The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 28 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, JANUARY, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 28 JANUARY. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Ministers of God … … … … …	321
Handling the Word of God Deceitfully … … …	323
Presbyterianism the Instituted form of Church Government …	326
The Law a Schoolmaster to bring to Christ … … …	327
Justification of Error … … … … … …	328
Pastoral Reminiscences … … … …	330

THE MINISTERS OF GOD.

[We regret that circumstances prevented the earlier appearance of the following *report* of the discourse delivered by the Rev. James McCulloch – retiring Moderator – at the opening of the Synod of Eastern Australia.]

"In all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God." 2 Cor. 6: 4.

Two things are presented to our consideration in this text.

I. The persons referred to, and

II. Their mode of acting.

I. The persons referred to are "the ministers of God." This designation points to their peculiar office or work. They are God's attendants or servants. They wait on him for instructions, and act for him in the weighty and important work of the Gospel ministry. "These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show unto us the way of salvation." "As the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters," so the eyes of God's true ministers wait on him that they may catch the intimations of his will.

There are various views presented of the work of God's ministers. Sometimes it is spoken of as that of an ambassador sent from the Court of Heaven to treat with guilty rebels, and to negotiate peace between them and their rightful Sovereign on Gospel terms. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as if God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." At other times, Gospel ministers are called stewards, – "stewards of the mysteries of God." Gospel truths are entrusted to them, that they may take care of them and dispense them faithfully and seasonably to God's household. Again, they are described as shepherds, having the souls of men committed to their charge, that they may gather them into the fold of Christ, feed them by leading them to the green pastures and beside the still waters, go before them pointing out the way, and acting like the Great Shepherd of whom it was prophesied, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs with his arms, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead them that are with young." Once more, ministers are spoken of as sentinels. "So thou, O son of man, I have set then a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore than shalt hear the word at my mouth and warn them from me." This the Apostle Paul applies to ministers when he says, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself unto the battle?" They are to be on the outlook for dangers, and to give distinct and faithful warning to their hearers. They are to warn them generally, and in regard to the particular dangers to which they are exposed from within their own souls, as well as the dangers that arise from the times in which they live and the circumstances in which they are placed..

So far for the work in which those described in the text are engaged. But the expression "ministers of God" may be viewed also as pointing to their appointment to and qualification for the work, implying that they are ministers of sending and preparing. By him they are specially called, and specially fitted for the work. Their being so is frequently referred to by Paul in this epistle as indispensable. "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." . . . . "*Now then* we are ambassadors for Christ." . . . . "For we preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

II. We come now, in the second p1ace, to consider the mode of acting followed by the persons described in the text; "In all things approving ourselves *as* the ministers of God." To whom do they thus approve themselves? Firstly and chiefly, to God. It is to the sovereign that the ambassador is to approve himself; the steward is to approve himself to the householder, the shepherd to the owner of the sheep, and the soldier to his general. So ministers, as God's ambassadors, stewards, shepherds, and soldiers, are chiefly concerned to be approved unto him. The interests of his cause in the world

are, to no small extent, committed to them and he is to reckon with them how they have acted towards the weighty and important trust. Hence, like Paul and his fellow labourers, they should "labour, that whether present or absent; they may 322 be accepted of him." Knowing that they "must appear before the judgment seat of Christ," they should "study to show themselves approved unto *God*." Further, those described in the text, act so as to approve themselves to their own consciences. "Pray for us: for we trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly." "Herein do I exercise have always a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man." If in all parts of the divine service it be necessary "to draw near with an heart sprinkled from an evil conscience," how much more so in this? There needs to be a renouncing of the hidden things of dishonesty, and not walking in craftiness, a consciousness that they are actuated by pure motives, that they have some reason to believe that they are prosecuting the work with simplicity, diligence, and earnestness; that their "exhortation is not of deceit, nor of uncleanness, nor in guile," but that as they "are allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so they speak, not as pleasing men but God, who trieth their hearts, not using flattering words, nor a cloak of covetousness, nor of men seeking glory."

Thirdly, the ministers of God approve themselves to the consciences of their fellow men. "By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." To the judgment of those who know and appreciate the truth, every faithful minister commends himself. And, whilst he cannot expect the admiration of those who have little or no spiritual discernment and little or no relish for faithful dealings, still he may succeed in securing a testimony in the *consciences* of all. If many will not understand or sympathise, they must feel that the faithful minister is acting in accordance with his position as a minister of God.

Thus John the Baptist, by manifestation of the truth in his life and preaching, commended himself to the conscience of Herod. "Herod feared John knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him, and when he heard him, he did many things and heard him gladly."

Let us now consider *in what* the ministers of God approve themselves to God, to their own consciences, and to the consciences of their fellow-men. Here a wide field opens, as furnished by the Apostle in the many and varied particulars he adduces in the context, of which the following are some – "in much patience, in afflictions," . . . "by pureness, by knowledge, by long suffering," . . . . . "by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth."

Let us look at the leading parts of a minister's work, in connection with which the particulars mentioned in the context are less or more exemplified, and first as to preparation for preaching. As, in ordinary cases, the public preaching of the word forms by far the most important part of the ministerial service, due preparation for this is highly necessary. "Till I come give attendance to reading." "Meditate on these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all," "*Study* to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Hence those who are concerned to approve themselves in this matter, will devote themselves to the prayerful and careful study of God's word, that they may ascertain the mind of the Spirit as thereby conveyed, and bring the truth to bear seasonably and faithfully on the various cases of their hearers, – that they may act as skilful and faithful ambassadors, that they may dispose wisely and faithfully of their Master's goods, and that they may feed the flock with knowledge and understanding. They are also concerned to have on their own souls a deep impression of the message prepared, that they may speak as those that believe.

I need not to remind my brethren, that preparation for preaching consists, to a very great extent, in having the mind in suitable exer-

cise and a suitable frame for the delivery of our message.

In certain cases, when ministers are by providential circumstances prevented from studying beforehand, they may warrantably expect needed assistance. And, after due preparation has been made, most appropriate, and telling views of divine truth may be presented to the mind at the time of delivering the message. But, if they neglect the careful and prayerful study of God's word, they are not approving themselves to God, to their own conscience, or to intelligent and judicious hearers. It is an attempt at serving the Lord with that which cost them nothing, and a neglecting of the divine exhortation, "*Study,* to show thyself approved unto God." Farther, ministers of God aim at approving themselves in the proclamation of divine truth, making it manifest that they are much engaged in this work, that they are fervently, energetically, faithfully following in this respect the example of Paul. "Ye know that from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility . . . . And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house . . . . I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." See Acts 20: 18, &c. Like Paul, they aim at preaching "Christ, warning every man, and teaching every man, in all wisdom, that they may present every man perfect in Christ," that in their preaching they may be "unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish," and be able to take their hearers "to record that they are pure from the blood of all men."

Again, God's ministers are concerned to approve themselves in their conduct. To this the Apostle makes special reference in the context and in other epistles. If Christians generally are under obligation to have their "conversation such as becometh the Gospel of Christ," how much more those who are preachers of that Gospel. Such are specially bound to abstain from all appearance of evil, to follow after those things which are pure, lovely, and of good report. It is not only in the pulpit they are to act in character, as ministers of God, but in their intercourse with men, and in their general deportment, aiming at this, that they may examples in all things, patterns of good works. To what a great extent the Apostles succeeded in thus approving themselves to those among whom they laboured is evident from the appeal made to the Thessalonians. "Ye are witnesses and God also, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved our-selves among you that believe." Where this is not habitually the character presented, no favourable testimony can be elicited from the minister's own conscience, or from those among whom he labours,

Again, Gods ministers are concerned be approved in exercising the government and discipline of Christ's house. They know that, in dispensing sealing ordinances, it behoves them to acquit themselves as faithful stewards, acting wisely, faithfully, and tenderly within the province assigned to them by the Head o the Church.

This is more especially needed in times when the line of demarcation between the Church and the world is so much practically ignored, and the garden of Christ, to a grievous

extent, in many instances turned into a common. In such circumstances the temptation to laxity is very great, inasmuch as those who dislike faithful dealings can easily find places of refuge. But let it be our great concern in this matter to approve ourselves to God, to our own consciences, and to all that make the word their rule, and leave consequences with God.

323

Finally, God's ministers approve themselves by bearing testimony against assaults upon and compromises of the truth, Like Paul they are "set for the defence of the Gospel," and "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." They bear in mind that Christ's faithful witnesses are described as overcoming "by the blood of the Lamb, and by the *word of their testimony*." They are no favorers of that liberality with their Lord's goods, which has become so popular in connection with the formation of ecclesiastical unions as well as otherwise. In opposition to the talk about mutual concessions, – that we must give and take, they adopt as their motto, "Buy the truth and sell it not." "Hold that fast which thou hast."

In conclusion, we see, fathers and brethren, the great aim and object of the true ministers of Christ: "to approve themselves in all things as the ministers of God." Such no doubt have cause to exclaim, "In many things we offend all," that they come sadly short in this great attainment, – but not allowedly. They realise, and that more and more deeply, the vast responsibility involved in the performance of their work, and the solemn account they have to render for its discharge. Hence, like Paul, they labour that they may be accepted of Christ; they watch for souls as they that must give an account. Hence, how much they are concerned to have the testimony of a good conscience that they are approved unto God! And, whilst such regard the *divine* approbation as the first and main object, they are not regardless of the *legitimate* approbation of men. So far from being regardless of what men think or say of them, they study those things that are of good report, that they may thus exert a beneficial influence, knowing that Christ commands his disciples to "let their light shine before men, that they may see their good works and glorify their Father who is in heaven." At the same time we are not to forget that, in times of defection and latitudinarianism, an uncompromising and steadfast adherence to truth will meet with but a very limited amount of human approbation. In that respect it may be expected that the faithful adherents to truth will be misunderstood, if not misrepresented. We observe, secondly, that it is by aiming at, and in some measure attaining to, the course described in the text, that we can have comfort and expect success in our work. "Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity; not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to youward." "Our Gospel came to you not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake."

All true ministers of Christ are concerned for success, and that in all the ways in which they may warrantably expect it. Their prayer is, "Let thy work appear unto thy servants," more especially in the conversion of souls and the upbuilding of the converted. And, surely, we are warranted in saying that, in proportion as a minister makes it his great object in all things to approve himself as a minister of God, the desire of his heart as to success will be granted. "Them that honour me I will honour." Christ will also honour those who are faithful in testifying for his truth. See the epistle to the Church in Philadelphia. Let us, my brethren, realise that Christ's blessing is our only hope as a Church. Without this no Church can advance in doing Christ's work; mere human devices and worldly expedients are of no avail for this. How emphatically the Lord is teaching us as a Church, "It is not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." May we learn the lesson, and let it be our great object in our respective spheres of labour and in our present meeting of Synod, so to approve ourselves in all things, that we may feel encouraged to pray, "Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us."

May the elders of our Church be enabled also in all things to approve themselves as office-bearers in the house of God. May they see the obligations under which they lie to act with becoming fidelity, zeal, and wisdom in the congregations with which they are respectively connected, and in the courts of our Church. And let all the members of the Church present feel their obligations in all things to approve themselves as members of God's house, that "you may adorn the doctrine of God your Saviour in all things," – that you may bear much fruit, as herein the Father is glorified, and you prove that you are his disciples. See to it that ye be like the Roman converts whose "faith was spoken of through the whole world," like the believing Thessalonians who "were ensamples to all that believed in Macedonia and Achaia." Study much the epistles addressed by Christ to the seven Churches of Asia, imitating those Churches in those things in which they were commended by the Saviour, and shunning those in which they were censured by him.

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY.

There is no position more indubitable in Christian theology, than that the modern of the divine Master should be sufficient for the disciple. Whatever basis was sufficient to form the spiritual knowledge, and to sustain the religious intelligence of the man Christ Jesus is a sufficient resting place for the faith, and infallible warrant for the practice of his followers. The age in which we live resembles that in which the Gospel was first preached eminently in the assertion of a high intellectual activity; and the temptation is very great, both to the Christian teacher and the Christian disciple, to enter this sphere of secular intelligence, for the purpose of appropriating its materials, and interpreting its conclusions in the service of revelation. This inclination, to make the world's science the servitor – or, at all events, the ally – of Bible truth, has the merit of good intention in many instances, it may be presumed; but the attempt is not often harmless, and, in any case, it is not safely conducted, unless the limitation, under which it should be guarded, be observed, and the principles of Christian duty are touched in such an endeavour; be zealously respected. To be wiser than Lord Jesus in matters of religious concern – to lean our faith on supports other than he used – may easily lead us into the conceits of a fleshly mind, but will not assuredly promote religious intelligence or life within us. These remarks have an easy application to the question of the inspiration of the Scriptures. There is no sphere of Christian faith or duty in which the example of the Lord and Master is more significant. His confidence in the oracles of God was unqualified. His repose of soul upon the written Word was visibly unvexed by the shadow of a disquietude; and most reassuring to us, on whom the ends of the world have come – this calm faith of the soul of the man Christ Jesus lies anchored in the Gospel histories, over those very abysses of man's origin and the world's creation, which secular science, in our day, has been employed to agitate and embroil. So far as

the persuasions of the man Christ Jesus are concerned, the question of man's origin is settled. So far as the force of his example reaches the grounds on our faith, as to man's origin, ought to rest, are determined. The foundations of that belief – if we are to use the same foundations with him, who is made of God to us wisdom – are the written Word. The conclusion built on that Word – if are to believe in company with the Light of the World – is the ordinary one; that mankind is descended from a single pair, and that the history of the race dates from "the beginning" of the Mosaic 324
record, "*Have ye not* READ?" Such is the ground for our faith by the Saviour of mankind: and the faith itself; "*He that made them in* THE BEGINNING *made them* A *male and* A *female*. We have, in a sentence, the faith of the Son of Man as to the origin of the species, and an exhibition of the evidence by which that faith was (to his satisfaction) warranted.

Any truly Christian mind may well start after this the question, whether the endeavour to co-ordinate secular science with the truths of the divine Word has always been prosecuted on sound principles. Has it always been sufficiently considered, that the public character of the Saviour is involved, and the place which he is to hold, as an authority in religion, is closely affected by any relaxation of the authority of the written Word? In any concord that can be established between conterminous regions of knowledge, the foundations of both must stand unmoved; but in the sphere of Christian knowledge we shall look long for anything more fixed and central than the perfection of the Saviour, both as the subject and the expositor of religious troth and, as mutually and vitally enwrapt in each other, the perfect wisdom the Saviour stands or falls with the perfect trustworthiness of the written Word – that in its most primitive utterances, "in the beginning," and in those subjects most vexed by the tumults of sceptical speculation – the origin of man and the creation of the world.

It is by directly associating the public character of the Saviour with these utterances of the written Word, that we can best estimate the stubborn tenacity with which the early records of the Bible refuse to be accommodated to any other than their natural meaning; while we see also, by the reaction which all such accommodations exert on the competency of Jesus as a religious instructor, how ill they repay the trouble that is often expended on them, or how fatally they press the life out of the heart of Bible truth by a pressure (supposed harmless) put on the extremities. On this principle of maintaining with scrupulous care the all sufficiency of Jesus as the light of the world and full of grace and truth, we prefer to accept, in his company and on the authority of his example, the plainest and most obvious rendering of the creation record; and to lay it down as an ultimate maxim in such matters, that no theories can possess the reality how-ever they may, under certain conditions of set knowledge or comparative ignorance, wear the grace – of truth, which would render the Christian's faith different from the Christ's, either in its substance or its foundation. The conflict of evidence (so-called) in cases of collision between Scripture and Science is more correctly defined as an inability, in the operator, to bring up all the evidence that is due to one of the scales of the balance. The demand for a reconciliation, in such circumstances, is both idle and absurd. But, not so the inquiry, as to which of the two scales has received its final load? And this inquiry fortunately does admit of an answer, both on the side of secular science and also on the side of Scripture truth. Thus, negatively, the accumulation of knowledge in the scale of natural science are, confessedly, progressive, or, in other words, incomplete. The attempt to keep such a scale in equilibrio is equivalent to the problem of extracting rest from motion. While, positively, the other scale of the balance is finally weighted, or, in other words, revelation is complete as to its outward form and materials. There ought to be no hesitation, in such circumstances, as to the conduct of any follower of Christ. He ought to retain immovably the solid truths which his side of the balance contains. He should grasp, with a clear apprehension, the condition under which the state of equilibrium must, and shall, ultimately, be attained. A progressive science – such as men's knowledge of the natural world is – cannot be isometrical with a final system of revealed truth. The progress of science must cease, and its conclusion on the point at

issue fix themselves, before the effort, to super-impose the parallel lines of truth on one another, so prove their equality, will repay the trouble. Let the Christian hold firm his perfect and ultimate revelation; he can afford to wait till science presents a perfect and ultimate, and not merely a partial and ephemeral, theory of the natural world. Meanwhile, there is but one condition possible under which a perfect revelation and an imperfect science can be made to appear in accord. By a hasty, a timid, or an unreflecting *sacrifice* of certain contents of divine revelation, the weakling in the faith may adjust the weight of his creed to the momentary demands of the science of the day. But tomorrow comes, and a new phase of science along with it, and the adjustment of yesterday is exploded with renewed scorn. Nor can it be otherwise, unless the conditions were altered. Let us see a final science, or final scientific conclusion, on the subject in hand, and we do not fear but that they shall tally with the written Word.

The unreasonableness of the task which is sometimes set believers in divine revelation – or which at other times they themselves – of squaring two records,(one of which is final and the other imperfect) would be duly estimated if the burden were shifted to the other shoulder; or, in other words, if the task of reconciling science with the Bible were imposed on the student of science himself, instead of being uniformly expected at the hands of the student of the Word. There would really be no more logical unfitness in asking the student of natural science to explain to us why his science leads to a conclusion derogatory to the religious character of the Saviour than there is, the converse demand made on the believer, to reconcile the records of Moses (which the Saviour religiously embraced) with the progress reports of human science. The only answer to all such demands is the call for patience, and, on the side the Christian, a studious estimate of moral weight of that character of Christ, by the constraining force of whose example he infixes his faith steadfastly and confidently in the truth of the written Word.

"*The Written Word*" * is the title of a lecture recently delivered in Melbourne by a noted minister of the Unionist Church there, and subsequently published under the title of "The Written Word and other Essays." The scope of the lecture; or, as now published, of the essay, is to establish an entire disjunction, both form and character, between two things, which the author regards as widely different. The Word of God is, to the writer of the essays, something quite distinct from the written Word. The former term he applies, exclusively, to divinely revealed truth, as conveyed *from God to the mind of the* "*seer*." The latter term he appropriates to the communication in writing of that revealed truth, *from the prophet to mankind at large*. To establish and defend this distinction – or, perhaps, we ought rather to say amplify and illustrate the statement of it – is the scope of the essay; and the writer's design, though he never plainly states it, is readily recognisable when he proceeds to say that the Word of God (in his sense of the expression) is the sole subject of

those laudations which the Scriptures so often bestow on divine revelation, and that the written Word has no proper interest in them. Thus, for example, if we take the eulogiums pronounced on the revealed will of God in the 19th Psalm, the essayist's view of these commendations is, that they belong, not to the written Word, but (as he distinguishes) to Word of God. To the *first* living depositary of any divine revelation that revelation was the Word of God. To him, and him *alone,* as thus in

---

* *The Written Word and other Essays*, by the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, M. A. Melbourne: S. Mullen, 56 Collins Street East. 1868.

immediate contact with the divine revealer, that Word was "perfect converting the soul," "sure making wise the simple," "right rejoicing the heart," "pure enlightening the eyes." But how much of that perfection, certainty, rightness, and parity remains in the Word after *it has been written* is a matter wrapt in obscurity, or left to be ascertained for us, by such works as this essay. The writer's purpose is never directly expressed, or even clearly hinted throughout; but we can hardly err, after this review of his positions, in deducing it; and it is such a purpose as manifestly demands the caution and reticence, which he has carefully maintained.

The obvious drift of the essay, then, is to denude the "written Word" – that is, the Holy Scriptures – of those attributes of perfection, sufficiency, and plenary inspiration that make it an infallible standard and rule of faith. And, whereas, such qualities are claimed by the Scriptures for themselves, as the Word of God, the writer of the essay sets up a Word of God distinct from the Scriptures and subsisting only in the momentary impressions of the minds of a few men, and, at the expense of the Scriptures, which he despoils of all these lustrous characters, he adorns this fancy of his own with the sacred name of the Word of God and with those beams of moral perfection, of which he had shorn the sacred writings. Of course we are thus led upon ground which no Romanist nor Rationalist would have any difficulty in utilizing. It is not with such a fancy "Word of God," as our essayist fashions for himself, that the Church of Rome holds a quarrel. It is not with the attributes of a revelation having no permanent shape among men, but vanishing, like a ghost, in the impalpable vision land of a lost prophetical *consciousness,* that any Rationalist need fight. What Romanist and Rationalist alike cannot abide is an intelligible, authoritative, and exclusive rule of faith and life embodied with these attributes, in written language, and open to the study and the apprehension of all. Such a rule of faith our essayist has subverted. To him the Scriptures are not held for such a rule; and he leaves us to search for it – to find such a law of the Lord as is "perfect," "sure," "right," and "pure" – where it can but distantly be contemplated, in the act of evanescence, in the impression produced by direct divine communication on the minds of inspired men long since gathered to their fathers. The general effect is thus to leave qualities of undependableness, mistake, fallibility in unascertained and, therefore, conveniently expansible degree attributable to the written Word.

It is not disputed by those who hold the plenary inspiration of the written Word, that mistakes in the texts of the sacred book have arisen through the accidents necessarily attending their frequent transcription in the long lapse of ages through which they have come down to us. But this sort of error is conditioned by its very nature, within comparatively narrow limits; it actually attaches to the sacred text in a degree that is wonderfully small, as contrasted with the like accidents in other ancient records. And such as it is, it has a tendency, since the invention of printing, to vanish, not to diffuse itself, and to disappear under the comparison of different manuscripts. Such as it is however, it is freely acknowledged as a source of error; though, like the gaps in the luminosity of the sun, without sensible influence on the practice or comfort of human life. It is very evident that such a source of error is too feeble and inoperative for the objects of the essay now under notice. The author, indeed, accepts it as an instalment of the imperfection,which he wishes to fasten on the written Word; but the necessities of his theory demand a wider latitude of error and mistake to dwell in. The essay is reticent; but the writer lets himself out, in a closing note on this point, as follows: –

We are entitled to assume the accuracy of every part of Scripture, even in minutest details, until the contrary shall have been proved; wherever a proved error may have arisen through corruption of the
text, we are entitled to assume that it has done so; and *if any*
proved

errors remain for which such an explanation will not suffice, we are entitled to ask that they shall not be allowed to shake men's faith in the rest of the sacred *book,* and *especially* in the divine *truth* which it professes to reveal. The credit, in a word, of Holy Writ does not hang on its miraculous freedom from such errors, and cannot be destroyed by their existence. At the same time, the general presumption in favour of its verbal correctness, (*a.*) from its mere antiquity and literary authority, (*b.*) from its sanctity as a record of revelations, (*c.*) from the acknowledged inspiration of its authors, and (*d.*) from the divine reliableness which can be proved to belong to *at least some* of its words, is so strong, that no error ought to be assumed without the most exact and cogent proof.

