it is unavoidable by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an offence in the proper import of that term, as used in the Book of Discipline, chap. 1. sec. iii., and should be regarded and treated in the same manner as other offences.

“*Resolved*, That the Sessions and Presbyteries are, by the constitution of our Church, the Courts of Primary Jurisdiction for the trial of offences.

“*Resolved*, That after this declaration of sentiment, the whole subject of Slavery, as it exists in the Church, be referred to the Sessions and Presbyteries, to take such action thereon as in their judgment the laws of Christianity require.”

These resolutions are well characterized by a member of the Assembly—a thorough-going pro-slavery man—as “doing as little as possible.” We know of nothing more disgraceful to Church courts, than the

passing of such resolutions that may be interpreted to favour both sides of the controversy. And yet, legislation of this kind is growing. This Assembly is almost as pro-slavery,—if the reports of some of its members are to be credited,—as the Old School.

Congress.—Matters have progressed little the last month—up to this date, June 15th,—no decisive vote has been taken in the Senate upon Clay's Compromise Bill, and its fate is uncertain. In the House, the voting has commenced upon the California Bill, but as any quantity of amendments have been offered, and each has to be voted upon, there is no knowing when the main question will be reached.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

PRACTICAL SERMONS, to be used in Families and Social Meetings. By Archibald Alexander, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., 8vo., pp. 571. *Presbyterian Board of Publication*. Philad.

Books of sermons are frequently dull reading: Not so this volume. The sermons are short—there are thirty-seven in the volume,—in style plain, but uncommonly brief, in doctrine sound, and, as they profess to be in the title, eminently practical. We give the titles of a few taken indiscriminately:—Knowledge of Sin and the Law,—New Creation,—The One Thing Needful,—Faith's Victory over the World,—Difficulty of Knowing our Faults,—A Dying Martyr,—Prayer. In all we see the same eminent tact in elucidating matters of Christian experience, which gave such wide-spread popularity to a series of essays by the same author, a few years ago, published in the New York Observer, and other papers, under the signature A. A., and extensively republished in magazines and newspapers. The print is large, and the work is got up in that substantial and durable style that characterizes the issues of the Presbyterian Board.

PIOUS MEDITATIONS, and Devout Breathings. By the Rev. Joseph Hall, D. D. Bishop of Norwich. 18mo., pp. 298. *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 265 Chestnut Street, Philad.

This is, indeed, a work of Christian experiences. Just such a book as the Christian of spiritual mind and heart would wish to have at hand as a stimulant and guide in occasional meditation. It has something for nearly every variety of frame—for every incident of Providence. Heavenly Conversation, Love Unchangeable, the Happiest Object, Trust upon Trial, Angelical Familiarity, The Christian Indeed, are specimens of some hundred and twenty Meditations and Breathings comprised in this excellent little volume.

THE STORY of Wm. Tyndale, &c. **THE SHEPHERD BOY OF BETHLEHEM**, &c.

These are two small 18mo. volumes of thirty-six pages each, issued by the *Presbyterian Board*, containing each some two or three short narratives. We again recommend these small publications of the Board. They are generally very interesting to children, and, of course, well adapted to cultivate a taste for reading. A good supply of the best of them, would be found of no little advantage in fixing the minds of children, and in developing an early taste for books.

ACTIVE BENEVOLENCE. An Essay on the Duty and Privilege of Beneficence, &c. By A. Bower. 8vo. pp. 15. Philad. 1850.

The design of this *Essay* is not merely to enforce certainty and liberality in works of beneficence, but also to encourage *systematic*

efforts and contributions. The subject has not received that attention which, we are assured, its importance demands. The standard of liberality, in contributing for religious purposes, is too low, and besides, the voluntary principle, so largely acted upon now in all that relates to *private* Christian activity, has nearly carried this whole subject out of the domain of ministerial and pulpit investigation. We are glad to see attention turned to this matter, and to find it treated as occupying a high place among Christian duties, *for which every requisite provision has been made by the Head of the Church.* This Essay may be read with profit. We hope it will be circulated and read. The author sees the constitution of the church, in regard to this matter, in the true aspect. He says,—

“The deacons are to collect for religious purposes, have charge of, and distribute the funds, and do the work of the fiscal agents of the ‘Church and of the Boards.’ If these ‘magnify their office,’ the standard of benevolence will be greatly elevated in the church, and the temple of the Lord be up-built according to the demand.”