The *italics* are ours. The writer does not favour us with an application of his theory to any particular portion of Scripture, nor does he hint where any proved errors, not explainable by corruption of the text, are to be looked for. There was, perhaps, no room for overtaking this in essay, and sufficient has been done by laying the written Word open to errors which are not due to merely mechanical causes. This latitude of possible error in the Scripture is wide enough to accommodate any theories of the origin of man, or of the age of the world. It is a *surrender* of the solid and sterling qualities, which Scripture claimed for itself, and which the Saviour of men, and the Light of the World devoutly conceded to it – for the purchase of a present with the ever varying phases of human speculation, and a momentary smile from the speculatists.

We dislike the contents of the essay of course, but its literary characteristics are pleasing enough. The style is scholarly; with that sort of seductive quietness which invites the reader to resign himself into a species of mental anaesthesia. The pleasure of such narcotic easy reading is great; and would be greater in this instance than it is, were it not for the surgery to which the operating essayist subjects us. We at length open our eyes dissatisfied to find that the dreamy half hour with our author has brought us the sacrifice of something dear as a right hand, and precious as a right eye. With all its literary ability, however, the essay is disfigured with signal marks of personal vanity. We forgive the empty display of Greek and Latin quotations that are handy enough to any tyro; but the following fling at the alleged incapableness of sundry divines and prea-chers comes at the back of so many similar sneers by the essayist, on other occasions, at his contemporaries and breth- ren, that we find it hard not to construe it as a tasteless and repulsive advertisement of the essayist's preaching powers.

Doctrine and practice are not here two things, *as divines docquet them in the division of a catechism, or as unskilful preachers distribute them into* "*heads*" in a sermon, but are as God gives them to us in spiritual experience.

Owen and Edwards on this showing, must have been very

unskilful preachers. Yet it will require something else than a fascinating style before they are approached or resembled, in reverence for God's Word, acquaintance with its doctrines, or power and unction in charging them on the consciences of men. We have not touched on the contrariety that there is between the views of the essay and the doctrinal standards which the essayist has subscribed. But it does not require a skilful preacher to see the indecency of such an essayist subscribing a confession which enumerates "*all the books* of the Old and New Testaments," and adds "all which are given by inspiration of God *to be the rule of faith and life*." We have lived to see many sad tokens of decay in the Free Church of Scotland, and these essays by the young minister, who has been assistant, successively, to Dr. Candlish in Edinburgh, and Dr. Cairns in Melbourne, will be far from rejuvenating the character of his Church. But they will doubtless be effective aids to "progress" and "advanced opinions."

326

PRESBYTERIANISM – THE INSTITUTED FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

It is not our intention to offer a full view of the instituted government of the Church. All we propose is, to ascertain its *form* – whether it is Episcopal, Congregational, or Presbyterian. Our inquiry will thus be restricted to the distinctive peculiarities of those different forms of Church government. These fall under the two heads *of functionaries* and *functions.*

I. Who, then, are the functionaries by whom the government of the Church should be administered?

We answer, in the *first* place, They are not the members of the Church as such – all the communicants – as Congregationalists hold; but certain office-bearers only, as Presbyterians hold.

1. That it is not by the members of the Church as such that its government is to be administered is evident, for the Scriptures distinguish between those who are members of the Church and those who rule in the Church. To the believing Hebrews the apostle writes, (Hebrews 13: 17) "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves." Here we have plainly two classes, – some who are not to *rule,,* but to "obey" and "submit themselves," and others who "rule." Thus some of the members of the Church, – its non-official members, – are excluded from the exercise of rule. In the preceding context, (ver. 7), the same distinction is presented – "Remember those which have the rule over you." If all ruled, according to the congregational plan, such language as this would be wholly inappropriate. See also 1 Thess. 5: 12, 13.

Here we must advert to a striking inconsistency in the views of Congregationalists on the point under consideration. They acknowledge as office-bearers only the pastors and deacons, and yet practically they make all the members office-bearers for what else are the rulers of the Church – those who administer its government, than office-bearers?

Again the pastors are described as the class of office-bearers "who have the charge of the spiritual concerns of the Church;" (Payne's Manual p. 2l). And, yet, all the members, if it pertains to them to administer the government of the Church, have "charge of its spiritual concerns." It is with its spiritual concerns alone that those who administer its government have to do. Thus a certain work is assigned to certain office-bearers as the appropriate, and distinctive work of their office, and not withstanding, we are told that it is equally the work of those who hold no office – of the members at large.

2. As the rulers of the Church are distinguished by the scriptures from those over whom they rule, the names which they bear are descriptive of their office and authority. They are called *presbyters,* or *elders,* a name given by the Jews both to civil and to ecclesiastical *rulers*. (1 Tim. 5: 17). They are also called *bishops,* that is overseers, (Acts, 20: 28; Titus 1: 7), a term which clearly implies the idea of rule. What were the use of inspection unaccompanied by power to regulate and correct? In passages already quoted (Heb. 13: 7, 17,) and elsewhere, they are expressly called *rulers*. Now, God having "set some in the Church" to whose office such titles are applicable, it follows that all its members are not rulers. Titles equally appropriate to all would not be given exclusively and by way of distinction to some.

3. The rulers of the Church are further distinguished from the members at large by the qualifications which they are required to possess. "A bishop," says the Apostle Paul, "must be one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God? (1 Tim. 3: 4, 5.) Now, why should ability to rule be thus required in a bishop, as a distinct official qualification, if the duty of ruling, instead of being specially attached to his office, devolved upon all the members.

4. It is to a distinct class of office-bearers, and not to all the members that instructions are given respecting the government of the Church – "the elders which are among you I exhort . . . feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof" – or performing the duty of bishops – "not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being Lord's over God's heritage," (1 Peter 5: 1-3). Here the elders or presbyters are instructed "to feed the flock;" and it is well known that the word which is here rendered *to feed* conveys the additional idea of *leading* and *ruling,* and often conveys, the idea of *ruling* exclusively. It is the same word that is rendered *rule* in Rev. 2: 27 – "he shall *rule* them with a rod of iron, and also in Rev. 12: 5, 19: 15, and Matt. 2: 6. What the Apostle intends, when he exhorts them "to feed the flock," is, as he afterwards, expresses it, that they should perform towards it the duty of bishops, in which, as we have already remarked, the exercise of rule is comprehended. It is, indeed, evident, without any exact inquiry into the meaning of the words on which we have now remarked, that the elders are exhorted to exercise rule – to govern, for they are cautioned against an extreme to which they would be liable only in discharging this duty – the extreme of "lording it over God's heritage."

5. The distinction, which we have now traced in several particulars, between the rulers of the Church and the members over whom they rule, has its origin in Christ's institution. He "hath set *some* in the Church" to exercise various official functions, among which government is particularly mentioned. (1 Cor. 12: 28.) He has not committed the exercise of those functions to all the members of the Church. It is to certain office-bearers alone that he has committed the power of the keys, that is, the power of government. (Matt.16: 19, compared with Matt. 18: 18.) In the former of those passages Peter alone is expressly addressed, but from the latter of them it is evident, that it was simply as a power which should thence forward belong to his office that the power of the keys was given to him, and that accordingly it was given equally to his brother office-bearers.

It is proper to observe in this connections, that, while the apostles were extraordinary, they were also ordinary office-bearers. Their office comprehended all inferior offices. Peter accordingly, addressing the elders describes himself as "also an elder." (1 Peter 5: 1.) Hence, when the power of the keys was conferred upon the apostles, it was conferred upon them, not as apostles merely, but also as presbyters, and when it was conferred on them as presbyters, it was conferred upon the

presbyters of the Church in all time coming as represented by them. This is evident from the fact, that, according to the Scriptures, as we have seen, presbyters possess it.

Thus the scriptures teach that it is certain office-bearers, and not by all the members, that the government of the Church is to be administered, and that by those office-bearers it is to be administered *authoritatively*. It cannot indeed be administered otherwise; what is not authoritative is not an administration of government, and he that does not act authoritatively does not act the part of a ruler.

We now proceed to show that what is really the teaching of the passages; which Congregationalists adduce to prove that is not by certain office-bearers, but by all the members, that the government of Church is to be administered, is perfectly consistent with our doctrine and even confirms it. The passage which seems to be most relied on is Matthew 18: 15-17 – "if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; and if he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother; but, if he will not hear thee, then take with

thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established; and, if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but, if he shall neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." According to this passage it is to "the Church" that the exercise of discipline is committed; and the question is, what is "the Church" intended – is it, as Congregationalists contend, the Church which the communicants of a particular congregation compose.

That we may arrive at a satisfactory answer to this question, we must bear in mind that when the direction, "tell it unto the Church," was given, the Christian Church was not yet founded, for it was not founded till after Christ's resurrection. Accordingly, it is not from the application of the term *Church* after the Christian Church was founded, and to the Christian Church, that the meaning of it in this place is to be ascertained, but from the application of it at the time, that is, before the Christian Church was founded. The point to be determined is not what it came afterwards to signify among Christians, but what it signified then among the Jews – among those whom our Lord addressed. And what did it signify then among them? Not certainly "the body of communicants," as Congregationalists explain it. "We appeal first," says Dr. Payne, "to Mat. 18: 15-17 – 'if the brother,' &c., 'tell it to the Church,' i.e., to the body of communicants." Now, as yet there were no "communicants." The Lord's Supper had not been yet instituted; and it cannot be supposed for a moment, that Christ intended by the "Church" what did not exist at the time, and what those whom he addressed could not possibly understand by it.

It is well known that among the Jews discipline was exercised by the rulers of the Synagogue assembled as a Court or Consistory, to which the Hebrew term for *Church* was applied. Accordingly, when our Lord laid down the rule, "tell it unto the Church," the idea of such a court would necessarily be conveyed. His hearers were well acquainted with this arrangement for the exercise of discipline, and they knew no other; and the language which he employed was applicable to it. At the same time that language seems to have been studiously adapted to a transition state. The rigidly appropriated terms, as *Synagogue* and *Sanhedrim*, are not used; but a term is chosen which was applicable and applied to the Courts of the Jewish Church, on the ground of their general character as *assemblies,* and which therefore, would afterwards be equally applicable and would come to be applied to the Courts of the Christian Church as bearing the same general character. In this we may probably recognise an instance of the profound wisdom of our Lord's method of teaching.

The view now given is thus briefly stated by Goodwin, though himself a Congregationalist. Speaking of the Synagogue ecclesiastical court, he says, "it was a *representative church*; hence that 'tell the Church,' (Matt. 18: 16) because unto them belonged the power of excommunication," Moses and Aaron, Book 5. ch. 1.)

Let us now examine 1 Cor. 5: 1-7, compared with 2 Cor. 2: 5-11, another passage to which Congregationalists appeal as inconsistent with the Presbyterian doctrine, that it is by certain office-bearers only that the government of the church is to be administered.

Let the reader observe the circumstances under which we approach this passage. We have found the passages, adduced as teaching the Presbyterian doctrine in question, incapable of any other than the presbyterian interpretation; and now what we have to ascertain is whether the passage before us can, without violence, be harmonized with them. It is not necessary that we be able to shew that, standing by itself, it would convey presbyterian views; what we have to shew is, that other passages conveying such views, it does not contradict them.

Both passages refer to the case of incest which had occurred in the church at Corinth. In the first of them the apostle reproves the

Corinthians, because "they had not mourned;" and, as it was the duty of all to mourn under the circumstances, this reproof was doubtless addressed to all. He states, that in mourning they should seek that the incestuous person "might be taken away from among them," which mode of expression seems to intimate that it was not by themselves as a body that he should be excommunicated. If excommunicated by themselves as a body, he could scarcely be said to be "taken away from among them." In what follows, indeed, his excommunication seems to be represented as the act of all – "I have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when years gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan." This language, however, is quite consistent with the Presbyterian mode of procedure. The apostle addressed the Corinthians, as a Church, and they would be "gathered together" as a Church to exercise discipline, when the office-bearers authorised to exercise it were "gathered together" for that purpose, the people at the same time feeling due interest in the matter, and, as circumstances permitted, manifesting such interest by their presence. In the case of associate or organised bodies, it is usual to represent the whole as doing what is done constitutionally and regularly by the proper functionaries. And this is a more correct way of speaking than to represent the functionaries themselves as doing it; what is done comes forth and stands not as the deed of the functionaries but as the deed of the whole body. Thus, though it was by the elders only that the man slayer was to be judged, as we learn from Deut. 19: 11 12, – "if any man hate his neighbour, and lie in wait for him, and rise up against him, and smite him mortally that he die, and fleeth into one of these cities" (the cities of refuge), "then the elders of his city shall send and fetch him thence, and deliver him into the hands of the avenger of blood, that he may die," – yet the whole congregation is represented as judging him: "they shall be unto you cities of refuge from the avenger; that the man slayer die not, until he stand before the congregation in judgment." (Num. 35: 12). The actual procedure was that a man slayer having fled to a city of refuge, the elders of his city fetched him thence; investigated the case, and, according to the judgment which they formed respecting it, "delivered him into the hand of the avenger of blood," or "restored him to the city of his refuge;" now what was thus done by the elders, the office-bearers of the

congregation authorised to act in the case, and what Moses ascribes to them in one passage, he ascribes in another; as we have seen, to the congregation itself.

In 2 Cor. 2: 6, the apostle, referring to the incestuous person, who had been excommunicated, says "sufficient to such as man is this punishment which was inflicted of many." Now excommunication is a punishment of such a nature, that, the practical infliction of it is necessarily in a great measure, the act of the people, and on that ground, without at all supposing that the people acted judicially in the case, this phraseology is quite appropriate.

THE LAW A SCHOOLMASTER TO BRING TO CHRIST.

When the law is set home by the Holy Spirit, it becomes a schoolmaster, sharp indeed, and scourges sinners unto Christ. The fox is then unkennelled, and driven from his old haunt, sincere obedience, the common refuge and convenient screen for drunkards, fornicators, liars, thieves, and simpering deists who are all at their wits end presently, when they find their thatched hovel in a blaze.

No sooner is the rigour of the law perceived by the understanding, and felt in the conscience, but it forces everyone to say, as Paul did, *When the commandment came*, came home to my heart, *I died*, all hope of life through my own obedience 328 perished – Romans 7: 9. And they can take up Paul's lamentation, a mighty strange one to a modern Christian who has got no feeling, *O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death*? – Romans 7: 24.

Now they know, by good experience, that *death is the wages of sin*; and feel, themselves in a state of condemnation. This makes them dread sin, and free to part with it, because it has lost its painted cheek, and shews its haggard countenance.

A sinner, thus convinced of sin, struggles hard to help himself. He watches, strives and prays, and fain would keep the whole law. But as he strives, the law opens to his view, and shows its spiritual nature, and its marvellous extent; reaching to every action, word, and thought, and calling for obedience every moment. And now he feels his nature's sad depravity. His heart is earthly and unclean, and therefore has a fixed dislike for spiritual duties. It may be *forced* on them, but cannot *relish* them, nor keep *a full attention* to them. He could sit for hours in an idle playhouse; and though crowded up exceedingly, could keep a fixed attention all the time, and be sorry when the farce was over. But his heart goes to prayer, like an idle boy to school, sauntering every step, and would play truant, if he dare.

After many fruitless struggles to keep the law, he finds himself *without strength.* Fain he would delight in God, and in his spiritual service, but he cannot. His nature will not kindly move towards God, and when thrust upon the task, groweth quarrelsome or sleepy, and is quickly jaded down. Hence he finds an utter need of the Spirit's aid, to create his heart anew, and breathe some *spiritual life,* to enable him for *spiritual service.*

The *curse* of the law has now made known his *guilt;* the *spirituality* of the law has shewn his *depraved nature;* and his *vain attempts* to keep the law have disclosed *his utter feebleness.* Thus the law has prepared him for Christ. His heart is humbled, and broken down with an awful sense of his guiltiness and filthiness and feebleness.

He mourns, because he is stript of all his fancied worth, and fancied ability to help himself; *weary* of sin and of his evil heart; *heavy laden* with a guilty burden, and seeking rest but finding none.

Pray, doctor, who is this sorry fellow, this weary wretch, that comes to Jesus Christ with such a loaded pack upon his back? Some highwayman, no doubt, or some housebreaker, perhaps a murderer, at least a person excommunicate, who has been very naughty, and would not wear a white sheet.

Indeed, sir, this sorry fellow, is the doctor himself and every one who comes aright to Jesus Christ. Did you never read the invitation which he makes to sinners? *Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest* – Mat. 11: 28. You are a sinner, sir; and all men are sinners, and condemned by the law; but all men do not feel their condemnation, and therefore are not heavy laden with a guilty burden, nor labouring after rest. Yet only such are invited, and only such are accepted. What right have you to come to Jesus Christ, unless you come in his appointed way?

If your wealthy neighbour should invite his poor parish widows to dine on Sundays at his house, this invitation would give you no right to dine, nor yet the vicar. You are not *poor widows*. And supposing you should borrow female clothing, put on a gown and petticoat, and call yourself a *poor widow,* this female dress would not procure a right to dine, but might expose you to a cudgel. Yet this is now become the genteel way of coming unto Jesus. Men borrow at a church the garb and language of a Christian, and say most sad things of themselves, while they are upon their knees, as if they were *poor sinners* truly, and yet would execrate a preacher, who should say the same things in a pulpit, which they had uttered in a pew.

You have heard, no doubt, of beggars who tie a leg up when they go a begging, and then make hideous lamentation of their lameness. Why, this is just your case, sir. When you go to church a praying, which is begging, you tie your righteous heart up, and then make woeful outcry for *mercy on us miserable sinners.* Oh, sir, these tricks may pass a while unnoticed; but Jesus Christ will apprehend such cheats at last, and give them their desert.

Would you know where God will cast a gracious eye? He tells you; *To this man will I look, saith the Lord, even to him that is poor and contrite* (Isaiah 66: 2), poor in spirit, and bruised with a sense of his sinfulness.

And would you hear whom Jesus calls? His own lips inform you, *I am not come to call the righteous*. No, why should he? If he did, they would not come in his way, for they have found a better. But I am come, he saith, *to call sinners* – sinners sensible of sin; and bruised with it; and to call them daily *to repentance* – not to patter over good confessions with a frozen lip, but to breathe them from a mourning heart – Luke 5: 32. St. Luke introduces the call with these words, *The whole need no physician, but the sick.* And pray, sir, who are the *whole*? Have any kept the *whole* law without offending in a single point! Not a man. Then all are condemned by the law, and have passed under its curse. Yet many think themselves *whole,* or *nearly* whole, and therefore see *no need* or *little need* of Christ's atonement. Alas for such! when the stone they have rejected falls upon them, it will grind them unto powder. But the sick need a physician. They feel that woeful sickness, the *plague of the heart* (1 Kings 8: 38), and loathe themselves in dust and ashes. But we must take a littler further notice of our young pilgrim, before we drop him altogether. He was left disconsolate, with raw back and weeping eyes, just flogged out of Moses' school and seeking balm to heal his wounds, but finding none. At length the invitation of Jesus reaches his ears, *Come unto me thou heavy laden soul, and I will give thee rest*. He hears and wonders, listens and he is pleased. A gleam of joy steals in his heart – a joy he never felt before, springing from a cheering hope and dawning prospect of deliverance. This kindles high esteem and kind affection for the Saviour, who appears all lovely in his sight, and often

draws a heavenly tear from his eyes. The name of Jesus groweth musical, his love adorable, and his salvation above all things desirable.

The weeping sinner enters now upon a a new world, and joins himself with the praying citizens of Sion. Jesus is welcomed as his King and Saviour, and receives hosannahs from him. He begins to understand what grace means, even mercy, rich mercy, freely shown to a lost and ruined sinner. No sermon suits him now but what directs his heart to Jesus, and sets the Saviour forth as prophet, priest, and king, to save his people. A full and free salvation captivates his heart. 'Tis just the thing he wants, and therefore highly welcome.

JUSTIFICATION OF ERROR.

The most competent defenders of the ecclesiastical amalgamations, that have passed in these colonies under the name of Unions, are well aware that they have been reached and could be reached only by a compromise or surrender of truth. The object in each case was to unite Erastians, Voluntaries, and Free Churchmen in one ecclesiastical organisation, and to do this, while the distinctive view entertained by those parties respectively, – and they are mutually antagonistic views, – underwent no change. And such an object, it is evident, could be accomplished only by a compromise, by elim- 329
inating from the testimony adopted, or from "the basis of Union," – for this is the terminology employed, – the truths which the distinctive views of the negotiating parties contradicted, on the one hand, and, on the other, embodied. Free Churchmen and such as concur with the Established Church of Scotland hold that Christ is head over the nations, and that it follows from this branch of his headship, that civil communities as such are under obligation to befriend his Church, and, at least under certain circumstances, to endow it; this view of his headship over the nations Voluntaries reject. Free Churchmen hold that Christ as head of the Church has conferred on it all that is comprehended in spiritual independence and that flows from it, and that as head of the nations he requires that they do not encroach on this independence or in any way hinder or obstruct the exercise of it; Voluntaries also claim spiritual independence for the Church, though their doctrine on this most important subject is not identical with that of Free Churchmen; Erastians, on the other hand, even when they theoretically hold the Church's spiritual independence, practically surrender and thus vir-tually deny it. To this extent and in these respects, – and other points of difference exist, – the parties to the Unions effected in these colonies held and still hold irreconcilable views. Hence, that they might be amalgamated notwithstanding in one Church organisation, it was necessary that no testimony or a very elastic one should be emitted on the subjects which their difference respect; and according to the writer of the article in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review,* to which we referred in our last number, the latter expedient, that of emitting an elastic testimony, which how-ever is no testimony, was adopted,– such a testimony "that everywhere . . . . men sign these documents, maintaining their belief that the present position of the Established Church of Scotland is satisfactory, or that it is not; that the disruption of 1843 was a great mistake, or a religious necessity;" or that, as he elsewhere expresses it, "the Voluntary may cling to his Voluntaryism, the Church of Scotland man to the Established Church, and the Free Churchman to his disruption testimony."

Confessedly, then, – and, indeed, the fact is too evident to be denied, – there has been a suppression of testimony and thus a compromise of truth. The question, therefore, arises, was such a compromise justifiable. The defenders of our colonial Unions maintain it was, and in doing so they commonly call to their aid the distinction between essential and non-essential truths, implying, if they do not venture to assert, that it is only the former class of truths that is necessary for a Church to comprehend in its testimony, and that, accordingly, it is not necessary for it to comprehend in it the doctrine of a civil establishment of religion or that of the Church's spiritual independence. It is in this evasive manner that the argument is usually conducted. There seems to be a shrinking, and no wonder, from enumerating or even characterising the truths that are to be regarded and treated as non-essential, and, particularly, from referring to this category the two doctrines just specified with respect to which Unionists are chargeable with a suppression of testimony. The object appears to be, – an object quite in accordance with the spirit of the times, and prosecuted on every hand, – to relieve from the old Presbyterian sense of obligation to bear a full scriptural testimony, and to convey the more "liberal" view that a curtailed testimony is sufficient, a testimony comprehending only essential truths. We fear, however, that, on whatever grounds some of the truths, which God has given to his Church, are, even by those who regard them as such truths, excluded or omitted from the Church's testimony, other truths, all other truths may, on the same grounds or on grounds involved in them, be quite as warrantably omitted from it, and thus that entire freedom from the trammels creed obtained, for which some openly contend and which, indeed, they assert for themselves. But, waiving this consideration, though one of great weight, let us endeavour

to ascertain whether the distinction between essential and non-essential truths, as it is employed by Unionists to determine the contents of the Church's testimony, is really available for their purpose. And here it is obvious that, when non-essential truths are spoken of in such a connection, truths which are not essential to the Church must be meant, such truths that the Church may do quite well without them. Now, surely, it will not be alleged that the doctrine of Christ's headship taken in its whole extent, or the doctrine of the Church's spiritual independence which flows from it, is a doctrine of this kind. To what source could the Church, if it ignored the doctrine of Christ's headship, trace its constitution and privileges, and whither could it look for that exertion of power and communication of blessing without which the most legitimate and strenuous discharge of its functions would be of no avail; and, if it ignored the doctrine of its spiritual independence, on what principle could it adjust its relations to the civil power, or claim supreme and exclusive jurisdiction within its own province? Of whatever doctrines the distinction between essential and non-essential truths may justify the disparagement by the Church, it will not justify the disparagement or surrender by it of the two doctrines under consideration, for these evidently are in the strictest sense essential to it. To the great fact which one of them presents; – the fact that Christ is its head, – it owes its existence and character, and the other determines its relative position and asserts its right to occupy it. But we go further, and maintain that neither the distinction in question nor any other distinction justifies the disparagement or surrender by the Church of any truth. It is not on the ground that a truth is essential that the Church's obligation to receive and hold it rests, but on the fact that the enunciation of it may be prefaced with "thus saith the Lord." What God has revealed he has revealed to be received and held, and how can it be otherwise therefore than that the Church is under obligation to receive and hold what he has revealed? Thus the distinction under consideration is not at all applicable within the sphere of the Church's testimony, where it could be applied only in the interest of latitudinarianism, and

for the purpose of disparaging the claims of truth. It is applicable, however, within the sphere of personal religion. Cases occur in which we are called upon to receive as true believers persons who are ignorant of certain truths or hold erroneous views with respect to them, and, in dealing with such cases we must dispose of the question, whether the truths, which are not known or with respect to which erroneous views are held, are truths of which the knowledge and belief are essential to salvation. If they are, those who are ignorant of them or in error with respect to them cannot be true believers; if they are not, those may be true believers who sustain such a relation to them. Within this sphere, and within this sphere only, the distinction may be legitimately applied.

We have dwelt longer than we intended on the attempt to justify the Unionist compromise of truth by means of the distinction between essential and non-essential doctrines. Our special object, however, is to take notice of a bolder attempt, the attempt to justify it from the alleged impossibility of answering the question put of old by Pilate, in the same belief, we presume, that it could not be answered, "What is truth?" With this attempt we shall deal in the form in which it has been made by the Rev. Mr. Kinross in a series of articles published in the *Presbyterian Magazine.*

We regret to find, on referring to the numbers of the magaz- ine we brought with us, – for we write these lines at a distance from home, – that the one containing the first of the articles is not among them. We must therefore defer our remarks till our next number.

330

PASTORAL REMINISCENCES.

FALLEN DOCTORS *

It has been supposed by some who have had the means of studying the subject, that there are certain occupations which have a greater tendency than others to induce intemperate habits amongst those who follow them. Whether this is actually the case or not, there can be no doubt that it has become quite a popular idea in many places, that the parties who follow some particular branch of employment are more loose living, more drunken, and more disorderly than those who follow other branches. The same thing is supposed to hold true, – at least, to some extent, – in regard to those who follow the learned professions. As among the more vulgar occupations of humanity there are supposed to be some, which have a tendency to lead those who follow them to contract intemperate habits, so also, as is supposed, is it among those who follow the learned professions. Rightly or wrongly people have taken up the opinion, that the medical profession has this tendency. It is conceived that the knocking about life of men, – and, especially in country districts, where they are exposed night and day, at all hours and in all weathers to fatigue, cold and wet, and other similar contingencies, induces them to take a reviver, rather too frequently, until by degrees they acquire that unhappy habit, which issues in degradation and misery. It has been said and well said, that one swallow does not make the summer; and any one would both be rash and unjust, who would brand the whole of that most useful, and most honorable profession, to which poor, diseased, suffering humanity owes so much with the vice of a mere proportion of its members. That would be about as fair as to say, that all lawyers were rogues, and all clergymen hypocrites, because a proportion of those who follow these professions are rogues and hypocrites. It is nevertheless a certain fact, that there are numbers of medical men, and especially amongst country practitioners, who from some cause or other fall into intemperate habits; and it seems, for many reasons, a duty incumbent upon the profession to shun the danger, and steer clear of temptation when they are making their calls. A few cases out of many may be mentioned, as illustrations, of how far and how foully gentlemen highly educated, and highly respected, may sink through the vice of intemperance, and lose their position, their respectability, and in short everything that is worth the retaining. The first case, to which reference may be made, is that of a surgeon named R. R was possessed of an acute mind, and was both well informed, and capable of communicating, in an agreeable manner, his information to others. He was also supposed to be skilful in his profession; had a good paying practice, and for several years maintained a respectable character in the place where he was established, both as to behaviour, and as to attention to his duties. At last a change came over him for the worse, no one could tell how. All of a sudden he gave way to various strange, unaccountable acts of folly, which it was shrewdly whispered about, *must* have been done under the influence of drink. Still, for weeks some of his more intimate acquaintances could not bring themselves to believe, that their friend the doctor had yielded to the vile habit of intemperance. They thought that the unhappy man *must* be labouring under some disease which was affecting his brain, and making him so different from his former self. At length the case became so plain, that it could not be misunderstood. It was evident, that the wretched being, but shortly before strong-minded, intelligent, and useful, had become maudlin and idiotic, with no other dist-

---

* This paper of course refers to the Home country

temper than vulgar intoxication. In these circumstances means were employed to inform his relatives of the state of matters. Upon this, a sister, a most lady-like and accomplished person, came to visit him, – and during her stay the doctor behaved tolerably well, – but no sooner had she gone, and the restraint which her presence imposed upon him was removed, than he broke out afresh, and within a few weeks had become apparently a confirmed drunkard. One day after he had begun to recover from one of his drunken fits, an old gentleman, who took a great interest in the doctor, paid him a visit, and gave the fallen man a pretty long, and a pretty severe lecture, on the sin, shame, and folly of his conduct. The lecture was listened to in silence, and with apparent attention, but no sooner was it concluded, than, to the lecturers horror, the doctor addressed him, and said, that if he would put his hand in such a place be would find a bottle, and intimated that they would have a dram together over it. Dr. R. who, previous to this miserable outburst of inebriety, was respected, and looked upon as a rising man in the neighbourhood where he resided, was known to have been at one time in Demerara; and it was conjectured; that when there he had been addicted to the vice of drinking, and that by beginning to tamper afresh with the fatal destroyer, his old habit came back upon him with full force, and made him fairly give way before it. Upon all these degrading circumstances becoming known, his patients, as was natural, forsook him; and as his practice fell off, his pay fell off likewise, until he felt the pinching of an empty purse, which he might never have done if he had continued sober and well conducted. Truly this sin, as well as other sins, brings its own punishment, and Dr. R. found it so. His drinking brought him no good but evil. It brought him loss of character, loss of practice, and loss of society, so that he occupied a very different position indeed after, from what he did before. Such,

then, is one instance of a medical man yielding himself up to habits of intemperance.

Another may be mentioned differing in some respects from that of Dr. R., but even more distressing in its consequences. Dr. C., after having gone through the usual course of preparatory study, and received his diploma as a properly qualified medical practitioner, established himself in his native town. He was greatly liked by the people for his genial, friendly manners; and though young he was looked upon as possessed of great skill in the treatment of diseases. Unhappily, amid the rising tide of Dr. C's popularity, there was an element of evil at work, which was in the end to prove fatal, not only to his prospects but to himself. Dr. C. was too convivial, and could discuss his tumbler or two of punch with the townspeople or farmers with a suspicious relish. He had evidently got to like the drink, and after the manner of too many others in similar circumstances, he did not know when or where to stop. He no doubt had the idea that a glass of something strong would help him to do his riding on those boisterous days and nights, when he had to make professional visits along the bleak seashore. Thus he would imbibe here and there until he became, what no one, and especially what no medical man should become, intemperate in his habits. He did not, however, carry on the practice of drinking with impunity. The vice in his case, just as in the case of others, produced its usual effects of a more common description. But besides producing its more common effects in his case, it developed in him the disease, which not only put end to his career as a medical man, but his life. It brought on a weakness in the lungs, and one day he burst a blood vessel, and the haemorrhage was so great, that he knew 331
at once that he must die. To his afflicted wife watching beside him, and telling him to try and compose himself to sleep, he said, "Oh! yes, *I will soon sleep*," meaning that he would sleep the long sleep of death. Thoughts of the sinful life that he had lived, – of the judgment seat before which he was so soon to stand, – and of that eternity upon which he was soon to enter, filled him with amazement and dismay. A clergyman in the place was sent for to pray with him, and for him, and to direct his mind to the way of salvation. When the clergyman entered that chamber of sickness, within a little time to be the chamber of death, the unhappy sufferer was so agitated, that not only was the bed shaking, but the very floor of the room had a tremulous motion communicated to it. The way of a sinner's acceptance was pointed out, and earnest supplication for the dying man was offered at the throne of grace, and he was then left to be alone with his God. And so earnest was that dying man in regard to his spiritual condition, that as was reported he came out of his bed, and fell on his knees on the floor beside it, and actually died while he was engaged crying for mercy. A veil is drawn over the unseen world, and we cannot follow the unhappy man's spirit into it, to see whether, like the malefactor in the Gospel, he found mercy in his dying hour; but we can see the mournful effects of that vice which brought him to an early grave. That vice was the means of cutting Dr. G. off in the mid-time of his days; and removing him from a sphere of labour, where he might have spent a life of usefulness. It was the cause of his wife being made a widow, and his children fatherless; and, indirectly, it was the cause of several of the family finding graves in foreign lands, where, but for his being removed from them, they would in all probability have never been.

The third case which may be mentioned as illustrative of the vice of drinking amongst medical men, is that of a Dr. B. Dr. B. lived in a village in the county of F. He was at one time quite an agreeable gentleman like man. He was received into the best society of the district, and had the confidence of the people about. Little by little, evil communications corrupted his good manners, and he became, although perhaps unwittingly, the servant of drink. Now everybody, who knows anything of the matter, is aware that drink is a tyrant, a hard master, who works his poor slaves to death. Drink is worse than Pharaoh in his dealings with the Israelites, though he made them to serve with rigour, and placed them under taskmasters who beat them. Why, instead of doing any of his servants good, as some maintain that he does, drink takes away the healthy bloom from their cheeks, he produces a transformation on the very breath of their mouths, which becomes so foul and offensive as to be fit to turn the stomachs of those who may chance to inhale it. Moreover, drink strips its slaves of their very raiment on many occasions, and makes them work in rags, clouted shoes, and old battered hats that have a smashed and ragamuffin appearance about them. Well, when this downward transformation takes place, the deluded, seedy victims of drink ma*y* look out for being cast off, and shunned by the more respectable members of a community. This at all events was the case with Dr. B. As he fell deeper and deeper into the pit of intemperance, he became less and less companionable, and less and less the companion of those who formerly received him. As the unhappy man became more and more out at elbows, he became less and less the associate of those who used to be his acquaintances and friends. He lost caste, and sunk lower and lower in the scale of society. At last the final smash, as it were, of his fortunes came. Having, like the prodigal in the parable, lost all – lost character, – lost practice, – lost substance, – lost house and home, – he became a wanderer on the face of the earth. He was so reduced, that he had to apply for

charity to those with whom he had formerly been acquainted, and with whom he had sat at table and ate and drunk with them on equal terms. Still there was nothing, no humiliation, no misery, no degradation which had any beneficial effect upon him. The hardness of the way of transgression did not lead him to turn out of it. He loved his iniquity, and after it he went. He was wedded to his lusts. He went on in his old course drinking, drinking, drinking, until he actually became ugly under the vicious influences to which he yielded himself. He not only became debauched in his appearance, but his face became so blotched and sodden as to be anything but pleasant in its expression. The end of all this came at last, and was about as melancholy as was to be expected. One day a gentleman was walking near the village, where Dr. B. had once rented a nice house, and had once enjoyed earthly comfort, and earthly respectability, when he came across a miserable, broken down looking crea-ture standing at a fence. The gentleman recognised in this wret-ched object the once gentleman like, well to do Dr. B. The gentleman seized upon the occasion thus afforded, of having a conversation with the degraded, fallen man, upon the subject of intemperance. He spoke of the awfulness of the sin of intemperance, and of its dreadful consequences both for time and eternity. He then asked poor B. what he thought would become of him when he stood at the bar of judgment, and when he entered upon the eternal world, if he went on as he was doing, and did not repent and turn to God. "Pooh!" was the reply. "You think to frighten me, do you, with your great talk? There is nothing to be frightened at. It is nothing but oblivion beyond the grave. It is all oblivion when we are gone." Within a very few weeks after this the unhappy man had an opportunity of judging of the falseness of his ideas. How he died, whether

after many struggles, or whether he died under the stupor of drink, no one could tell, for there was no one there to see; no one to watch beside him during his last hours on earth. He was found lying one morning a bloated, stiffened corpse, on a bleak hillside in the neighbourhood. He thus died the drunkard's death, and sleeps in the drunkard's grave, having wasted talents, time, and everything under the influence of that vice whose victims are thousands in every land. The life and death of Dr. B. might well be a warning to all not "to look upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its colour in the cup, for at last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder."

The writer has selected these three examples of medical men as giving way to this vice, but he has known a number of others in the same profession who have been its victims. Of this number there were at least two, if not three others, whose cases were attended with as painful, if not more painful circumstances than those adverted to. What, then, is the lesson to be learned from such a state of things? It is without doubt a lesson of watchfulness and sobriety. Let the gracious warning voice of God be heard, when treating of this subject. In God's word it is said, and it will hold true to the end of time, "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of might to mingle strong drink." Let none dare, with that woe sounding in their ears, to say, "Come ye and I will fetch wine and we will fill ourselves with strong drink, and tomorrow shall be as this day and much more abundant." Let all on the other hand, with a salutary sense of their own weakness and a wholesome dread of the danger, they would incur by indulgence, determine through grace to deny themselves to this evil; or any other evil, which would prove dishonoring to God, injurious to themselves, or hinder their usefulness to others.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 29 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, FEBRUARY, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

This issue was missing from the original files and consequently has not been reproduced.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 30 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, MARCH, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 30 MARCH. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Salvation a Legacy … … … … … 345

Bearing of the Principles and Teaching of the Church of Rome on Loyalty to the British Crown … … … 347

Sabbath Observance … … … … … 349

Presbyterianism the Instituted Form of Church Government … 350

Correspondence – A Retrospect … … … … 352

Moderatism in Victoria … … … … 353

Shakespearian Readings and their Apologies … … 354

Young Men: Those we want and those we do not want… … 355

SALVATION A LEGACY

"For where a testament is, there is of necessity the death of the testator." – Heb. 9: 16.

The word here translated "testament" is elsewhere rendered "covenant," and our translators have wavered between these two renderings according to the scope of the several passages. And they used this latitude of translation not without reason: for the sense of Scripture frequently vibrates between the ideas which these different renderings represent; and some passages present the original word in connections which favor the notion of a covenant, while others no less unequivocally agree with the conception of a testament. The word thus variously ren-dered signifies naturally the composing or rather the disposing of things in a particular order, and this general signification is by usage limited so as to specify a bargain or agreement arranged between parties, or also the ordering of his effects by a dying man for the benefit of survivors. Here in the passage before us the latter sense of a testament or will is unequivocally apposite.

I. We consider the blessings of salvation under the notion of a legacy.

A legacy or bequest is some advantage or profit or possession which comes to a man through the medium of a testament or will. All benefits conveyed from one man to another are not necessarily of that description. Benefits may be bestowed by gift during the lifetime of the benefactor, but a legacy is of another nature, and whatever it may be in itself, as riches, lands, property,

or such like, the distinguishing character of a bequest is that it comes to the person interested as the gift of the dead. Not till the hand that conveyed it is cold in the tomb, and the heart that cherished the design of kindness has ceased to beat, does a legacy come to the person for whom it is intended. And, such being the nature of a legacy, it remains to enquire whether the benefits of salvation and the gift of God's grace agree to this description. Whether any point of resemblance or identity assimilate these blessings to a legacy.

1. Now the blessings of salvation are the gift of one who has died. Need we say that they are all of them gifts of Christ? And He is the living one and he died. He died for our sins according to the Scriptures, for this end that he might be Lord both of the living and the dead. Into the Father's hand he commended his Spirit, and there were those who saw his sepulchre and how they laid him. Angels also there were who sat the one at the head the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. Whatever benefits then we have from Christ, they are the gifts of one who has died; and in his death also and by his death were his benefits communicated. We have redemption, through his blood the forgiveness of our sins according to the riches of God's grace. By means of death he redeemed the transgressions that were under the first covenant.

2. The benefits of a legacy may have cost the benefactor much, but they cost the legatee nothing. So is it with all the blessings of salvation. Let us take for example the gift of justifying righteousness. One of Christ's glorious qualifications as a Saviour, is that he has such a righteousness to bestow. He is the daysman so earnestly desired by Job, the Interpreter, one of a thousand, who can show unto man his righteousness, He it is whom Isaiah celebrates as the boast of the believing portion of Israel. "Surely shall one say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength; in the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory." He is Jeremiah's King, whose name is the Branch, and who also has the denomination of the Lord our righteousness. "Him," says the Apostle to the Romans, "hath God set forth as a propitiation for sins through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." "He is made of God to us righteousness."

Now this righteousness was no light or easy achievement to Jesus. It was righteousness wrought out in a world of sin. It was obedience to the law rendered in the likeness of sinful flesh, with all the trying accompaniments comprehended in the contradiction of sinners, and measured in its difficulty by resisting unto blood, striving against sin. He was reviled as he accomplished that righteousness; and part of it was that he should not revile again. He suffered wrongfully, and it belonged to that righteousness that he threatened not. He did no sin even when he was judicially made sin for us, when he bare our sins in his own body on the tree. So hardly, with such difficulty did Christ act while bringing in everlasting righteousness. At such a cast of pains did he magnify God's law and make it honorable, and the Lord was well pleased for his 346
righteousness sake. But now the righteousness comes to us as a legacy, as something of inestimable value, indeed which cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof; and yet it is given away without money and without price. As a dying friend the Lord Jesus has left it to all who believe; and now it is not in heaven that any of us should enquire who shall go up for us to bring Christ down from above. We are justified freely by God's grace, receiving abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness. The righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ is unto all and upon all them that believe; and because our own righteousnesses are as filthy rags, therefore does the Lord Jesus, as a near kinsman, spread the skirt of his garment over us, causes the filthy garment to pass away from us and clothes us with change of raiment.

3. Such benefits as are conferred in a legacy are always bestowed as marks of distinguished personal affection from the giver to the receiver. He who has such gifts to give may will them at his death to whomsoever he likes; and they are heartless indeed who can receive and enjoy such benefits unmoved. Usually there is some antecedent ground of affection already laid between the testator and the legatee, and men in making the final disposition of their goods, generally give the first place to such as stand nearest them in family relations. A father wills his goods to his children. One brother in a family wills his to another. Or, if there be no such friend to endow; men will adopt for heirs such as may have attracted them by personal qualities or otherwise. But any way it stands good that affection, goodwill, personal liking is the prevailing reason for making much dispositions. This also holds good in the case before us, yet with a speciality or difference. When the Lord Jesus was making his final arrangements for leaving the world, he told his disciples, "henceforth I call you not servants but friends." And how did he prove that he was their friend? He did so by the blessing which he left them. "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you:" and "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This is the legacy which the Lord Jesus left behind him to avouch the great love wherewith he loved us. But there is a mystery in Christ's goodwill. He finds not the objects on whom he expends his dying favors loveable, he makes them so. His dying love tokens are for men, yea, for the rebellious also; and of rebels he makes them friends by his gifts. And you, who sometimes were alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, unblameable, and unreprovable in his sight. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends, but when we were yet sinners, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.

Surely it should quicken us to a warmer appreciation of the blessings of God's grace, – to consider that they all are the benefactions of a dying friend, yea, that all the grace we have, was once his personal property, and did not reach us but by the channel of his death. How do men value the last gifts of a friend, and look upon them to renew the impressions of their love! And shall such feelings fail only as between us and Christ? Shall we wear his righteousness, the spotless robe of his obedience imparted to us, and feel no burden of gratitude laid on our shoulders? Shall the peace of God rule in our hearts, that peace which was his before it became ours, and not joy in God through Jesus Christ, through whom now we have received the atonement? If we are Christ's legatees shall we not reckon ourselves his friends? And so we are his friends if we do whatsoever be commands us.

II. We consider the instrument by which these blessings are conveyed. It is a testament or will.

A testament is the written document by which a legacy is bequeathed, the medium of connection between the testator who wills away his goods and the legatee who receives them; and it is this instrument that is said to be of force when men are dead. The particular testament by which the blessings of salvation are conveyed is in effect the covenant of grace. It is that disposition or ordering of things with a view to the exercise of mercy, which God in Christ settled before the world began. Viewed as between Christ and the Father, this system of grace is distinctively a covenant. Viewed as taking effect between Christ and his people, it has the features and specialities of a testament. Both these characters in fact belong to it simultaneously. It is at once a covenant and a testament.

1. As a covenant, the disposition of things which the Scriptures call grace has its origin as an arrangement between the

Father and the Son. Its discovery dates from the fall and ruin of mankind. When in Adam all had died, and by one man's transgression many were constituted sinners, out of this fall-en family, thus the discretion of justice, did God the Father give an election to be redeemed. For great love wherewith he loved them, he said deliver from going down into the pit, and, laying help for them on one who is Mighty, his hand rested on the man of his right hand, even the son of man whom he made strong for himself; and he said to him as he afterwards said to Gideon, “Go in this thy might.” By reason of this gift or grant made to the Mediator we hear in the gospel of those whom the Father gave unto him, and of his sheep who shall never perish, because the Father, from whom Christ receives them, is greater than all. Very marvellous is it to think of the gift, the Fathers gift to Christ. It was the gift of persons defiled by sin, obnoxious to justice, condemned by the law, under sentence, and reserved for its execution. In this state, were they gifted and made over to the Saviour, and that with the express design that he should redeem them from all iniquity and purify them to himself as a peculiar people.