MRS. WHITTELEY'S MAGAZINE FOR MOTHERS,

We have received monthly, and have always looked into it with profit. Fathers as well as mothers will find not a few useful hints in this well conducted Magazine. Office, Brick Church Chapel, Second St., New York. Published by H. M. Whittlesey.

We would call the attention of our readers again to a work lately issued by the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, entitled,—

THE CHRISTIAN'S DAILY WALK.

It is an admirable book. Just such a book as the true Christian often feels the want of,—a book of systematized and plain directions, admonitions, and encouragements, under the ordinary, as well as extraordinary labours and trials of life.

TO OUR PATRONS AND READERS.

This number brings to a close another—the fifth—year of our editorial labours: a year signalized by fewer striking events than the preceding, but still by no means destitute of historical moment. In regard to political movements, it has been styled, with some truth, “the year of Re-action.” Twelve months ago, the revolutionary spirit was still rampant in the Old World. Rome was a republic,—Hungary was waging her mortal conflict with her mighty opponent,—Germany was heaving with popular discontent and commotion. Now, Rome lies, once more, at the feet of a spiritual despotism—Hungary has been crushed by her ruthless enemies,—Germany has settled down into, at least, apparent quietude. The time is not yet. The masses must still groan, for a season, under the iron rod of arbitrary power. Kings and nobles, and the priesthood have had a short respite. Popery, and even the Jesuits, have re-established their alliance with most of their old confederates in oppression. However, something has been gained. Popular liberty has made some advances. France, Sardinia, Prussia, many smaller German States, and even Austria, have a form—in most instances, imperfect—but still a form of constitutional government. In nearly every kingdom in Europe, some true light has been diffused. The Bible has been circulated even in Rome. A mea-

sure of religious liberty has gained entrance even into Austria. Sardinia has arrayed herself against papal and priestly arrogance, and usurped independency of civil control. In a word, liberty has taken possession of a higher vantage ground than she held before the great outbreak of 1848. The aspect of affairs is ominous. The ruling powers of Europe—Northern, Southern, and Eastern, are drawn together more closely. The league seems to be nearly complete between the “beast and the false prophet;” and yet there is no mutual confidence. The peace of Europe hangs by a thread. Mutual jealousies mar the intercourse of the great powers, and, independently of the movements of the masses, the discerning eye can distinguish not a few elements of discord, and, it may be, of speedy and general conflict.

Efforts have not been wanting in behalf of true religion. These continue. Christ is “riding forth on his white horse, with his bow and his crown.” He has followers—a few as yet,—“called, chosen, and faithful.” To them he will give strength. They shall possess the kingdom.

We may be deceived, but every thing betokens another eventful era at hand. We will endeavour to note the progress of events, and to lay before our readers in our brief monthly summary, all that is of marked and present importance, and all that may seem essential to a correct judgment of the signs of the times.

In other departments, we ask again the assistance of our brethren—such as wield the pen of ready writers. Our effort has all along been to make the *Covenanter* a vehicle—not for mere literary or even theological disquisitions,—these are more suitably located elsewhere than in the limited pages of a magazine like ours,—but of practical essays that bear directly upon the present aspect of things in Church and State. It is our purpose to make our pages a mirror of the times—in which may be seen its peculiar controversies and changes—approving and defending what is good, and opposing and confuting what is evil. In carrying out our design, we hope to resume the system of reviews, interrupted for the last year by causes beyond our control.

Finally, if there was ever a time in which the exercise of vigilance was imperatively demanded, this is that time. It is a period of intense mental activity. Business and politics absorb the attention of the great majority around us, generating, even in the church, a spirit of indifference to the truth and to the glory of Christ, and endangering the rapid decay of vital religion. As witnesses for the prerogatives of Christ, in his grace and government, we must stand upon our watch tower, and let nothing escape that can endanger, however plausible its aspect, the paramount claims of our Hope and Sovereign. With this purpose, we set out upon the labours of another year, asking God's help, and relying upon the countenance and co-operation of the friends of truth and of a Covenanted Testimony.