Answerable to the character of this grant was the action of the Mediator, for in the character of a surety he accepted the charge committed to him. “Jesus,” (says the writer of the Epistle,) “was made the surety of a better testament.” As Judah became answerable for the safety of Benjamin to his father, so Judah's Lawgiver, the Shiloh made himself answerable for all whom the Father gave unto him out of the world, and took as it were in hand to be security in their room for all claims of justice against them, that God's law might be vindicated and God's government no loser by their salvation. He that hateth suretyship, says the wise man, is sure, and the suretyship of the new covenant was no light undertaking. It was not fit nor possible for any but Him who was the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person. Sin was in the case, and He who was surety for the transgressors, behoved by himself to purge their sins. There was a curse involved, and He who was to stand Intercessor for the transgressors, must needs be made a curse for them. But the Lord Jesus drew not back. He sware to his own hurt and changed not. He fainted not in the design he had taken in hand until he had made his soul an offering for sin, pour out his soul unto death, died, the just for the unjust, and given himself to God for us, an offering and sacrifice of a sweet smelling savor.

Now this death of the surety communicates the testamentary character to the covenant. The Lord Jesus has a will of his own as to the benefits arising from his sufferings. He makes a disposition of his goods. He leaves directions behind him. He destines the advantages of his suretyship, including the advantages of his death, to penitent believers. He wills that upon his death the fruits of his obedience, the justifying influence of his righteousness should be for the benefit of all who come unto God by him; and this is the testament, or will, or disposition of things which acquires strength upon Christ's death, so that in his death it is sealed; and now that he has died is irrevocable and irreversible.

Two ways we conceive the death of Christ operating to give effect to his will or testament. For, on the one hand, it is not till death comes that there is an absolute certainty as to the estate to be conveyed. A friend may will us the most magnificent fortune, and do so in perfectly good faith: yet, though the estate may be in his hands when he wills it, such are the changes of human life that the estate may all be lost and ruined before the death of the testator, and before the will can come into operation. Now such is the value of the legacy which Christ designs for his people that nothing but his death could settle all doubts as to its communication. Nothing could exceed the glory of that legacy, for it comprises a Kingdom that cannot be moved, an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, and all spiritual blessings both of grace and glory. Nor could any the least doubt of Christ's goodwill in making the legacy be entertained. And yet so dreadful were the risks, so awful the difficulties of the undertaking, that only the death of Christ could afford the perfect evidence that such more than royal munificence was possible, and that he who offered the inestimable benefit had it to give.

This testament then is of force now that Christ has died; for it appears now that he died not in vain. The pleasure of the Lord has indeed prospered in his hand. He has, as the surety of sinners magnified God's law and made it honorable. His justifying righteousness endureth for ever. He has finished transgression, and made an end of sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness. And now it remains that he shall see his seed, that a generation must come in succession to him to declare his righteousness. The meek must eat of the goodness which he has provided for the poor. There is an estate left by the surety of sinners. There are legatees whom he has named and appointed. His death has put life into his dying deed, and they who are called shall receive the promised eternal inheritance.

And, on the other hand, death gives effect to a testament by withdrawing it from the region of will and choice, and putting it under the dominion of public justice. So long as the Lord Jesus remained on earth, the Law of God was not the guardian of saving blessings. There was no public law of the divine government necessitating the mediation of Christ. He was not held bound to it, nor held bound to us, by any cords other than those of his own affections. Of his own goodwill he became our surety, and not from any antecedent obligation; and all through the great work his own will was the only tie between our souls and his sufferings. At the last moment had he prayed the Father, more than twelve legions of angels would have stepped between him and his enemies. And this perfectly discretionary power was essential to impress Christ's benefits with the characteristics of a will. Absolute discretion over his bequests must remain in the hand of every testator till death

paralyze it. But Christ's death at once gave rigidity to his testament. It came then to be of force absolutely. For the testator then left it in the keeping of divine justice. And now God is just and the justifier of the ungodly. A just God

and a Saviour, he declares his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, and is faithful and just to forgive our sins. This faithfulness, this justice in forgiving our sin is justice to the will of Christ. For eternal justice will never wrong the dead, nor, having surviving interests of the dead to care for, will dispose of them otherwise than the testator desired, much more will this be when the interests are those of God's own Son, and the survivors interested are his brethren.

BEARING OF THE PRINCIPLES AND TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME ON LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH CROWN.

The belief is very generally entertained that the Church of Rome is most unfavourably distinguished from all protestant churches and from the Jewish Communion by the great prevalence among its members of a spirit of disloyalty towards the British Crown. The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, in no way exaggerated the prevalence and operation of this belief, when at the meeting of the Civil Service Club held on the 14th instant, he used the following language: "When the news of the attempt [to assassinate the Duke of Edinburgh] reached Sydney, did not everybody guess, and guess rightly, from what quarter the blow came? When the news of the deed first reached us, was it not the general surmise that it was one of those Irish Roman Catholics? There was no difficulty in guessing who had done the act, for all knew that there was avowed disloyalty in the minds of some individuals, of that body."

Those who entertain the belief referred to do not allege that all the popish subjects of the Queen are disloyal, and, therefore, the assertion of their own loyalty, by some members of the Church of Rome, though the truth of their assertion of it be not questioned, affords no evidence that that belief is not fully justified by facts. Neither is it alleged that none who are not papists are disloyal, or associate themselves in treasonable or seditious proceedings with disloyal papists. It could well be otherwise than that the existence and manifestation of widespread disloyalty, among those whose character is formed by the Church of Rome, would awaken the sympathy and attract the co-operation of bad and reckless men who are not of its communion. What is alleged is, that the statistics of the Church of Rome present the prominent and disgraceful fact, that to a great extent a spirit of disloyalty obtains among its members, while no such fact is presented by the statistics of any protestant church or of the Jewish communion.

Of the truth of this allegation the evidence is only too abundant. Fenianism, an organisation which has derived its inspiration, as, with inconsiderable exceptions, it derives it materials, from popery, affords emphatic evidence of it. The Church of Rome, indeed, professes to disapprove Fenianism; but, if we only consider abject subjection of the great bulk of its people to the authority of its priests, we must find it difficult to reconcile with the sincerity of this profession the fact that papists, with unabated activity, maintain and prosecute the Fenian conspiracy; and the further fact that, from time to time, popish priests give public expression to their sympathy with Fenianism, as three or four of them did recently at Hokitiki in New Zealand, and yet are not visited with any censure or reproof by their ecclesiastical superiors. But whether this reconciliation can be effected or not, still, on the ground that Fenianism derives its adherents almost wholly from the Church of Rome, we are justified in regarding the existence and character of this detestable organisation as an348
evidence of the prevalence of disloyalty among the members of that Church. It may perhaps be urged that the grievances of which Irishmen have cause to complain account for the Fenian-
ism of the Irish papists. But how can those grievances, to what-ever extent they exist, be regarded as originating the Fenianism of that portion of the population, when they do not drive into Fenianism the Irish Protestants whom they equally affect?

The fact of a prevalence of disloyalty among the members of the Church of Rome, to which the membership of Protestant churches and that of the synagogue exhibit no parallel, manifesting itself so obtrusively that it is more than established, the question arises how is it to be accounted for? This is a question which ought to be answered, while without prejudice, without flattery, and without fear. The right answer to it will, no doubt, be offensive to some, as shedding upon them a reproving light, (John 3: 20,) and will therefore be deprecated or condemned by others. It is, however, of great importance that it be given, for until the view, which it will present, is adopted and acted on generally, proper means will not be employed to avert the great and imminent danger to which this and every British community is exposed from the presence and agency of popery. And, if we would obtain the right answer, we must derive it, not from the general declarations of loyalty, however emphatic, made by representatives of popery on special occasions and to meet special circumstances, nor from the endorsement of such declarations by a certain class of Protestants, but from the ascertained principles and actual teaching of the Church of Rome. If those principles and that teaching are such in their whole extent or as regards any portion of them, that they naturally, if not inevitably, produce disloyalty, then and in that case the prevalence of disloyalty among papists is fully accounted for. And are the principles and teaching in question of such a character? On such grounds as the following we hold they are.

The books specified in the following resolution, the first of a series adopted at a conference of the popish clergy of the diocese of Sydney, and transmitted by the Vicar-General to the Council of Education, are sanctioned by the authorities of the Church of Rome in this colony. The resolution is in these terms: "that we, the catholic clergy of the diocese of Sydney, cannot, and will not, accept any series of books for use in our primary schools, which shall not have received the sanction of our Archbishop. That the series of school books published by the Christian Brothers, and also the series at present used in the Roman Catholic Schools in England, under the Privy Council System of Education, having been sanctioned by his Grace the Archbishop, either of these series will be accepted for use in our schools." Now those books, which are thus sanctioned and approved of by the Church of Rome, and which it wished to use in its schools, and, no doubt, uses in schools which are entirely under its own control, what-ever else they teach, teach sedition. The Colonial Secretary, after reading in his place in parliament, on the 23rd July, 1867, some extracts from the books in question, for the purpose of shewing their unsuitableness for schools attended not only by popish but also by Protestant children, proceeded to describe them as regards the feature of their character to which we now direct attention. "There were, moreover," he said, "passages in these books which were of a highly seditious nature. This was no place to talk of the wrongs of Ireland,

nor was he going to raise any question as to how that country had been governed, but he did not think that it would become the members of this government, holding office under the Queen, to sanction what was no more nor less than sedition. (Hear, hear.) If parents desired to have their children taught sedition, there were places where it could be taught [namely, the schools in which those chosen schoolbooks of the

Church of Rome were used,] but this House ought not to teach it," by sanctioning the use of such books. In the Legislative Council, on the 25th July, 1867, the Postmaster General spoke of the school books in question in similar terms. After stating that "he understood sedition to mean the exciting hatred and resistance to the dominion of the ruling powers," he said, "in this volume [the Literary Class Book, or series of Select Reading Lessons in Prose and Verse, by the Christian Brothers,] he found frequent repetitions of such words as 'the foe' and 'the enemy' as applied to England, and the English rule was always spoken of as that of the enemy;" and again "it always spoke of the rulers as 'enemy,' 'foe,' 'usurper,'" – language in which Mr. Plunkett intimated his concurrence by calling out, hear, hear." It thus appears that the Church of Rome is careful to employ suitable means to infuse disloyalty into the minds of even the children of its communion, and, if we may judge from Mr. Plunkett's approval of the ruler of the empire being spoken of to children, and therefore by those who teach them, by themselves, and of course, by all, as an "enemy," "foe," "usurper," it is evident that the influences under which they grow up are such, that when they are old they do not depart from the path of disaffection into which their feet were early directed.

Nor is it only in its schools, and to the children of its people that the Church of Rome teaches disloyalty towards the British throne; it teaches it also in Maynooth College to its future priests, and thus provides for its being taught to its congregations, as is fully proved by a "Report," now before us, "on the books and documents on the Papacy, deposited in the University Library, Cambridge, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, A. D. 1840." This Report was drawn up in pursuance of a resolution adopted at a public meeting held in the Town Hall of Huntingdon, on the 28th December, 1850, the Earl of Sandwich, Lord Lieutenant of the county, in the chair; and, in compliance with a "Requisition from Lord Lieutenant and county of Huntingdon," the extracts made in the Report from "the Books and Documents" to which it refers were verified under the direction of the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, who in a communication dated 4th February, 1852, certified their correctness. According to those extracts, thus verified and attested, those preparing at May-nooth for the priesthood of the Church of Rome are taught that all baptised persons are subject to the authority of that Church, and, therefore, that Her Majesty Queen Victoria, is subject to its authority; that all heretics, and therefore her Majesty, are, *ipso facto*, excommunicated, and incapable of holding any public office; that they are justly punished with exile, imprisonment, and even death; that heretical rulers may be deprived of their sovereignty by the Pope, and their subjects released from their allegiance; that heretics are to be exterminated, if the power to exterminate them is possessed, and can be exercised without danger to the Church. On this last point, the following language, which we quote from one of the extracts from the Maynooth text books is sufficiently comprehensive and decided: "let Catholics, who having taken the sign of the cross, have girded themselves to the extirpation of heretics, enjoy the same indulgence, and be fortified with same holy privileges, which are granted to those who go to the succour of the Holy Land."

Others may choose to believe, in the face of these facts supported by the fullest documentary evidence, the declarations of loyalty to Her Majesty, – an excommunicated heretic, incapable of holding any public office, – made by priests of the Church of Rome, but we cannot; neither could

the noblemen and gentlemen, who signed the Requisition from the Lord Lieutenant and county of Huntingdon to which we formerly referred, believe such declarations. "We understand," they say, "that at the very time these Bishops were making public professions of gratitude and loyalty, they were pronouncing, in their secret states, a sentence of excommunication against all heretics, – that they set up a code of Canon Law of Benedict xiv., which contains, among others, laws for the restitution of all forfeited property held by heretics, – for the extermination of heretics out of their dioceses, for compelling Roman Catholics, under the heaviest spiritual penalties, to submit to and obey the temporal commands of the Pope, with others of a similar import."

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Report of a Lecture delivered in connexion with St. George's Mutual Improvement Association, by the Rev. J. McCulloch.

The subject of our lecture is, as has been announced, Sabbath Observance. We need scarcely make any apology for addressing a lecture on this subject in connexion with an association, whose object is, the intellectual, moral, and spiritual improvement of its members, under the guidance of the Word of God and the Westminster Standards.

Let it suffice to say that we have selected this subject for the following, among other reasons, – the subject is one of very great importance, and it is too evident that unsound views and lax practices respecting it are sadly prevalent in the community. As to the terms in which we have stated our subject, we have chosen the word *Sabbath* and not the very common and popular word Sunday. That term is employed by us because it is the name given by the Divine Author of the institution; because the name is most appropriate, inasmuch as it clearly sets forth the nature and design of the institution; and because it would be preposterous for any one professing the true religion to lecture on the observance of Sunday, in other words to discuss the questions why and how people should worship the sun. In passing, we would take the liberty of remarking that there is, in such matters, a great deal in a name. With the use of certain names, certain ideas are associated. Hence, in those countries in which the name Sabbath or Lord's day was usually employed, stricter and more scriptural views of Sabbath observance prevailed than in those communities in which the term Sunday was generally used. Sabbath obser- vance in Scotland and England respectively furnishes an appropriate example of this. When looser views regarding Sabbath observance become more prevalent in a community the use of the term Sunday becomes more prevalent in like manner. This remark, we fear, is sadly applicable to Scotland in the present day and to many Scotchmen in the colonies. But to pass from this, the other term in the statement of the subject of lecture is "observance." This, connected with the first term, comprehends var-ious topics, such as the obligation, mode, and advantages of Sabbath observance. The topic, which we purpose mainly to handle on this occasion, is *the proper mode* of Sabbath observance. But, as preparatory to this, we shall for a little discuss the continued obligation to keep the Sabbath. This is necessary on two grounds. To continue the observance of any ordinance, the obligation to observe which

has ceased, is unwarrantable and vain. Moreover, there are not a few in our day who deny the perpetuity of the Sabbath. Our reasons for believing in the continued and universal obligation to observe the Sabbath are the following. Its appointment was coeval with the creation of man and evidently designed for the race. See Genesis 2: 2, 3. Further, the requirement to observe the Sabbath forms part of that law which, from its very nature, is of perpetual and universal obligation. The man who would question the obligation of the fourth, might

just as well question the obligation of any other command of the Decalogue. Again, in a passage in the prophecies of Isaiah which unmistakeably refers to gospel times, the Sabbath is spoken of as in continued existence, and the man who observes it faithfully is marked out as an object of the Divine favour. Isaiah 56: 6-9. "Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on mine altar, for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people. The Lord which gathereth the outcasts of Israel, saith, yet will I gather others to him, beside those that are gathered unto him." Again, the Saviour declares that "the Sabbath was made for *man*," – for man without any qualification or limitation, and not for the Jews only. Once more Christ teaches his disciples to pray that their flight from Jerusalem, at the time of its destruction, might take place "not on the Sabbath day." On this we would make the following remarks: – Long before the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish dispensation had come to a close, and the Christian dispensation had begun. The Saviour intimates that the Sabbath would then be in existence, and exhorts his disciples to be so concerned for its strict observance as to pray that they might not be under the necessity of effecting their flight on that sacred day. The fact that the first day of the week, instead of the last, is now observed as the Sabbath intimates nothing against its perpetuity. The fourth commandment is evidently so worded as to show that the great truth taught is, that a seventh day, coming after six days of labour, should be consecrated to the Lord's service. It remained with the Lawgiver to fix the particular day of the week. At first he fixed the seventh day of the week as the appropriate day for commemorating the completion of the work of the first creation. And there is abundant evidence for affirming that the Sabbath has, under Divine authority, been transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week. And there is nothing in this contradictory even to the language employed in the fourth commandment. It is still true, as much as under the Patriarchal and the Jewish economies, that a seventh sacred day succeeds six days of labour. As already stated, there is sufficient evidence for asserting that a transference of the Sabbath has been made from the seventh to the first day of the week. We say sufficient evidence, for it is altogether gratuitous and unwarrantable to say that the evidence must be of a particular kind, – that it must be an express command.

After reading from a sermon of President Edwards, a passage showing that God's will is to be ascertained, in many cases by just and a necessary inferences from revealed truth; the lecturer proceeded thus: –

According to this sound principle, we hold that there is sufficient evidence to prove that a change as to the particular day of the week to be observed as the Sabbath, was predicted and actually made. In the 118th Psalm, in a passage which has undoubted reference to, the resurrection of Christ, the day of his resurrection is predicted as a day appointed of God for religious exercises and rejoicing. The following prediction also evidently points to the same change in respect to the commemoration days: – "Behold I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create," &c., Isaiah 65: 17, 18.

In connexion with these predictions it is important to bear in mind the following New Testament facts: – On the first

day of the week, – the day of Christ's resurrection, – the disciples were assembled together and Christ appeared in their midst. And, again on that day eight days, they were assembled together in like manner, and Christ again appeared among them. Again, the first day of the week is spoken of as the usual time for the disciples assembling for religious exercises, – for preaching and hearing, for observing the Lord's supper, and for making collections. Again, the apostle John declares "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." This was the name by which the first day of the week came to be called, – a name, which, like the Lord's supper, is significant of its origin and design, – a day appointed by the Lord Jesus and observed in honour of him. Finally, on this part of the subject, if the first day of the week be not the Christian Sabbath, then there is no weekly Sabbath under the New Testament dispensation, as this is the only weekly day of sacred rest observed by the Christian Church. But, as it was predicted, that the Sabbath should be in existence under this dispensation, it must be the first day of the week.

We now proceed to consider *the right mode* of Sabbath observance. From the accounts given in the Scriptures it comprehends two elements, – abstinence from things forbidden, and the performance of the duties required.

First, the Sabbath as to be observed by cessation from men's ordinary employments. When this Divine ordinance was instituted, we are told respecting the author of it, that "He rested on the seventh day from all his work, which he made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he rested from all his work, which God created and made." The commandment enjoining the mode of Sabbath observance runs thus: – "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son," &c., &c.

And in harmony with this are the words of the prophet Isaiah, – "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." According to these statements, men are to desist on the Sabbath from their usual employments on the other days of the week, – whether these be conducted in the house or in the field, the shop, the counting house, the steamboat, the railway, or newspaper office, – whether it be manual or mental labour that they involve. According to the instructions contained in the fourth commandment, parents are to see to it that their children rest on the Sabbath; employers are to do the same in reference to their servants, whether as employed by them in their houses, or business establishments; and whether they act as individuals or as members of companies in employing them: Yea, the rest of the cattle is to be secured by their owners. And not only are men to abstain from the open pursuit of their ordinary employments, but also, with certain necessary exceptions, from all secular acts, such as posting, or receiving and perusing letters, and newspapers, and

prosecuting journeys on business or pleasure on land or water. Surely these are secular acts, acts belonging to the other six days of the week and not to this sacred portion of time. Besides, all worldly pleasuring is to be abstained from on the Sabbath. Here we do not refer to such improper amusements as are to be abstained from at all times, such as those furnished by the racecourse, the theatre, and ballroom, but such as may with propriety be indulged in on the other days of the week, such as visiting friends, riding or walking for pleasure, "not doing thine own pleasure on my holy day." Before leaving this part of the lecture we will dispose of certain exceptional works which may lawfully be done on the Sabbath day – works which were allowed under the Old, and are allowed

owed under the New Testament dispensation. From certain incidents and statements in the history of Christ as contained in the Gospels, we learn that there are three classes of permitted acts, – attending to the necessary claims of nature, relieving from suffering, performing certain secular acts in connexion with the service of God. In Christ's justification of the conduct of his disciples in plucking ears of corn and eating them to satisfy the cravings of hunger, we have a warrant for the first class of permitted acts, namely, some amount of work in preparing and partaking of food; at the same time due care should be taken that there be no more work in this connexion than is really necessary. Again, we learn that it is warrantable and proper to relieve from suffering, whether man or beast, on the Lord's day, from the fact of the Saviour's healing on that day – from the references he makes to the well known practice of leading animals to watering and pulling them out of a pit on the Sabbath, and from the general principle he lays down in connexion with such cases. "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath day." As for the last class of permitted acts, there is abundance of warrant in several of the acts and sayings of Christ. He caused a man to carry his bed on the Sabbath to show that a miracle had been effected in his behalf. He travelled to the synagogues on the Sabbath. He alluded to the priests performing secular work in the temple on that sacred day and yet being blameless.

From these things we learn that certain works may be done in connexion with religious services, such as journeying to and from the house of God. We are evidently to go by the general principles involved in such cases as have been adduced. Whatever may be fairly reduced to one or other of these three classes of acts, – attending to the necessary claims of nature, relieving from suffering, performing certain secular acts in connexion with religious services, – may be regarded as warrantable exceptions. As there is a great tendency to stretch unduly excepted acts, there is need of great care and tenderness in dealing with this matter. As a certain writer well observes, "Our Lord did not make a practice or labour of healing on the Sabbath; nor did he authorise his disciples to adopt a custom of plucking and bruising ears of corn; nor command a systematic preparation of appliances for providing against the possible accident of an animal falling into a pit. It is deeds of mercy to the suffering, deeds essential to the duties of piety, deeds of necessity that could not be provided for beforehand or postponed, that he practised and recommended." Hence we infer that there are to be no systematic preparations for cases of necessity, that may occur. Steamers, trains, postmen, post office officials, omnibuses and cabs, and servants in newspaper offices, are not as a matter of course, to be kept at work every Sabbath to provide for contingent cases of necessity. Let there be provision made for disposing of these cases when they do occur.

PRESBYTERIANISM THE INSTITUTED FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

Having shewn that, according to Christ's institution, presbyters are the rulers of the Church, the office-bearers by whom its government is to be administered, we now proceed to ascertain their *functions* as rulers. Here we shall observe the same limitation as on the preceding branch of the subject, confining our-selves to the controverted points that affect the claims of the rival systems. Instead, therefore, of attempting to state at large what the rulers of the church have to do, and how they should do it, we need only address ourselves to the latter of those inquiries; nor is a full answer to it necessary.

1. It is not by single office-bearers that acts of government

are to be performed, but by a plurality of office-bearers assembled as a court or consistory. This is clearly established by the rule laid down by our Lord – "tell it unto the Church." (Matt. 18: 17.) Paul's instructions to the Corinthian Church are in accordance with this rule. Its office-bearers were to exercise discipline "when they were gathered together;" it was not a single office-bearer that was to exercise it. (1 Cor. 5: 4.) And the proceedings of the council held at Jerusalem, of which we have the history in the 15th Chapter of the Acts, were in accordance with it. Here we have the act of government, for which the occasion called, performed by an assembly of office-bearers. Paul and Barnabas, and those who accompanied them from Antioch, having stated to a meeting held receive them, that certain of the Pharisees who believed, taught that it was needful to circumcise the Gentile converts, and to command them to keep the law of Moses, "the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." A single office-bearer did not deal with it. Any of the apostles who were present in Jerusalem at the time could pronounce an inspired deliverance in the case; and when, notwithstanding, it was laid before an assembly of the rulers, the apostles taking their place among them as if they were no more than ordinary office-bearers, it was strongly indicated that it was by such assemblies that the government of the Church was to be administered.

Such language as the apostle addresses to Timothy, (1 Tim. 5: 19,) – "against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses," – though it has been adduced as proving that it is by single office-bearers that the government of the Church is to be administered, gives no support whatever to this doctrine. Such language would be perfectly proper in addressing a ruler who was to act only as it member of a consistory. Besides, Timothy was an extraordinary office-bearer, and though he might act singly under extraordinary circumstances, this would be no proof that ordinary office-bearers might do the same under ordinary circumstances.

2. It is competent to a single consistory of office-bearers, or, to use the scripture term, to a single presbytery, to exercise rule over several congregations. The evidence on this point is exactly such as was to be expected in the case not presented in direct and express statements, but by ample and unquestionable facts, from which our position follows as a clear and irrefragable inference. We proceed to lay before the reader a portion of those facts. It is plain that the Church at Jerusalem must have consisted of several congregations; for its members amounted to "many thousands," or rather – retaining the term in the original – to "many *myriads*" or tens of thousands – Acts 21: 20; and it was physically impossible, therefore, that all of them should assemble together as one congregation. The Christians at this time possessed no public buildings; and even the largest of our modern public buildings would not accommodate "many myriads." Besides the

believers did not all speak the same language; on the contrary, the diversity of languages among them was so great, that the gift of tongues was necessary to enable the Apostles to address such of them as were present on the day of Pentecost, each in his own language. Hence, if they all ass- embled as one congregation, in whatever language the services of that congregation might be conducted, it would be wholly unintelligible, an unknown tongue, to a large portion of them; and it cannot be doubted that the arrangements adopted pro-vided for the edification of all. The fact that there were so many ministers in this Church, and among these the Apostles themselves for a considerable period, strongly confirms the conclusion to which we are thus irresistibly led – that it comprehended a plurality of congregations.

Now all those congregations, – and the number of them must have been considerable, – were under the government of one body of office-bearers, of one presbytery. This we need not prove, for congregationalists themselves hold that there was but one governing body in the Church at Jerusalem, which they compress into one congregation. Proof, however, is not wanting. No one can read with an unbiassed mind, the portion of the Acts of the apostles which refers to the the church in question, without perceiving that all its affairs were managed by one body of rulers. Thus when a controversy arose at Antioch on the subject of circumcision, it was determined "that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." – Acts 15: 2. Here "the apostles and elders," or the rulers of all the congregations composing the Church at Jerusalem, are represented as one body. The following passage leads us to view them in the same light: "Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present." – Acts 21:18.

We may observe in passing that, in the application of the term *Church* to the Church at Jerusalem, (see Acts 8: 1, 15: 4.) we have a conclusive instance of the use of it in the scriptures to denote several congregations. It is true that we are not told, in so many words, that the Church at Jerusalem consisted of several congregations; but do not the facts, – the statistics of that Church, – to which we have directed attention convey this information as *effectively*, as any words could convey it? Its members were very numerous, – "many myriads," and spoke different languages; its ministers were numerous, and among them, for a time, were several apos-tles; its members met regularly to attend on the ministrations of the gospel, and, as they possessed no public buildings, must, in most instances at least, have held their meetings in private houses. And do not these statistics demonstrate that it consisted of many congregations? It was physically imposs- ible that it should meet as one congregation. A body so large must have been distributed into many congregations that such buildings as could be procured might afford accommodation for its assemblies. Such distribution would be rendered necessary also by diversity of language. He, that, in the face of these statistics, maintains that it consisted of but one congregation, would seem to hold it as a principle that no inference from facts is to be received as a truth, and should be prepared to reject not a little of what is now regarded as a portion of human knowledge, and a portion of it supported by most satisfactory evidence.

Though we were to view the Church at Jerusalem as comprehending only one solitary congregation, still it would not by any means present the aspect of a congregational Church. In a congregational Church there is but one pastor or presbyter, but in the Church of Jerusalem as we learn from passages already quoted, there were many. If the proceedings of that Church had been conducted according to the congregational model, and had been related by a congregational historian, we should not read that a certain question having arisen at Antioch, it was determined that commissioners "should go up to Jerusalem unto the *apostles and elders* about this question;" and that "the *apostles and elders* came together for to consider this matter." – Acts 15: 2, 6. A Congregationalist relating congregational proceedings would say that the question was referred to the *Church* at Jerusalem and that the *Church* "came together for to consider" it.

The statistics of the Churches at Ephesus, Antioch, and Corinth lead to the same conclusion, that it is competent to a presbytery to exercise rule over a plurality of congregations.

3. Of a court of still more extensive jurisdiction than a presbytery, and acting as a court of Review, we have a clear example in the 15th Chapter of Acts. A question arose at Antioch respecting the obligation of circumcision and other Jewish ob- 352
servances. On this question the rulers of the Church at Antioch doubtless pronounced a deliverance. It cannot be supposed that they did not, as rulers, promptly and distinctly condemn the grievous corruption of the gospel which the Judaizing teachers sought to introduce. But, notwithstanding, "no small dissension" continued to prevail with respect to it. It was therefore determined to refer the whole subject to a higher tribunal, to a council or synod composed of commissioners from the Church at Antioch and probably from other churches, and of the rulers of the Church at Jerusalem. When the synod was convened, the question submitted to it was fully and freely discussed, – there was "much disputing." At last a deliverance was agreed on, and transmitted in writing to the churches which it concerned.

4. The decisions of the rulers of the Church are authoritative and not merely advisory. This is implied in the very idea of rule or government. He that merely gives advice does not act the part of a ruler. When the ordinary members are required "to *obey* those that have the rule over them," it is clearly intimated that the latter are invested with authority, and that in the matter to which this exhortation applies they act authoritatively. Those over whom they rule could not otherwise be called upon to *obey* them, and, – which is a still stronger expression, – to *submit* themselves.

The power, however, with which the rulers of the Church are invested is not "lordly" or legislative, but only ministerial and executive, – a power to administer Christ's laws, and to be exercised "for edification and not for destruction."

To secure to the teaching of scripture on the subject of Church government the candid and earnest attention to which it is entitled, we submit to the reader the following remarks, which derive increased, and, indeed, great importance from their extensive application to the investigation of religious truth.

1. Our first remark is, that it concerns us to know the mind of Christ on every subject on which he has been pleased to reveal it, and so far as he has revealed it. The fact that he has granted a revelation on a given subject is, itself, a decisive proof that it will be to our advantage to possess the knowledge of that subject which he has thus communicated. And besides it is a homage which we owe to him as the prophet of his Church, that we earnestly apply our minds to all his instructions.

Whatever use may be legitimately made of the distinction of essential and non-essential religious truths, it certainly ought not to be resorted to as justifying the neglect of those truths which we refer to the latter class: A truth may be non-essential, in the sense that the knowledge of it is not necessary to salvation; but no truth which Christ has revealed, is non-essential in the sense that it is useless or unimportant, so that it

is a matter of indifference, to the individual and to the Church, whether it be known or remain unknown, or whether the views held respecting it be purely scriptural or more or less erroneous.

2. We observe, secondly, that to the upright and successful investigation of religious truth earnestness is necessary. We must be sincerely desirous to know the truth, and to know it in the particular case with which we are occupied at the time. When it it is a case with respect to which controversy is waged between our own and another denomination, we must be conscientiously careful, that, when the evidence adduced makes against the views of our own denomination, we do not regard it on that account, as so much hostile argument which we have to repel. The views of our denomination have no claim upon us on any other ground than on their accordance with the truth, and therefore we should never maintain or support them against the truth, proved to be such by sufficient evidence.

3. We request special attention to our third remark, that the teaching of scripture on any subject should be taken as a whole.

It may be conveyed in two sets of passages, which, at first sight or to a prepossessed and prejudiced mind, may seem to contradict each other. In such a case, instead of taking one of those sets of passages and rejecting the other, we must take both. The doctrine of scripture, on the subject to which they refer, is the doctrine which combines and harm- onises them. For example, the scriptures speak of Christ as a man, and they also speak of him as God. Thus we have two sets of passages respecting his person; and the error of the Socinian is, that he founds his views wholly upon one of these, – the passages that represent the Saviour as a man, – and rejects the teaching of the other, – the passages that represent him as God. The orthodox doctrine is founded alike upon both sets of passages, and combines and embodies both, viewing Christ as both God and man in one person. This error, of deriving instruction exclusively from selected passages and silencing others, is the great exegetical error of Arminianism, which impresses upon it the character of a partial system, a system of which, not the whole scriptures, but a portion of the scriptures forms the basis. The Arminian takes his stand on the passages that assert or imply human responsibility, and he explains away and silences, as inconsistent with these, the passages that relate to electing love and efficacious grace. But, here, again, the orthodox doctrine is founded alike upon both sets of passages, and combines and embodies both.

As regards Church government, then, the question is, not whether certain passages do not seem to favour certain views, but what all the passages that bear upon the subject, teach us. Accordingly, instead of setting up passage against passage, the proper course is to make our system embrace all the passages, – to derive it faithfully from their joint teaching.

The neglect of the very obvious, but most important rule, of which we now urge the observance, is a great cause of the prevalence of error and the pertinacity of controversy. The first step for the inquirer is, to receive all that the scriptures teach; he may next endeavour to harmonise the different portions of their teaching; but if, in any case, he fail in this attempt, he must still hold all they teach in that case none the less firmly on that account. How can he reject any of their declarations? Do they not all rest on the same authority; and that the authority of God? And, though the rejection of some of them were an allowable course, how could he determine which of them should be rejected? His only guide would be his prejudices.

Correspondence

A RETROSP'ECT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TESTIMONY.

SIR, – I have recently been much occupied with thoughts upon certain questions, which have been keenly discussed in our day. The questions I refer to, are chiefly ecclesiastical. Perhaps there are few periods in the history of the world, when there has been a greater amount of religious controversy, than just the last thirty years. Patronage, intrusion, voluntaryism, spiritual independence, union, ritualism, instrumental music in divine worship, have all come in for a full share of consideration and debate in our day. It has often occurred to my mind, as a circumstance worthy of more consideration than it has yet received, that in an age characterised by religious excitement and revival, there should have been such an extraordinary amount of controversy, occasioning bitterness of feeling, and no little strife and division among brethren. It had been a result, at once natural and desirable, that a revival of evangelical religion, should have been followed by earnest and sustained labour for the conver353
sion of sinners, and the promotion of personal holiness. Instead of this, however, the result has been, the raising of a multitude of controversial questions, the buckling on of armour, and the exhibition of ecclesiastical gladiatorship, in contending fiercely about some point of outward formality, ecclesiastical arrangement, or external union. How noticeable, for instance, the circumstance, that, when the Free Church got out of the distressing and perplexing conflict, which had for ten weary years so painfully occupied the minds of the Ministers of the Gospel; and when she seemed to have reached a period when she could peacefully and energetically have prosecuted her proper work, in preaching the gospel, pastoral visitation, and caring for souls; instead of eschewing the field of controversial warfare, on which so much time and energy had been already expended, she plunges into the muddy waters of strife and contention, and becomes embroiled in strivings and contentions about other churches, to the distraction and disquiet of her own body. It is not a little remarkable that this should have been the case chiefly with regard to the question of union. Union, that sweet and lovelike word, whose winning aspect has fascinated so many stout hearted and stalwart men of battle! Union – so suggestive of peace, and harmony, and love, and yet so fertile, in these days, in all that is bitter, vengeful, envious, and divisive! How abundantly has this been manifested in the Colonial unions. It was in connection with Australian unions that the Free Church was first called on to try her hand at this work. It is not, perhaps, of any consequence to enquire into the causes, why she shewed herself so unskilful in dealing with such questions, but most assuredly she had proved herself much more expert in prosecuting a war of separation, than in conducting measures for union, when called on to deal with that question. Many proofs of this are at hand. One of the most prominent and notorious, is the extraordinary lack of pluck and principle manifested in the case of the memorable expulsion at Geelong in 1854. The then Free Synod of Victoria, which then and there met, found that certain of their brethren, tho' not opposed to union, were nevertheless unable to acquiesce in its being consummated upon the terms then proposed. It would require, I humbly think, a singularly constituted mind, to see in this, a crime des-erving of expulsion from the fellowship of the Church. For this declinature, however, to agree to union on the terms then proposed, seven brethren were summarily expelled from the body. I venture to say, Mr. Editor, that this was one of the most unjust, unfair, and unconstitutional acts ever perpetrated by any body of men calling themselves a Church Court. The moral and ministerial characters of these seven

Brethren were altogether unimpeachable. No crime could be laid to their charge. They had in no way violated their ordination vows. They were simply advocating and maintaining their conscientious views upon an important ecclesiastical question, which they had a perfect right to do: – and for this, a deed was done, a flagrant act of oppression was committed upon them, which is a standing blot upon the character of the body that committed it. The idea of a Court of the Presbyterian Church, carrying a measure by expelling the minority, instead of vindicating and maintaining it views in the usual constitutional way, by a vote, is something so outrageous and revolting, that one scarcely knows how to account for it. The step which the unrighteously expelled brethren instantly adopted, in constituting themselves into a synod, under the name and designation of the Free Church Synod of Victoria, took the jubilant party rather aback. They were not prepared for a measure of such a bold and decided character. They now found that in their haste to get the very name of the Free Church extinguished in the Colony, by going into union with men who neither loved the name nor the principles of that Church, they had done a deed which bade fair to be the means of

perpetuating that name in the colony in spite of them. It could be no very pleasant prospect to those who had acted so bravely, to look forward to the result of their little tyranny, in the shape of an organized Church, maintaining a permanent protest against their anti-Free Church movement. Whether it was any apprehension of this, that moved them, we say not, but at any rate, they did appeal to the Free Church, of Scotland for help and counsel in the very awkward position in which they now found themselves. Now, supposing the real state of affairs to have been placed honestly before the magnates of the Free Church in Scotland, what was to be expected, as the judgement which they would pronounce upon the proceedings referred to? But before noticing the reply of the Free Church to the application made to them, let us consider the character of the application itself. Well then, they applied to the Free Church of Scotland to send out a deputation, consisting of some of their most noted and esteemed Ministers, in order to consult and advise with them in the then particular crisis of affairs. The parties invited to visit the colony on this occasion were the following: – William Cunningham, D. D., Robert 8, Candlish, D.D., Thomas Guthrie, D.D., James Begg, D.D., William Wilson, and William Nixon. These gentlemen did not find it convenient to comply with the invitation, but replied by letter, to which they all adhibited their names. This famous document, then, furnishes us with the deliberate and conjunct view of the Victorian case, arrived at, and agreed upon by these well known men, who may surely be relied upon as representing the sentiments and opinions of the Free Church. Let us, then, take this notable document under review.

This, however, must form the subject of another letter. – Meantime, I am, &c., N.

MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

(*Concluded from page 340*.)

But there was a special case in which evidence appears of the concurrent operation of arrangements to pave the way for the religious drama. I commend to your careful scrutiny the two advertisements which appeared in the following order, and the one immediately under the other; the clipping is from the *Geelong Register,* January 14, 1868: –

ASSEMBLY HALL.
GEELONG MECHANICS' INSTITUTE.
SHAKESPEARIAN READINGS and RECITATIONS, in aid of the Building Fund,

Saint Andrew's Presbyterian Church,
YARRA STREET, GEELONG,
ON
TUESDAY EVENING, 21st JAN., 1868,
Programme in future advertisement

HIGH CHURCH SUNDAY SCHOOL FUND.
Lecture in aid of the above will be given in the Hall of the Mechanics Institute, on
MINOR POETS OF SCOTLAND,
By The
REV. J. W. INGLIS,
of Sandridge,
This Evening, TUESDAY, 14th Jan., 1868.
Doors open at 7.30. Lecture, to commence at 8,
The Rev. T. McKenzie Fraser will preside.
Tickets 1s., at the Institute and at all Book Sellers.

During the discussion it was urged that Mr. Fraser did not lose character by presiding at the entertainment given by Mr. Inglis. The idea might indeed be well suggested; for who is Mr, Inglis? He rose at a bound to the status, privileges, and distinction, of purveyor of amusements to the Presbyterian church of 354
Victoria. His entertainments have been often advertised. He is one of the more marked specimens of the ecclesiastical drift of the present epoch. The demoralising experiment was fitly tried under the auspices of Mr. Inglis. It passed off without remonstrance. People seem to have made up their minds as to what is to be expected from Mr. Inglis. But where the carcass is, there the eagles will be gathered together. If, under the spiritual blessings devel- oped by Union, Mr. Inglis has been floated to the surface as the illustrator of Burns, we may look for more in the same direction. Whatever manipulation may be accomplished with professed articles of belief, through combined dexterity, dishonesty, and unfaithfulness, there is no preventing the irresistible action of cause and effect. The church that canonises Robert Burns is obviously far advanced according to the civilization of the times. It is not to be supposed that Burns is to have it all to himself. If the High Priest of Burns gets on so well in the Presbyterian Union, surely the church must be ripe for the apostle of Shakespeare. The time is up. The new bright occidental star is the Rev. Francis Rae. While I have associated Mr. Fraser's name so closely, with the clerical theatricals for reasons which are apparent, Mr. Rae is by no means to be cast into the shade. These theatricals were in behalf of the congregation over which he was inducted a few weeks ago. Mr. Rae has made his *debut.* Perhaps his benefit might come rather soon, but, in any case, his entertainment assumes a style and character which reduces Mr. Inglis to low comedy all at once. The movement was vigorous enough to suck in three ministers besides Mr. Rae himself. One, indeed, drew back, but the other three held on. The performance was declared to be a success. Mr. Rae won laurels, and got the compliment that such as he would attain to brilliant results on the stage. What self-denial in Mr. Rae to continue a minister of Christ when such honours invite him to be the apostle of Shakespeare. And yet, is it consistent in Mr. Rae to adhere to the sham reality when the way is so clear to betake himself to the real sham? I did not hear the lecture on the Coming of Christ, which was delivered by Mr. Rae, so I do not know what place Shakespeare may have in that important matter. One of the defenders of the Shakespearian readings says of Shakespeare, "that he brought forth fruit – immortal fruit – to the glory of God and the benefit of mankind, no one can deny." The letter, extending over several columns, gives numerous extracts from the plays to prove what a good Christian was Shakespeare. Who knows but the way for the millennium is to be paved by the universal diffusion of

Shakespeare. Who knows but the watchfulness inculcated upon those who are waiting for the coming of the Lord Jesus is a keen relish for the beauties of Shakespeare! Just listen to the following piece of theology from one of the friends of the readings. The question had been asked, could these ministers be considered as waiting with their loins girt and their lamps trimmed? Here is a professed reply: – "When a man is in the faith, or believing the gospel, he is prepared for whatever his Heavenly Father may call him to, whether to live or die, even though he should be in the midst of the reading of Shakespeare when called." Who knows but the wise virgins will be found at last to be those who are well versed in Shakespeare: No doubt some of these sentiments, and some of the foregoing language, are more or less unusual. But one must not sleep in these stirring times. I am only trying, in my own way, to keep in the track of the advanced theology, headed by Messrs. Fraser, Rae, &c., and to familiarize myself with the kind of piety which they are patronising. Mr. Fraser is a pillar in the Union. He was convener of the committee appointed to beg, bag, borrow, or invent a hymn book – which tried to invent one, but ended by borrowing one. Mr. Fraser is also connected with the theological hall. It is well to take an estimate of the builders of the Presbyterian Babel called Union.

It would, no doubt be instructive to take up and discuss the subject raised by the Shakespearian readings, but that would require a treatise with free scope to follow out questions along all their sinuosities. It would also require some care and discrimination to avoid extreme positions, untenable either way. But while it might require some nice analysis to attempt to draw a line, it is never to be forgotten there are stages at which the nice analysis is altogether unnecessary. It would be difficult to determine to a degree where cold ends and heat begins, yet no one has any difficulty in determining that 40 degrees F. is rather cold, and 140 degrees F. is rather hot. Some questions regarding the reading of secular literature may be so adjusted, that if one conclusion is adopted, license is claimed in consequence, and if the opposite, then the allegations of harshness and extreme positions are ready. But these are the mere tricks of controversy. With regard to the Geelong theatricals, the point at which I find satisfaction is this, that on the broad ground of their spiritual instincts, enlightened, as I trust, by the Word of God, the more piously inclined in Mr. Fraser's own congregation, as well as others, remonstrated against the desecration of the office of the holy ministry, which was involved in the Shakespearian readings. In conclusion, in spite of all the shallow talk of advancement, civilisation, &c., religious theatricals belong to the dark ages; and theatrical ministers are the best possible mark of an advanced stage of corruption in religion and morals in every age. By their fruits ye shall know them. The Union is developing itself in ways which will be a conclusive commentary on the pious pretence under which important truths and testimony have been forsaken.

I am, &c.,
PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, 7th February, 1868.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TESTIMONY.

SIR, – If you can find room for the following notice of part of the business transacted at a recent meeting of the Unionist Presbytery of Geelong, it will form a suitable appendix to the remaining portion of my letter of last month. The report from which I take a clipping appeared in the Geelong papers. The following is the clipping: –

"The Presbytery then proceeded to give judgement in the case of the Rev. F. Rae, who had laid on the table of the Presbytery at its meeting on the 4th of February, a letter in which he acknowledged that he had been guilty of falsehood in representing himself to be a widower, Mrs. Rae being alive, and expressed deep contrition for his sin. After Messrs. McDonald and Middlemiss, commissioners from St. Andrew's congregation, and the Rev. I. Hetherington, who had been requested to give his advice on some points of form, had been heard, it was moved by the Rev. A. J. Campbell, and second-ed by the Rev. T. M. Fraser, 'That this Presbytery, looking at the gravity of Mr. Rae's sin and the deep injury it has inflicted on this church and the interests of religion, resolve to suspend and, they hereby do suspend, him from all the functions of ministry for three months, commencing at the date of the meeting of the Presbytery on the 11th of February last.' The Rev. F. Steels of Bellerine moved that the Presbytery give Mr. Rae a solemn admonition and rebuke. This, however, not being seconded, fell to the ground. Various members having expressed their views, Mr. Campbell's motion was agreed to, and the moderator intimated to Mr. Rae the sentence of the court. Mr. Rae declined to submit to this judgement, and appealed to the commission in May."

In the *Geelong Register* the notice of the Presbytery meeting appeared on the 5th of March. In the advertising columns 355
of the same paper there appeared on the next day the following intimation: – "St. Andrews Church, Yarra Street. The Rev. Francis Rae will preach two sermons on Sabbath next, 8th inst. Morning – 11 o'clock; subject 'God.' Evening – 6.30 o'clock; subject 'The twilight of life.'"

It is well that these representatives of advanced opinions in Theology give us such excellent practical illustrations of the direction in which they are making progress.

I am &c.
PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, – Victoria,
March 7th, 1868.

"SHAKESPEARIAN READINGS" AND THEIR APOLOGISTS.

With reply to the Rev. J. McKenzie Fraser's attack on the Reformed Presbyterian Church. By the Rev. A. M. Moore, M. A., Geelong.

Our readers have derived or will derive sufficient information respecting the Geelong clerical "Shakespearian Readings," from the letter of our esteemed correspondent, the Rev. Mr. MacPherson, of which we published the first portion in our last issue and give the remainder in this number. And as Mr. Moore maintains the same views with Mr. MacPherson, – views in which we need not say we cordially concur – it is unnecessary for us to give an analysis of his pamphlet, which deals vigorously but temperately with the method of assimilating the Church to the world, which it is his object to expose and check, and with the defenders of it.

The following passage describes in graphic terms and most truthfully, a class of Free Churchmen with which we have been too familiar in these colonies.

"Perhaps Mr. F. belongs to a party to be found in both Scotland and Australia, of whom if it can be said they ever 'bought the truth' we are compelled to say, they have most ignominiously sold it again. It is no uncommon thing to find men making a noise in Scotland about 'Free Church principles,' and when they reach the shores. of Australia, these principles are cast to the winds; as if what is truth on one side of the globe, ceased to be truth when its advocates have reached the other.

One day such men are bent on dividing, the next on uniting, and they have no patience with those who refuse to jump with them from side to side, from right to left, and from left to right again, according as it may suit their interests or whims. But be it known to such uncertain, unsteady men, that Covenanters have adopted their principles, and mean to abide by them, because they are Bible revealed, and blood bought principles – principles which have stood the test of severe persecutions, and a world of obloquy and reproach,"

YOUNG MEN: THOSE WE WANT AND THOSE WE DO NOT WANT.

We make the following extract from a discourse by the Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, of New York. In placing it before our readers, – and we wish they had access to the whole discourse, we must advert to the use made by the excellent author of the word "everlasting," when he applies it to the incessant recurrence of "the last amusement or the last scandal" in the talk of certain young men, as unhappy and objectionable. The solemn significance of such terms ought not to be disturbed by a degrading employment of them.

"If we might have all wishes in one, we could wish nothing better, nothing greater, than that the youth now growing up should be cast into the right mould. A present generation, duly trained in boyhood and adolescence, will make a coming generation of men, (I wish our otherwise rich English had two words, as most other languages have, to express the thought) of men, who shall stand in the battle. Of poor sauntering triflers, in human shape and men's apparel, we have enough; of literary Sybarites, bred on stories, fugitive poetry and monthly magazines; of minute scholars, glorying in the niceties of metre and accent, college honours, and other tongues; of dressed creatures that sweeten soirees and playhouses with their odours; of things that flutter and die in the light of fashion, as moths about a lamp; of religious professors that almost ask leave to serve Christ; of the sons of Belial who surround them; more than enough have we of such young Americans, aping every effete custom, and appropriating every fungous abuse of the old countries, and spoiled tenfold worse by every voyage and travel abroad, so that they blush at the marks of an American as much as their fathers would have gloried in the same; more than enough of young men whose everlasting discourse is of the last amusement or the last scandal. But of men, spirits in earnest, souls that have an aim, bent towards some object, and that a great one; bearing and doing, training themselves by toil, by temperance, by self-denial, by prayer, for the benefit of the greatest number, it must be confessed with lamentation that we have but few. And if, as we suppose, the times which are coming on the earth will demand such men, strong to do and strong to suffer, our only mode of providing them is to deal with the young, and to pour the plastic masses into the shaping mould.

It will never do to ascribe the unmanly supineness and apathy of many Christian young men of our times, to any want of animating sentiment in Christianity. If the Reformation did no more, it taught us, that among the cinders of that old altar there lay coals of fire which needed but the stirring and the heavenly breath, to make them flame up to heaven. All the stories of romance wither and seem insipid when compared with Reformation history. You cannot read an hour about Luther, Calvin, Zwingle, Melancthon, Knox, or Melville, without feeling that you are communing with men. They had something to live for. They had some principles to die for. There were doctrines at stake. It is a symptom of the wretched, flaccid, pulseless condition of sundry in our day, that they never speak of theology, of catechisms, of doctrinal sermons, but with a sneer. The religion which they would like, if indeed they have thought enough to know their own mind, would be all sentimentality and all softness. Their weakened mental organs reject the strong meat. Know ye, O my beloved young friends, that manly bone, sinew, and muscle, do not form themselves on the emollient regimen of a Christianity without doctrine. The men who of old went to the stake, went for doctrines; these doctrines they had learned in the scriptures, elaborated in meditation, methodized in system, preached to listening thousands, digested in the succinct formulas of definition, and left for us, their children, in those permanent crystals of the Reformed Catechisms, which are scoffed at by amiable wits and religious *petit maitres.* Men, MEN, who can stand fast in the faith, who can stand alone, who have vertebral columns, who can bear; who can forbear, who can advance, who on due summons can strike, men armed with the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, that is with sword and shield, are bred in great study of God's Word, and great familiarity with those high evangelic truths which are the. motive powers of the spiritual universe. And this partly answers the question we have raised about the paucity of Christian soldiers, who seem to be in earnest, as earthly soldiers are in earnest. So that the way is prepared for stating two great means of promoting Christian courage and strength."

Advertisements.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 31 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, APRIL, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

Agents are requested to be so good as send in their accounts

The Testimony.

No. 31 APRIL. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Sabbath Observance … … … … …	357
Bearing of the Principles and Teaching of the Church of Rome on Loyalty to the British Crown … … …	358
A Retrospect … … … … …	360
Dr. Candlish's former views on the subject of Union … …	360
Pastoral Reminiscences … … … …	361
Pagan Worship retained in the Papal Church … … … 361	
Correspondence – To Presbyterians … … …	365
Free Presbyterian Church, Meredith … … …	365
Day of Thanksgiving for the Recovery of the Prince … …	366
Addresses to the Duke of Edinburgh … … …	366

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Report of a Lecture delivered in connection with St. George's Mutual Improvement Association, by the Rev. J. McCulloch.

(*Concluded from p. 350.*)

Hitherto we have been considering the negative aspect of the right mode of Sabbath observances, what we are to refrain from doing on that sacred day; and this view of the subject is highly important. It is so in itself considered, inasmuch as it involves conformity to the Divine will and conduces to the happiness of man; it is also of great importance relatively considered, that is as removing obstacles to the positive observance of the Lord's Day. This positive aspect of the case we now proceed to consider. The command as you are aware, runs thus "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The mere suspension of the labour and recreations of the six days cannot be regarded as, by any means, exhausting all that is contained in this requirement. And such *a mere* negative observance is impossible. The mind cannot rest altogether; as being from its nature active, it must be employed some way during man's waking hours. And if the Sabbath is to be kept holy, the mind, thus necessarily active, must be employed in sacred exercises. The public services of religion, including praise, prayer, reading the Scriptures, preaching, and hearing the Word, and the administration and receiving of the Sacraments are one of the prescribed forms of those exercises. Under the Old Testament dispensation the services of the sanctuary were connected with the observance of the Sabbath. "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary." Paul reminds the Jews that the Prophets were read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day. From Nehemiah we learn that public teachers, on the occasion of reading the Scriptures gave the sense, and made the people to understand the reading. The Saviour went to the Synagogues on the Sabbath, read the Scriptures, and taught the people. On the first day of the week, as already noticed, the disciples met together for religious exercises, (see John 20: 19; Acts 20: 7.) These exercises are well calculated to be a special means of benefitting men, and serve as a public testimony for God. Family devotion and instruction form another part of the sacred exercises of the Sabbath. "It is the Sabbath of the Lord *in all your dwellings*." No doubt these exercises are not to be limited to the Sabbath. It is a good thing to show forth his loving kindness in the morning and his faithfulness *every* night, and the following instructions are applicable to all times and places. – These words, which I command thee, shall be in thine heart, and thou shall teach them diligently to thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in the house, when thou walkest by the way and when thou liest down and when thou risest up." For such exercises, however, the leisure and quiet of the Sabbath afford peculiarly precious opportunities. And being engaged in these exercises is a most appropriate way of filling up sacred time. And, in connexion with this, we would observe that the great subjects of converse on the Lord's day, among the members of a household; or among friends and acquaintances, ought to be of a sacred kind. The prohibition to speak our own words implies that we are to speak the words of God. The Sabbath is, in this, as well as in other respects to be kept holy. The discourses of the Saviour with his disciples and others, on the Sabbath, with the exception of a few remarks respecting works of necessity and mercy, referred to spiritual subjects. The counsel of the Psalmist is peculiarly appropriate to this sacred season: "Talk ye of all his wondrous works."

The remaining part of Sabbath duties is that which pertains to private and personal exercises, – private reading, meditation, and prayer. Religious duties must not consist wholly of public and social exercises. No small portion of them requ- ires to be devoted to private study, of ourselves and the things of God, accompanied with secret prayer. Indeed, without this, public services are likely to be unprofitable and vain. When we speak of religious services as constituting the employments of the Sabbath, we mean the spiritual and cordial performance of such services, not the performance of them as a matter of form or a drudgery. "If thou call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord." The Sabbath is both a type and a foretaste of heaven. Hence, how

spiritual and delightful are its services, when properly conducted! But, in ord-

er to this, men need to be renewed in the spirit of their mind, that they may have spiritual tastes and dispositions. They need to be delivered from the law in its covenant form, and to have it written in their hearts as a rule of life. Thus they will be found observing the requirements of the fourth commandment, not in a self-righteous and slavish spirit, but in faith and love towards Christ Jesus, the only acceptable way of yielding obedience to this, or to any other part of the moral law.

We have thus endeavoured to point out the right mode of keeping the Sabbath, – a strict abstinence in thought, word and action, with the exception of certain necessary acts, from the usual avocations and pleasures of the week and heartily devoting that sacred portion of time to religious services.

The question is not, what is the *customary* and *convenient* way of keeping the Sabbath, but what is the right mode of doing so. This we have ascertained from the Word of God. And the same is evident from the nature and design of the institution – a day of holy rest, a rest from those things which tax the powers of mind and body, during the other six days of the week, and this, at the same time, accompanied by sacred exercises, – for it is a holy rest. Further, no other mode of keeping the Sabbath can answer the ends of the institution. – God's honour and man's advantage. No doubt, the great and ultimate end of instituting the Sabbath was the glory of God. In opposition to this it may be said that the Saviour declares "The Sabbath was made for man." But this declaration does not deny that the Sabbath was made for God. What it denies is that man was made for the Sabbath. Man was not made in subserviency to the Sabbath, but the Sabbath was instituted for promoting man's interests, and enabling him to accomplish the ends of his existence, of which glorifying God is the chief "The Lord hath made all things for himself." This applies both to man and to the Sabbath. The one was made and the other was instituted for the glory of God. And that the Sabbath was designed specially to accomplish this end, is evident from the description given of itself and its services. "If thou shall call the Sabbath the holy of the Lord and shalt honour him." Now God is honoured by Sabbath observance only so far as it in in accordance with the character of a day of holy rest, calling it practically "the holy of the Lord, not doing our own, ways, not finding our own pleasure, nor speaking our own words;" and nature itself teaches that it is due from the rational and moral part of God's creatures that they have set times for serving him, as their Creator, Benefactor, and Governor. And subordinate to the great end of the institution of the Sabbath is man's benefit, – man's benefit physically, intellectually, morally, and spiritually consid- ered. Now only by the mode of Sabbath observance pointed out can this subordinate end be accomplished. Man cannot be ben-efited physically by the Sabbath unless he be relieved from that which tasks his energies during the six days of the week. And it is by engaging in the enlarging, ennobling, and sanctify in exercises of religion that he reaps intellectual, moral, and spiritual advantages. If time had permitted, we might have referred to the national advantages reaped from the proper national observance of the Sabbath on the one hand, and the national calamities which follow national Sabbath desecration, on the other hand; and we might have pointed to examples of both in the case of Scotland on the one hand and that of France on the other. We are warranted from the Scriptures in asserting that national prosperity, and true religion stand or fall according to the treatment given to the Divine requirements, respecting the observance of the Sabbath. See Jeremiah 17: 19-27; Isaiah 58: 13, 14. But on this important point we cannot at present enlarge.

To the views maintained in this lecture, it may be objected by some, that such a mode of keeping the Sabbath imposes a burdensome yoke, and is calculated to breed, in the minds of young people, a dislike to that sacred institution, and so to occasion a great amount of Sabbath desecration. To this, we would reply, that, so far from a holy resting on the Sabbath being a burdensome yoke, it is a most delightful service. "If thou call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." Such observance affords pleasure of the highest and purest kind. Men, through the opposition of their hearts to the law, which is holy, just, and good, may make such a mode of observance burdensome to themselves. But that is no reason why the requirements of the law should be lowered to suit depraved tastes and dispositions. And, on the same ground, the requirements of other parts of the Decalogue would need to be lowered; as many would prefer a laxer mode of keeping themselves. If men will take occasion to sin, from a full exhibition of the requirements of the law of God, on their head be the responsibility. As to the young, it is incumbent on all, who, in the providence of God, are entrusted with their training, to impart correct views of the nature, extent, and blessed fruit of Sabbath observance. Before concluding we would remark that, in order to a due observance of the Lord's day, it is indispensable that various obstacles be removed out of the way, such as being occupied with worldly business or pleasure up to a late hour on Saturday night. Hence the necessity, both for buyers and sellers, of early closing of shops on Saturday night, hence also the importance of a partial holiday to the working classes, and the payment of wages at an early hour on Saturday, and of servants of every description having due facilities afforded to them for the proper observance of the Lord's day.

BEARING OF THE PRINCIPLES AND TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME ON LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH THRONE.

In an article on this subject in our last number, we undertook and proceeded to prove, that the principles and teaching of the Church of Rome fully account for the notorious and disgraceful fact of a prevalence of disloyalty towards the British Crown among the members of that church, to which the membership of protestant churches and that of the synagogue exhibit no parallel. The proof we adduced was derived from two sources, – the books which the authorities of the Church of Rome in this colony submitted to the Council of Education as books they would accept for use in their schools, and the text books used in Maynooth by students for the popish priesthood. Having dwelt sufficiently in our last issue on the seditious teaching of the former set of books, we shall now direct further attention to the seditious teaching of the latter. The Maynooth text books, as we stated in our former article, and shall now prove, teach that all baptised persons, and, therefore, Her Maj-esty Queen Victoria, are subject to the authority of the Church Rome; that all heretics, and, therefore, Her Majesty are, *ipso facto,* excommunicated and incapable of holding any public office; that the pope may deprive heretical rulers of their sovereignty, and release their subjects from their allegiance; and that heretics are justly punished with exile, imprisonment, and even death, and are be exterminated, if the

power to exterminate them is possessed, and can be exercised without danger to the church. It is evident that these doctrines are utterly subversive of loyalty to a protestant, and, therefore, in the estimat-

ion of Rome, heretical sovereign on the part of popish subjects; and that they are taught in the class books used in Maynooth is proved by the following extracts derived from the Report described in our last number. "Heretics are bound by the laws of the church, because they are by baptism made subjects of the church, nor are they more exempted from her laws than subjects who rebel against a prince." *Bailly's Moral Theology,* vol. I, p. 179; – *Report,* p. 13. "The first spiritual punishment annexed to heresy by the Canon law is major excommunication *ipso facto* decreed against it." *Same Class book,* vol. II, p. 19; *Report*, p. 28. "Heretics and those who favour and receive them the ancient law excommunicates, *ipso facto*." *Cabacassutius on Canon Law,* book V, C, XV., 8, 9; *Report,* p. 72. "We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which exalteth itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, which we have set forth above, condemning all heretics by whatsoever names they may be called." . . . . "If any temporal power, being required and admonished by the church, shall have neglected to purge his territory from heretical corruption, let him be bound by the metropolitan and the other comprovincial bishops with the chain of excommunication; and if he shall contemptuously refuse to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the chief pontiff, that from that time forth he may declare his subjects free from their allegiance to him, and expose his territory to be seized by Catholics, who may, without any contradiction, having exterminated the heretics, take possession of it" . . . . "Moreover, we decree that all believers, receivers, defenders, and favourers of heretics, shall fall under excommunication, strictly ordaining that after any of such persons shall have been branded by excommunication, if he shall contemptuously neglect to make satisfaction within a year from that day forth, he shall be tendered infamous *ipso facto.* Let him, neither be admitted to public offices nor councils, nor to elect any for such, nor received as a witness. Let him be also incapable of making a will, so that he may neither have the privilege of bequeathing property, nor let him succeed to any inheritance. Let no man, moreover, be compelled to answer him on any business; but let him be compelled to answer others." *Third Canon of the fourth Lateran Council, cited by Cabassutius in support of the doctrine of the preceding extract*; *Report*, pp. 74, 75. According to Thomas Aquinas, "princes can sometimes be deprived of their sovereignty, and subjects liberated from their oath of allegiance, and this has more than once been done by popes," *(Report,* p. 15); and, soon after the erection of the college of Maynooth, the then four archbishops and seven bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland promised to the Cardinal – prefect of the Propaganda, that Thomas Aquinas should be followed in the teaching of the college with respect to the pope's power to interfere in the temporal affairs of kingdoms and to dissolve the oath of allegiance, and not the Gallican doctrine, which denies that the pope possesses such power. *Report*, p. 5. "There are some who abuse this place [Matt. 13: 29) by trying to prove that heretics are not to be put to death, – which they who do seem to be anxious about themselves. First, indeed, it does not refer only to heretics, but to men who are children of the devil, as opposed to children of the kingdom, among whom heretics are the chief species, but not the only kind. Therefore, they who deny that heretics are to be put to death, ought much rather to deny that thieves, much rather that murderers ought to be put to death; for heretics are so much the more pernicious than thieves and murderers, as it is a greater crime to steal and slay the souls of men than their bodies . . . . "When, therefore, there is no danger that the wheat be rooted out along with them, but there is rather danger lest if they be not plucked up they may injure the wheat, what need is there to wait for the harvest? they are quickly to be plucked up, they are quickly to be burned" . . . .

Besides, why is there danger that the wheat be rooted with the tares? or why does the Father of the family order to wait for the harvest, unless that before the harvest they cannot be distinguished or separated from the wheat? When, therefore, they can be distinguished and separated, then certainly they are to be separated, then certainly they are to be burned." . . . "Who hath not known the Calvinists and Lutherans? Who does not see that they are heretics, who have revived almost every ancient heresy? truly there never was a heretic, there never can be a heretic, if they are not heretics." . . . . "I warn Princes, or because princes are not likely to read these things, I warn those who ought to admonish princes, that it is not lawful for them to grant to heretics those liberties which they call of conscience, and which are too much used in our days, unless first the church, or he who is head of the church, the Roman pon-tiff, – the person of Christ, and as it were, the father of the family – shall have judged that the tares cannot be rooted out unless the wheat be plucked up along with them, and that it is for the interest of the church that both should grow together until the harvest." . . . . "Nor ought princes to ask the father of the family that he would permit both to grow together until the harvest, but whether it was his will they should go and root up the tares; for they should be so affected and so ready, that they should be rather restrained than urged on by the father of the family."*Commentary of Maldonatus,* one of the Stan-dards of Maynooth, *Report,* pp. 53, *54.* See the whole comment in *Testimony* p. 312.

Such are the doctrines with respect to the treatment to be given to heretics. both subjects and rulers, which are taught in Maynooth and other Popish Colleges in Ireland to those who are preparing for the priesthood of the Church of Rome; and taught to them, of course, that they may afterwards teach them to the people. And is it to be wondered at that among a people who are taught such doctrines by religious instructors, whose persons and teaching most of them regard with superstitious reverence; disloyalty towards a sovereign, whom they regard as a heretic, should prevail and break forth into manifestation? Even Fenianism is in no way in excess of the fruits of disloyalty and sedition, that the dissemination by the agents of reputed infallibility and the consequent general belief of such doctrines, with respect to Her Majesty's right to rule, might be expected to produce, and, we must add, are doubtless intended to produce. The Church of Rome may think the recent Fenian displays of disloyalty premature; but it cannot for a moment be doubted that in teaching the doctrines an which we now remark, a body, whose operations are conducted with so much sagacity, and so skilful an adaptation of the means employed to the ends sought, intends that the disloyalty displayed should be produced.

But ought the Church of Rome, or any Church, to be allowed to teach such doctrines? Clearly not. To tolerate such teaching is to tolerate the undermining of the throne, and the mowing of disaffection among the people. "Let us inquire," says Milton, "whether popery is tolerable or no. Popery is a double thing to deal with, and claims a twofold power, ecclesiastical and political, both usurped, and the one supporting the other.

But ecclesiastical is ever pretended to political. The pope by this mixed faculty pretends right to kingdoms and states, and especially to this of England, thrones and unthrones kings,

and absolves the people from their obedience to them; sometimes interdicts to whole nations the public worship of God, shutting up their churches: and was wont to drain away great-est part of the wealth of this then miserable land, as part of his patrimony, to maintain the pride and luxury of his court and 360
prelates; and now, since, through the infinite mercy and favour of God, we have shaken off his Babylonish yoke, hath not ceased by his spies and agents, bulls and emissaries, once to destroy both king and parliament; perpetually to seduce, corrupt, and pervert as many as they can of the people. Whether, therefore, it be fit or reasonable to tolerate men thus principled in religion towards the state, I submit it to the consideration of all magistrates, who are best able to provide for their own and the public safety.

A RETROSPECT.

No. 2.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TESTIMONY.

Sir, – In my former letter, I brought my remarks down to the period, at which the Advocates of Union in Victoria received the famous Manifesto from the Free Church Ministers in Scotland, whom they had invited to visit them. This document may be allowed to be entitled to some consideration on account of the names subscribed to it. These names I gave in my former letter, and shall now proceed to deal with the substance of the document itself. It is dated "Edinburgh, Nov. 14th, 1857," and commenced thus: "Reverend and Dear Brethren, – We, the undersigned, having been invited to visit you in your present trying circumstances, and having felt ourselves obliged to decline the invitation, consider it right and respectful to express to you, in this written communication, our deep sympathy with you, as well as our sense of the honor conferred upon us, by your placing such confidence in us as to desire our presence among you." This initiatory passage makes manifest, at once, the side which those Reverend Brethren in Scotland, had determined to take in the union controversy in Victoria. They express their sympathy, yes, their "*deep sympathy*" with the triumphant majority, whom they describe as in "*trying circumstances*." Now, the question which, at once, suggests itself here, is this: – What were the "*trying circumstances*," which thus drew forth the "*deep sympathy*" of the brethren in Scotland? When we look for an answer to this question, in the then condition of the party to whom it refers, we so utterly fail to discover any feature in their case, calling for *deep sympathy,* that we are almost tempted to think, either that these Rev. Brethren must have been grievously ignorant of the true circumstances of the case, or, were roguishly indulging in a little irony, at the expense of the suffering Victorians. Deep sympathy! Trying circumstances! Why, what were those circumstances? They had met in Synod, – they had proceeded to consider the question of Union, – they found that there were some of their members unprepared to sanction the union without a more satisfactory guarantee for the maintenance of their Free Church principles, than the proposed terms of union provided. Was this the trying circumstance? No, for they had cut clean out of this difficulty before the sympathizing letter was written. In order to get rid of the conscientious minority, who were standing out for the Free Church, so that they might carry their resolve for union into effect, without the annoyance of Free Church scruples, they bring in a motion to have these sticklers for the Free Church at once expelled. This motion they triumphantly carried. Was this the trying circumstance? No, for surely it would be something like sheer mockery, to pretend pity or sympathy for a party who had successfully carried their point, and effected their object; and this was just what these men had done. To talk of pity or sympathy under such circumstances is something very like jesting. Again, then, we ask, what were the trying circumstances which called forth the deep sympathy of Dr. Cunningham, Dr. Candlish, Dr. Guthrie, Dr: Begg, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Nixon? Had these men expressed sympathy for the Rev. A. Paul, and the other brethren who along with him were attempted to be cruelly and unrighteously crushed, we

could have understood them. We could easily have appreciated the justice as well as the generosity of leading Ministers of the Free Church of Scotland, admiring the faithfulness of those who, in a distant land, could maintain amidst difficulties, the very principle which, these leading Ministers themselves professed to hold; and we could have understood both the consistency and the dutifulness of these same leading Ministers, expressing their *deep sympathy* for such faithful brethren, when made to suffer cruelly and unjustly for their fidelity. All this we could have understood and appreciated. But when, their sympathy is only for their oppressors, and these oppressors condoled with, as in trying circumstances, just when they had successfully accomplished their object, we feel driven to seek for some new and unwonted grounds, on which to account for men's actions. The ordinary motives that influence human conduct, seem to fail us, in such a case, and we ask, in amazement, what meaneth this?

Having thus seen how oddly the first paragraph of this famous letter reads, when taken in connection with the true circumstance of the case, we cannot be expected to anticipate any very brilliant display of high minded and honorable consistency, in the following portion of it. When we find such men as those, who had put their names to this letter, setting out by talking of persons being in trying circumstances, when there was nothing whatever trying in their case, except what they themselves had wilfully and knowingly brought about, and brought about too, in a way which far more loudly called for reproof than for *deep sympathy,* we cannot help asking ourselves, what strange views have now taken possession of these home authorities? Where now is all the zeal with which they once insisted on Colonial Ministers declaring distinctly their ecclesiastical connection. No compromise, – no shuffling, – no trimming would do in those days. What then meaneth all this wondrous love for those from whom in other days we were so emphatically warned to separate? Has it now been discovered that Free Church principles are untenable: or is it that they are found to be only points of local interest, and not truths that will bear to be avowed out of Scotland? Are the very men who, in the colonies, hold these principles most fully and most firmly, only deserving of expulsion, and repudiation for their pains, while they who unconstitutionally, wilfully and unnecessarily expel them, are to be talked of as be in *trying circumstances* and deserving *deep sympathy*!!

There is, however, one view of this subject which will justify fully the terms in which the Scottish divines express themselves. If we regard the Victorian Unionists as having committed grievous sin in the unjust and unconstitutional ejection of the non-consenting brethren, then, indeed, they were in "*trying circumstances*," just as any persons may be said to be in trying circumstances, who have incurred guilt. And that guilt was incurred in this matter is virtually, altho' rather timidly, admitted by the writers of the letter themselves. This I shall show in my next, and meanwhile,

I am, my Dear Sir,
Yours sincerely
N.

March 6th, 1868.

DR. CANDLISH'S FORMER VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT OF UNION.

In 1852 the majority of the Original Secession Church was admitted into the Free Church, and a special report was published at the time of the proceedings of the Free Church Assembly on that important occasion. Dr. Candlish was of course, and justly, very prominent in the formation of that union, and hailed this application as no less than the appeal of the Sec- 361 eders of Scotland to "the first free and reforming General Assembly." The speech which the Doctor made at that time is certainly instructive, and even extraordinary, especially in the light of recent occurrences. Here are extracts worthy of being perused now by all, and by none more than by some of the former Seceders. Speaking of the application of the Seceders, he said: –

"We not merely sustain the appeal of these brethren, reverse the sentences appealed against, and repone them to the office from which they were unrighteously deposed, or rather substantially declare the sentences to be null and void – we not merely do this; we also say that, as regards the particular document upon the ground of which they propose to unite with us, we are thoroughly satisfied that this union involves no compromise what-ever on their part, and no compromise at all upon ours. (Hear, hear.) It is *not a union, or a re-union rather, based on compromise.* On the contrary, in this age in which *the Church is rather apt to be drawn in a line of defection towards a spurious liberality, and latitudianarianism, and indifference to great and essential truths.* (Hear, hear.) I hail this union, or re-union, as the lifting up of a standard which will rally Scottish Presbyterians again on the old ground upon which they stood together and fought together before. (Cheers.) I hail this union as the erecting a platform upon which we can anew, as it were, rally our ranks *against all tendencies to defection.* The re-union between our seceding brethren and ourselves is, in my mind, very valuable as a noble testimony to greatly essential Christian truths. It is not merely a mutual complimenting of one another on the part of two branches of the Church of Christ in this land. It is not merely that they acknowledge our claims, and that we acknowledge theirs, historically viewed. We unite not merely upon ground of historical identity; we unite upon the ground of a common agreement in the maintenance of great principles. (Hear, hear.) We unite on the ground of our being of one mind and of one heart in holding, and maintaining, and practically carrying out, *great and fundamental truths of the Word of God, which, to a large extent, are compromised in this age of compromise.*

In particular, we unite upon the high ground of Christ's glorious and sovereign Headship over the Church which He hath purchased with His own blood. We unite upon the ground of His sole and exclusive government of the Church, which is His body. And, more than that, we unite upon the ground of Christ's glorious and sovereign Headship over the nations. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) We unite in owning him to be King of kings as well as King of saints. It is a noble testimony to what we have been accustomed to call the principle of a national establishment of religion, that is this night to be borne. And it is all the more noble because that testimony is to be borne by those who have been wrongfully and unrighteously deprived of the benefits of the Nat- ional Establishment. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It is a noble test-imony borne to what I will not merely call the principle of a nat-ional establishment of religion, but rather the doctrine that Christ reigneth as King of kings and Lord of lords; that He is the Prince of the kings of the earth; that by Him kings reign, and princes decree justice; and that all who hold any authority, and who wield any influence in the affairs of men, are bound to exercise that authority, and to use that influence, for advancing Christ's glory and the good of His Church, and for the overthrow of all that is hostile to these ends. (Loud cheers.)

I rejoice, therefore, in this union as a union effected, not upon the low ground of compromise, but upon the high ground of common principle. *These are the only safe unions in days like the present* – unions effected, not in the way of giving and taking, not by word catching and syllable splitting – (Hear, hear) – not by any expedients of that sort, but unions effected upon the ground of our agreeing on great common principles unions all the

more close, all the more endearing, all the more safe, and all the more enduring, if the principles upon the ground of which we unite be principles that the world is apt to contemn and despise, and that even Christian Churches are beginning to overlook and forget. (Hear, hear.)

Tonight we stand out as uniting upon the ground *of opposition to Erastianism on the one hand, and to Voluntaryism on the other.* (Loud cheers.) This is, in substance, in short compass, the ground and foundation of our present union. We stand out as united together upon this common opposition to Erastianism on the one hand, and Voluntaryism on the other. If we had not been opposed to Erastianism, if we had not been practically testifying against Erastianism, our brethren would not have been prepared to join with us – (Hear, hear, and cheers) – and if they had not been practically testifying against Voluntaryism, and that in circumstances of peculiar difficulty and trial, I *venture to say we would not have been prepared to unite with them.* (Renewed cheers.)

We unite upon the principle of recognising the identity of nations and the identity of churches before the Lord our God. (Hear, hear.) . . . . . I rejoice that we are of one mind and of one heart in owning the identity of this Church with the Church of the First and Second Reformations, and in owning, moreover, the identity of the nation with the nation in other days, when it was led to make high attainments as a nation in the sight of God, and to enter as a nation into solemn engagements before God . . . . . The satisfactory feature of this union is, that *we can meet before God, and in the face of all men, and solemnly declare that there is not one single individual on either side who is compromised, or who has consented to any abatement or qualification of the principles which he has been accustomed to hold* and maintain; and that we can meet on the basis of the great common truths founded on the Word of God, and contained in the Standards of the Church to which both profess to belong. We propose no terms to our brethren; we accept them upon their own terms and conditions; they themselves declaring they can come in upon these terms and condition, in entire subordination to the discipline and government of this Church." – *The Watchword.*

PASTORAL REMINISCENCES.

The way of transgression hard.

It has been said, on the best of all authority, that the way of the transgressor is hard. This saying, experience, as old at least as time, proves to be true to the letter. Satan and his angels among higher beings, and our first parents, Adam and Eve, with Cain, the elder born son among beings somewhat lower, are monuments of its truth. Illustrations of the truth of the saying are ever and again to be met with in the records of Scripture history. Both saints and sinners were made, in those old world times, to feel, and that most bitterly, that the way of transgression was hard. It did not matter either what the rank of the transgressor might be, his transgression was made to find him out. It might be a common soldier like Achan, who stole the wedge of gold, or it might be a mighty monarch like Pharaoh, with a whole army at his back, resisting the

commands of the Most High; still they could be both made examples of the truth of the saying, that the way of the transgressor is hard: the one by being put to death at the requirement of justice – and the other, with all his array, by being overthrown and drowned in the Red Sea. The visitations, indeed, which came upon some of the transgressors who are mentioned by the sacred historians, are such terrible instances of the hardness of the way of transgression, that the mere reading of them is enough to make the very hair of the flesh to stand 362 up. There is the case of Ahab the King of Israel, which is a case in point. Concerning him the prophet was instructed to declare, "Thus saith the Lord, in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." And of Jezebel also spake the Lord, saying, "The dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of JezreeL Him that dieth of Ahab in the city the dogs shall eat: and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat. But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up." Readers of the Sacred Scriptures are called upon to observe, in numberless places, how hard many of those who acted the part of transgressors found their way. Some of those parties, from their position or character, are in an especial manner to be taken notice of, both as regards their transgressions, and the heavy chastisements. with which they were overtaken in consequence of them. There is the case of the Psalmist for example, when he fell in the matter of Uriah the Hittite. He found that walking that time in the way of transgression was a hard walk. He felt, to his cost, that transgression proved like a sword in his bones. The transgression was grievous and complicated, and he was chastised in mercy with woes upon woes on account of it. It was made to lie like a millstone on his conscience until he was graciously led to repentance, and to cast himself with a broken and a contrite heart upon the divine forgiveness. That forgiveness the unhappy transgressor found, but he did not find it until he was constrained to own, that the way of transgression, which he had been tempted to tread, was a hard way. Now, those who have trodden the steps of the Psalmist in this respect, have had more or less of his experience. There have been many, alas! since the Psalmist's day, chargeable with the sin of adultery, and there can be no question, if the whole circumstances connected with them were known, that they not only ran the risk of destroying their souls in the world to come, but that they have got wounds, and dishonor, and a reproach which could not be wiped away in this. Out of three or four cases known to the writer, one may in particular be mentioned, inasmuch as the transgressor seemed, like the Psalmist, to obtain repentance unto life.

The case referred to is that of a man who, when he first came under notice, was gradually declining under the weakening wasting influence of consumption. This man had been a butler by occupation, and like too many of the class, commonly called gentlemen's servants, he had been loose, and careless in his private conduct. Amongst other forms of sin into which he had fallen, was the foul sin of adultery. In all probability, like some of his superiors, he had thought little of the sin itself. He would very possibly get to talk of it, in the slang of high life, as an intrigue, and laugh it off as no great matter. By and bye, however, when the Lord put an arrestment upon him, his sin found him out. When lying low, with the hand of disease holding him in its grasp, he was enabled to perceive that the way of transgression had been hard. He then *rued* his fast living in a manner in which, at one period, he never thought he would do. When his secret sins, as he lay on that dying bed, were set in order before his eyes, they seemed to haunt him like so many terrible spectres. Amongst all his sins, however, the sin of adultery was that which stared him most vividly in the face, and which assumed the most hideous aspect. It was ever before him. The thought of it filled him with shame, as the guilt of it burdened his conscience with sorrow. His case was sad in the extreme, but nevertheless it was not hopeless. As divine truth declares that there is mercy for the chief of sinners, so he humbly hoped that there might be mercy for him. He knew that his disembodied spirit would soon have to appear before its God, and have its destiny fixed for ever; and he sought, with apparent earnestness, pardon and acceptance through the Saviour. Those passages of Scripture, which set forth the gra-

ciousness of God in receiving sinners, were those which afforded him any ground for consolation. In particular he would repeat over and over, as one which precisely suited his condition, that passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians, which says, "Be not deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers shall inherit the kingdom of Christ and of God. And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." The poor penitent seemed to cling to the idea, that the same merciful God, who had had compassion upon these classes of sinners amongst the Corinthians, would in like manner be merciful unto him. And so it may have been. Before he closed his eyes in the sleep of death, and went down to the silent tomb, he, too, may have been washed, and sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. But be that as it may, his cue furnishes a lesson and a warning to those who are living as he had lived: and oh! that those licentious, and impure men and women, who prowl about our streets, and not infrequently pollute the fair homes of our country, would lay that lesson to heart. Happy would it be for them, if they would consider the sin, the shame, the misery, the death that follows in the train of their unchaste, impure, disorderly conversation. By the terrors of the Lord they might be persuaded, for the Lord declares this, viz., "That no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." Who would not, in the view of all this, deny themselves to such ungodliness and worldly lust? It is not the sin of impurity alone that brings misery. The way of this kind of transgression is indeed hard, as the fate of many a rake and debauchee amongst men, – and of many a seduced, outcast, and degraded wretch amongst women, testifies. But while the way of this kind of transgression is hard, it does not stand alone. The way of other kinds of transgression is hard also. It is true, at all events concerning the way of dishonesty, that it is a hard way. The case of Gehazi is a case in point. That man, being as he was in constant attendance upon God's prophet, might have been expected to have been under the influence of proper principles, and to have been characterised by honesty and uprightness of purpose. Still it was not so. He had a covetous heart, and he could not resist the temptation of obtaining, by very questionable means, the gold of Naaman the Syrian. He no doubt conceived, that he had conducted the operation with great adroitness, and that nothing could have been more clever than the manner in which he had hoodwinked the heathen warrior, and thrown dust in the eyes of his master the prophet. The wretched infatuate, however, deceived himself more than he did the men on whom he attempted to impose. He was playing with edge tools when he put on an innocent look in the prophet's chamber, while all the time there was a lie in his mouth, and money unjustly obtained in his hand. The prophet's eye was too keen not to pierce through the flimsy veil of that deception, and Gehazi was made to feel, in a manner that he never could forget till his dying hour, that the way of the

transgressor was hard. The crafty man was, that time, taken in his own snare. He little imagined that his wickedness was to come so soon and suddenly upon his own head. Still it did come. He had, in truth, scarcely dug the pit when he fell into it, and he had to carry about with him, all his days thereafter, a memento of the hardness of the fall which he had sustained. He had barely locked the doors of the tower upon his ill-gotten treasures, when the prophet pronounced his fate in terms which the prophet's God ratified. "The leprosy of Naaman the Syrian shall cleave unto thee, and to thy seed for ever." And no sooner said than done. The decree was sealed at 363
once. "He went out from the prophet's presence a leper as white as snow." He was taught there and then that he had made a bad bargain, and that his dishonest gains were dearly bought at the expense of a leprous body. He got more than he desired. He got Naaman's bags of silver, but he got, as a punishment for taking them, Naaman's disease. He was made to understand, whether he would or not, that the way of a transgressor is hard. Now this case of Gehazi is neither singular nor strange. He has had all but too many who have followed him in his sin, and who, in the long run, have been made to partake of his misery. There is not a thief, robber, forger, or fraudulent bankrupt, of whom it may not be pretty certainly declared, that they will find, before all be done, that the way of theft, robbery, forgery, or fraud, is a hard way. There are some famous examples of this, that loom large and stand out with extraordinary prominence in the calendar of dishonesty. There is, for instance, the case of Sir John Dean Paul, who, in the palmy days of prosperity, occupied a high place amongst the upper classes of society, and who had such a reputation for piety, in the religious world, that he was honoured with a first place amongst the promoters of Missionary and Bible Societies, and the like. This man in some of his business transactions, became chargeable with crime. He was hurled from the position of honour and influence, which he had previously occupied. He had to stand in the felon's dock, and listen to a sentence which reduced him to the miserable position of a convict, in one of the Country's penal establishments. The case of this man is no doubt a somewhat unusual one; and it may be as well to refer for illustrations to cases, which are usual and of everyday occurrence. Several with which the writer was personally acquainted may be mentioned. Mr. ——— was the clerk to a Municipal Corporation, and for a considerable time he maintained a reputable character. He was, as part of his duty, entrusted with the collecting and paying away of certain moneys belonging to the Corporation. Taking advantage of the trust reposed in him by his employers, he cooked (as the saying is) his accounts, and for a time succeeded in applying to his own purposes, various sums which ought to have gone to the funds of the Corporation. But as the proverb has it, "Murder will out," and so he experienced. One day when he little expected it, something came to the ears of the Chairman of the Corporation, which led to suspicion, suspicion led to investigation, and investigation led to the arrestment at once of the unfortunate man. At his trial, he was proved guilty on the clearest possible evidence of embezzlement, and sentenced to two years penal servitude. Dragged from a comfortable home, and good society, and compelled to live on prison fare and herd with gaol birds, the very scum and offscourings of the earth, he gradually fell into a diseased and weak condition, which issued in a dropsy. When at the point of death, the authorities humanely permitted him to leave the prison, and be placed in the infirmary, but it was only to die; for within a few days after his release, he passed away, and was buried with scarce a soul to follow his remains to the grave. His own brother, the Clergyman who had visited him in prison, and one other person being the only attendants at his funeral. Surely poor Mr. ———found that the way of the transgressor was hard, and others depending upon him found the same in their sad experience, for he left behind him a widow and two helpless children to battle unprotected with the world. The fate of this man might well be a warning to all in similar situations to do justly ill all their dealings. A person named D., was a young man respectably connected, – of good education, – and of a tall and gentleman like presence. Being somewhat *wild* in his tendencies he was sent out from England to the colonies, in order that he might push his own way. He got several good situations enough, but somehow he never was able to keep them. He liked to live in a flashy style, and thus was led to involve himself

in some very questionable proceedings in regard to bills and money matters generally. Still he was allowed to escape any serious consequences for a considerable time. His day came at last, however. It is said, "as long runs the fox as he feet has," and so as long ran D. as he was able. He got caught in the end, as was to be expected. Having been going it, at a pretty high, rate for some time at a first class hotel, he was pressed for payment, and being without the where withal in ready cash, he drew a cheque on a bank in which he had no funds; was immediately arrested – tried – convicted of an attempt to fraud – and sentenced to two years imprisonment, to give him leisure to ruminate over his folly and sin. Like poor Mr. ——— he found the prison lot a very miserable one. He no doubt always protested that though he had no funds in the bank when the cheque was drawn, still, that that bank was in the way of receiving funds on his behalf, and he thought the cheque would be honoured. But be this as it may, to prison he was sent to fulfil his term; and any one who had seen that young man, dressed as a gentleman, with his tall goodly appearance, and then seen him dressed in the prison garments; with his hair cropped after the convict fashion, and his face thin and woe begone – or seen him lying in the prison hospital on a pallet bed in the midst of a number of other wretched criminals – any one who saw all this, would have been constrained to admit that the way of this sort of transgression was at least hard. It would be well if young men who are disposed to live fast lives, would, take warning by the misery which overtook poor D., and renounce those follies and wicked indulgences, which lead to such misery. Once more, J. M., who was quite a youth, was received on his father's account into the employment of the Railway Company. He was connected with the ticket office department, and had the taking of a good deal of money. In conjunction with several of his fellow clerks, he entered into a scheme for embezzling the funds of the Company. So skilfully was the scheme contrived, and so well did all parties keep the secret, that for months upon months they succeeded in netting without detection their ill gotten gains. By some unforeseen circumstance the plot was discovered, and J. M. and a number of his accomplices were all arrested at the same time. On J. M.'s behalf bail was offered and accepted, and as a matter of course the accused was set at liberty. Fearing both the disgrace of a trial and the consequences of a conviction, he made his escape to one of the colonies, leaving his father to pay the forfeited bail, and to mourn over the fall, and dishonour of his son. It was conceived in J. M.'s case, that the cause which led to his dishonesty, was the loose and extravagant habits which he had contracted. These habits led him to spend a deal more money than his salary as a ticket clerk in the Railway could furnish; and thus he was induced to help himself out of the funds of his employers, It would have been his true course, to have abandoned his wicked and expensive habits, rather than steal that he might indulge them; but he preferred the other course. He preferred to keep his

habit and steal, and thus he ended his short merry career by becoming a fugitive from jus-tice, and bringing a grief on the hearts of his family, which years upon years could not efface. Youths in such situations as J. M. occupied, should abhor the very idea of taking their master's property, and applying it to their own purposes. The thing is both wicked and criminal, and they may be sure that exposure, disgrace, and punishment would sooner or later be their portion, if they were to yield to it. They should listen to the solemn warning addressed to them by the Royal preacher, "Rejoice O young man in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou that for all 364

these things, God will bring thee into judgment." There is another way of transgression which is exceedingly common, and which is about as hard a way as it is possible for mortal man to tread. It is the way of intemperance. Noah found it a hard way in his time, and ever since myriads upon myriads have found the same. Volumes upon volumes could be written containing illustrations of the truth of this saying. Scarcely any observant individual but must be acquainted of his own knowledge, with scores. Who has not been painfully familiar with cases even of ministers of the gospel, professors of religion, and young and old of all ranks and classes, who have been travelling in this way, and who have found it as hard as way could be. An instance or two may be given. The Rev. Dr. —— was the minister of a populous parish. For a considerable time the rumour went that he was too familiar with the grog bottle, but beyond the talk that Dr. —— had been either not very steady on his horse, or not very steady in his walk, nothing was done. At the long length, as is always the case, an occasion occurred an which the unhappy man in black was seen so absolutely drunk and incapable, that the scandal could be winked at no longer. Accordingly he was served with a libel. The fact of his drunkenness was proved. He was thereupon deposed from the ministry, deprived of his living, and sent penniless, and with a ruined character upon the world. The last that was heard of him was that he was a reporter for a newspaper. Thus this man who once had a name, – who occupied a large field of usefulness as a clergyman, – who had an excellent wife, and several interesting children, went on in the way of transgressors, and like others before him he found it hard. Of the class to whom Dr. ——— belonged many may have fallen as he fell, and have found in their mournful experience that they have chosen an evil and hard way. Leaving ministers, an instance may be given from another class. The instance is that of a Mr. S. When Mr. S, first came under notice, he was associated with several others as an office-bearer in a certain congregation. Of the whole of these office-bearers, Mr. S. was the oldest, and as it seemed the most experienced in the knowledge of divine things. No one could offer up a more scriptural, and apparently more earnest or experimental prayer at the prayer meeting; and no one could attend more sedulously the Sabbath School. While all this went on Mr. S. was respected, honoured, consulted, and looked up to, as an old disciple, devoted to the service of his Master. In course of time there came a change. It began to be whispered about that Mr. S. had been seen on several occasions under the influence of drink. At first those who were connected with him in Church fellowship were disposed to give no heed to these whisperings, but they became so frequent that an investigation was made into the matter. This investigation issued in the unhappy fact being fully established that Mr. S. had been on various occasions intoxicated. He was this compelled to renounce his office in the Church, had to withdraw from the Sabbath School, and had to submit to the suspicion of having been for years practising a deception in regard to religion. But notwithstanding all this, such a hold had the habit of intemperance obtained over him, that instead of being led to abandon it, he became worse and worse. He would palliate and excuse his conduct as if drinking was something, which persons situate, as he was; and having such a business as he had, could not avoid. Time passed on, and poor Mr. S., as he became more feeble and gray, became more the victim of indulgence, until his career was stopped by death coming for him in a somewhat strange and unusual farm. One day he was employed amongst the gooseberry bushes in his garden, when his hand was punctured by a prickle. Inflammation immediately set in, went up the arm, and finally through the whole system, and in the comparatively brief space of a week or so he was numbered with the dead. While Mr. S. was suffering in

the body during his last illness, he was apparently very earnest for mercy to his soul. He mourned over his sad backsliding, and seemed to cast himself afresh upon the mercy of God through Jesus Christ. We cannot penetrate into those awful things that take place when disembodied spirits leave their clay tabernacles, and depart to meet their God; we may, however, express the hope that his repentance was sincere, and that though he fell so far and lay so long he may yet have found pardon. Still his case furnishes us a warning, and that of the most solemn kind to all who profess religion, to beware of the intoxicating cup. By Mr. S.'s fall his own usefulness was entirely destroyed, and not only so, but he became a byword to some and a stumbling block to others. He found in the shame, degradation, and blasted reputation which overtook him in life, and in the remorse of a dying bed, that the way of transgression in which he had walked was hard. And as it was with him, so will it be with others that tread in his steps. Let all therefore beware how they touch or taste or handle the deceitful cup. It biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder.

PAGAN WORSHIP RETAINED IN THE PAPAL CHURCH.

MIDDLETON, in his "Letters from Rome," draws a striking parallel between the old pagan worship and the then (1742) papal ceremonies. The pagan form of profuse offering of incense at the doors and altars of their temples was faithfully copied at the doors and sacramental altars of the Romish churches. The sprinkling of those who entered and quitted the pagan temples with holy water was also adopted in the papal churches. The perpetual burning of lamps and candles before the popular pagan idols was also systematically observed towards the popish images. The votive offerings, in acknowledgement of wonderful preservations or miraculous cures, which were hung in rich abundance round the pagan deities, equally embellished the images of the Virgin and other eminent saints of Rome. The pagan act of prostration before the stone or wooden god they worshipped was as humbly observed by the Romanist in approaching the image of his favourite saint. The very adoption of the Church of Rome of the identical pagan deities, and of the tem-ples dedicated to the worship of particular idols possessing local popularity, was also as degrading as it is strikingly confirmatory of our argument. An antique statue of a young *Bacchus,* adorned with a new drapery, was worshipped under the title of a female saint. The Pantheon, which had been erected in honour of *Jupiter and all the Gods,* was re-consecrated to the *Blessed Virgin and all the Saints,* with the following inscription: –

Pantheon, &c.
Ab Agrippa Augusti Genero Impie Jovi, Cseterisq:
Mendacibus Diis
A Bonifacio IIII. Pontifice

Deiparae et S.S. Christi Martyribus Pie Dicatum, &c.

The temple of *Vesta,* near the Tiber (mentioned by Horace), was possessed by the *Madonna of the Son*; that *of Fortuna Virilis, by Mary the Egyptian*; that of *Saturn,* by *St. Adrian*; that of *Romulus and Remus,* by two other brothers, *Cosmas and Daminnius;* that of *Antoine* the godly, *by Laurence the Saint.* The temple of *Romulus*, on Mount Palatin, whither the pagans took their sickly infants, in the persuasion that this pagan hero god would heal them, had become dedicated to *Theodorus*; and the same superstitious worship was paid to their Christian saint, equally supposed to confer the gifts of healing. *Middleton* relates: "I myself, have been a witness, having seen, as oft as I looked into this church, ten or a dozen women decently dressed, each with a child in her lap, sitting with silent reverence before 365
the altar of the saint, in expectation of his miraculous influence on the health of the infant."

That the change from paganism to popery might be as little startling as possible, the names of the Christian image saints have been as closely as possible approximated to the pagan idol gods. Thus, in a place sacred to *Apollo,* there was the church of *Apoliinaris,* built thus, as the Romanists tell us, "That the profane name of that deity might be converted into the glorious name of this martyr." Where there anciently stood a temple of *Mars,* they have erected a church to *Martina.* In another place is an altar erected to *Saint Baccho.*

Again, our author observes: "The old Romans, we know, had their gods, who presided peculiarly over the roads, streets, and highways, called *viales, semitales,* and *confitales*; whose little temples or altars, decked with flowers, or whose statues, at least rudely carved of wood or stone, were placed at convenient distances on the public ways, for the benefit of travellers, who used to step aside to pay their devotions to these rural shrines, and beg a prosperous journey and safety on their travels. Now this custom prevails still so generally in all popish countries, but especially in Italy, that one can see no other difference between the old and present superstition than that of changing the name of the deity, and christening, as it were, the old *Hecate in Triviis* by the new name of *Maria in Trivio*; by which title I have observed one of their churches dedicated in this city."

Again, "When we enter their towns, the case is still the same as it was in the country. We find everywhere the same marks of idolatry, and the same reason to make us fancy that we are still treading pagan ground; whilst at every corner, we see images and altars, with lamps or candles burning before them, exactly answering to the description of ancient writers, and to what Tertullian rep-roaches the heathen with, that their streets, their markets, their baths, were not without an idol. But, above all, in the pomp and solemnity of their holy days, and especially their religious processions, we see the genuine remains of heathenism, and proof enough to convince us that this is still the same Rome that old *Numa* first tamed and civilized by the arts of religion; who, as Plutarch says, 'By the institution of supplications and processions to the gods, which inspire reverence whilst they give pleasure to the spectators, and by pretended miracle and divine apparition, reduced the fierce spirits of his subjects under the power of superstition.'"

(*To be continued in our next*).

Correspondence.

TO PRESBYTERIANS.

(*Per favor of* "*The Testimony*.")

FATHERS AND BRETHREN, – Probably you have seen a report in the public prints of the proceedings of a Unionist meeting, which was held on the Manning lately. The treasurer's account, as it reads in the newspapers, shews clearly, notwithstanding that there is seemingly an effort made to conceal it, that, financially, Unionism is not in a flourishing state on the Manning. If all that was said at the meeting referred to could be credited, the Union cause on the Manning is prospering amazingly in every point of view. But let Unionists give to the following questions the answers which facts give to them, and they will, in doing so, contradict point blank many of their own assertions. How many drunkards and tipplers have been reclaimed by Unionist efforts? How many Sabbath profaners have returned from the error of their ways in the Unionist congregation? What is the character, morally and spiritually, of the adherents; of the communicants; and of the elders of the said congregation? May the Lord hasten the time when every

man will speak the truth with his neighbour.

Subscribing myself a Unionist, let me indicate the sense in which I am one. I believe, then, that knowing, teaching, and professing what the Bible teaches, is essential to the purity and Scriptural unity of a Church; and that the more pure and scripturally united a Church is, the more it is of the same mind with the Adorable Head, and the more it sees the truth, eye to eye with him according to the promise, and *vice -versa.* And, therefore, I do not believe, – whatever doctors of divinity, or doctors that are neither doctors of divinity nor doctors of laws, nor doctors of medicine, and others may teach, – that a Church composed of parties avowedly opposed to each other on several doctrines of the Bible, and of the Westminster standards, is either a pure or a scripturally united Church.

Very sincerely yours,
A UNIONIST.

FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MEREDITH.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The annual meeting of the Meredith Free Church was held on Wednesday night, April 8th, the pastor, Rev. P. Macpherson, occupying the chair. After devotional exercises, the chairman proceeded to give a review of the Union movements in Scotland and Victoria. With regard to the home country he pointed out the position of extraordinary inconsistency, to which Drs. R. Buchanan and Candlish had been brought. For years back Dr. Buchanan had been pushing on a union with the voluntaries as best fitted to establish the kingdom of Christ, but during the controversy on establishments thirty years ago, this same Dr. Buchanan had pronounced the workings of voluntaryism in divorcing Church and State, to be the special work of Satan? Of course, this did not escape notice. It was cast up to Dr. Buchanan who tried to pass it off with a ghastly laugh. A free church periodical, (the *Watchword*) was reproducing these speeches on the establishment controversy with most damaging effect against the leaders of the Free Church who are forsaking their consistency. If it affords merriment to Dr. Buchanan, he is likely to be kept in good humour for some time. But it had fared even worse with Dr. Candlish. He had pronounced a solemn woe against the Free Church, if ever it should swerve to the right hand or the left from the even tenor of its testimony against Erastianism on the one hand, or Voluntaryism on the other. But the tide had set in with such force to the left hand that Dr. Candlish was completely swept away by it, and now the subtle doctor has discovered that this movement is the work of the Holy Ghost. Inconsistency has been cast up to the doctor, and he has not been able to brazen it out. The ghosts of his former speeches have come up in such terrible array

against him that they have fairly frightened him out of the Presbytery Court. He has accordingly given notice of his intention to retire, for the most part, from the public discussions in the courts of the Church on the subject of the Union movement. It was the best thing Dr. Candlish could do. Anything that he might advance could be met by the humblest member of Presbytery, just by quoting paragraphs from Dr. Candlish's former speeches. The Union movements had often been the fruitful source of discord and discussion, and he observed by the papers which had arrived by the last Suez mail, that influential members of the Irish Presbyterian Church were taking alarm at the manifest defection of the Free Church. At the disruption, the Irish Church had most heartily given its countenance to the Free Church, and also ever since; but now Professor Porter, of Belfast, declared it is a grave question whether the Irish Church, with due regard to its own character, 366
can continue to hold the friendly connection which has hitherto existed. With regard to the colony the speaker referred to the oscillations and vacillations of the section which split off from the Free Church three or four years ago. By death and departure from the colony that section had almost disappeared. They tried to make their way back to the Free Church, but did not succeed; they then tried to join the United Presbyterian Church in the colony, but that also did not succeed; they at last succeeded in tumbling into the Union. What was the astonishment of not a few Free Churchmen when they found that to let the drifting section into the Union, a bill was brought before Parliament, transferring the Free Church properties at Geelong, Ballarat, and Bellarine, &c., &c., to the Union. This required prompt resistance. A select committee of Parliament was appointed to inquire into the matter. The speaker could bear testimony to the great ability with which their respected Moderator Rev. A. Paul, demolished the pretences of the Unionists, as embodied in the bill. After a long examination, conducted mostly by the Attorney-General, it was plain that it could not be said honestly that the ministers, office-bearers, and congregations of the Free Church were joining the Union. It was only the section which required to be described as the body of which the Rev. D. Meiklejohn, of Kilmore, was the Moderator, a very different affair truly from the Free Presbyterian Church. It was with great regret he learned that the evidence taken before the select committee was not to be printed. Under examination almost every one on the Unionist side made a discreditable appearance. No doubt the shorthand papers were preserved amongst the Parliamentary archives, and it was to be hoped they would see the light some day. But after all this, when the Union took place, the Rev. A. J. Campbell, as Moderator, sent a notice to the Chief Secretary, which the Chief Secretary forwarded with a note of his over to the *Government Gazette* to the effect that the Presbyterian Church and Free Presbyterian Church had united. In this shape the matter would not stand before the Parliamentary committee. It was only Mr. Meiklejohn and his friends who were joining the Union. Now did Mr. Campbell believe that Mr. Paul, and Mr. McIntyre, and the speaker, and their several Congregations had joined the Union? Did he believe that Ascot, and Bellarine, and Free Church people at other places had joined the Union? Then why did he not abide by Mr. Meiklejohn and his friends? Mr. Campbell's statement was one of those mixtures of what was true, and what was false that occupied so prominent a place in the history of Union movements. At the very least Mr. Campbell's statement contained as much of what was false as of what was true. It was only half and half at best. The speaker had come across statements of Unionists where the ingredient of truth was much smaller. He had found that nine-tenths of falsehood was confounded with one-tenth of the truth. Here, of course, the truth occupied the noble position of a convenient back-door of escape if the party were charged with direct falsehood. But where was the limit to be met? Some could refine upon the truth till one part in a hundred would suffice, and ordinary mortals could not see it at all. It was instructive to notice that not long after Mr. Campbell had sent his half and half mixture to the *Gazette*, a case turned up in his own Presbytery, in which an unfortunate mortal had committed himself to a statement, in which he had stupidly not provided himself with a back-door of truth at all! Of course he would soon learn amongst Unionists how to manage these things much more adroitly. No doubt it might be said that Mr. Campbell must just do what he is bid. He had, truly enough, committed himself to a current which had swept much stronger men off their feet. Dr. Cairns wielded some influence while he occupied the vantage ground of a faithful position. But since the Union he was nobody and nowhere.

W. J. Reid, Esq., treasurer, read the balance sheet for the year 1867. Having done so, he observed that, notwithstanding all hostile influences, they were permitted, in the good providence of God, to continue their course as formerly. It was all the more satisfactory that they could say this without having had recourse to Shakespearian readings, or any such devices to raise the funds.

In the annual report the Committee express their thankfulness to Almighty God for all His continued goodness and mercy. They express their brotherly sympathy with those who have had to submit to actual loss of Church property; and record the expression of their fear that a precedent has been established for encouraging lax denominations to use political influence to gain legislative enactments to help them against the smaller denominations.

After disposing of some routine business, the meeting closed with the benediction.

That mercy, that comes not in at the door of prayer, comes not in at the right door; and that mercy, that comes not in at the right door, will do a man no good. – *Brooks*.

DAY OF THANKSGIVING FOR THE RECOVERY OF THE PRINCE.

An extraordinary to the *Government Gazette,* issued on the 7th inst., contains the following proclamation: –

By His Excellency the Right Honorable Somerset Richard, Earl of Belmore, a member of Her Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council in Ireland, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Colony of New South Wales, and Vice-Admiral of the same.

Whereas His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh has been declared convalescent, and it is fitting that Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects should testify their thankfulness to Almighty God for his great mercy in preserving the life of His Royal Highness from the hand of the assassin, Henry James O'Farrell, at Clontarf, on the 12th ultimo, and in restoring him to his wonted health and strength. Now, therefore, I, the Governor of New South Wales, by and with the advice of the Executive Council, do hereby direct that Tuesday, the 28th instant, be set apart as a special day of Prayer and Public Thanksgiving; and I further invite the clergy and ministers of religion of all denominations, and all other Her Majesty's subjects in the colony of New South Wales, to observe the day appointed as one of Special Thanksgiving to Almighty God for his great mercy in pres-erving the life, and restoring the health of the Son of our beloved Queen.

Given under my hand and seal, at Government House, Sydney, this ninth day of April, in the year of our Lord one

thousand eight hundred and sixty eight, and in the thirty-first year of Her Majesty's reign.

(L. S.) BELMORE.

By His Excellency's Command,

HENRY PARKES.

God Save the Queen!

ADDRESSES TO THE DUKE OF EDINBURGH.

To His Royal Highness Prince Alfred Ernest Albert, Duke of Edinburgh, Earl of Kent, Earl of Ulster, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Coburg and Gotha, K.G.

May it please your Royal Highness, –

We, the Minister and other Office-bearers of the Congregation of St, George's Church, Sydney, in common with the other members not only of that Congregation, but also of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia of which it forms a part, regarded with feelings of horror and utter reprobation the attempt

made on the life of your Royal Highness, and, during the period of prostration and suffering, (brief, through the great kindness of God) through which your Royal Highness has passed, we were deeply concerned for your safety and recovery.

We now rejoice that God, in whom we live, and move, and have our being, having, by a very remarkable interpositon, preserved your life in the hour of imminent danger, has restored your Royal Highness, and that so soon, to the full enjoyment of health.

We pray that He may long spare your life, and that, by His grace, He may enable your Royal Highness to adorn the doctrine of God your Saviour in the high position in which His providence has placed you

We avail ourselves of this opportunity of expressing our devoted attachment to the person and Government of our beloved Sovereign, and our high appreciation of the privileges which we enjoy as British Subjects.

WILLIAM McINTYRE, A.M.,
Minister of the Congregation.
JOHN McDONALD,
(For Session Clerk).
WILLIAM MANSON,
Clerk of Deacon's Court.

To His Royal Highness Prince Alfred Ernest Albert, Duke of Edinburgh, Earl of Kent, Earl of Ulster, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha.

May it please your Royal Highness, –

We, the President, Office-bearers, and Members of the Saint George's Church Mutual Improvement Association, as loyal subjects of the British Crown, feel deeply and faithfully attached to the person and Government of her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, and to the principles on which the succession to the throne is based.

We greatly rejoice that the life of your Royal Highness, attempted by a depraved and misguided assassin, has been saved by the kind providence of God; and it is our hearts desire and prayer to God that the life of your Royal Highness may be long and happy, adorned by every Christian virtue, and influenced by the faith which worketh by love, purifieth the heart, and overcometh the world, and which thus conducts to glory, honour, and immortality in the world to come.

By order of the Office-bearers and Members of the Saint George's Church Mutual Improvement Association.

WILLIAM McINTYRE, President.
R. M. McDONALD, Secretary.

Sydney, 1st April, 1868.

Laban's house was full of idols. Great houses are often so. Jacob's tent was little, but the true worship of God was in it. It is infinitely better to live in Jacob's tent, than in Laban's house. – *Brooks*.

A call to Mr. McCulloch from the Grafton congregation has been forwarded, and will be considered by the Presbytery of Maitland shortly.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 32 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, MAY, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines … … …	0s. 6d
Half inch … … …	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 32 MAY. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

PAGE.
The Civil Magistrate the Minister of God to his Subjects for good … 369
The Presbyterian Church of New South Wales and a Progressive Policy so called … … … … … 370
Sacred Music as a means of amusement … … … 372
A Retrospect … … … … … 373
Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria … … 374
Presbytery of Maitland … … … … 376
Priestly Approval of the Fenian Murder in Manchester … … 377
Presbyterian Divines and their influence on the Principles of Civil and Religious Toleration … … … … 377
Scepticism and Credulity with respect to the Supernatural and their practical effects … … … … … 378
Ritualism in the Church of England … … … 379
The Popish Chaplain of the Sydney Gaol suspended … … 379

THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE THE MINISTER OF GOD TO HIS SUBJECTS FOR GOOD.

"He is the minister of God to thee for good." Rom. 13: 4.

[We give below the substance of a discourse delivered in St. George's Church, Sydney, by the Rev. William McIntyre, A. M. on the day of public thanksgiving to God for the preservation of the life of the Duke of Edinburgh, when

attempted by an assassin, and for his restoration to health, – Tuesday the 28th April. An abstract of the discourse, supplied to the *Sydney Morning Herald,* at the request of the proprietors of that paper, contained the passages which the reader will find printed within brackets; but, when it was published next morning, it did not contain them. The authorities of the *Herald* office expunged them, on the ground, we presume, that they might be offensive to the church of Rome. We deem it right and, at the same time, sufficient to state this fact. We leave our readers to judge of the protestantism of protestants who, in the interest of the church of Rome, took so unwarrantable a liberty with a contribution supplied at their request.]

These words are a brief but comprehensive statement of the origin of civil government, its relation to the divine government, and its intended and actual bearing on the interests of man; and, in the circumstances in which we are now met, it is to our purpose to consider it in the light in which it is thus presented. We are met, as you are aware, to give thanks and to testify publicly our gratitude to God for the preservation of the life of the Duke of Edinburgh, when attempted by an assassin, and for his restoration to health; and; that our gratitude may be intelligent and the expression of it sincere, it is necessary that we understand the interest we have in the government against which the attempt on his life was really directed.

The origin of civil government, and not of civil government viewed in the abstract, but of civil government as exercised in any given community, is clearly indicated and, indeed, dec-lared in our text. To every subject of such government the apostle testifies that "he 'who exercises its powers towards him,' is the minister of God to him;" and, of course, he has his appointment from him whose minister he is. In whatever way he may have attained to the office which he holds, whether by succession, or by election, or by conquest, or even by treachery and a betrayal of trust, having attained to it and being invested with it, he occupies his official position in virtue of the disposal of divine providence. His occupation of it is the result of God's ordination. This view is distinctly presented in the preceding context. The language there is, "the powers that be are ordained of God." In whatever way they came to "be," and under whatever form of constitutional or despotic rule they operate, they are, as *being,* ordained by him. The fact that they are is the result and, therefore, an evidence of his ordination.

Civil rulers, as being the ministers of God, are required by the origin and nature of their office to act for God. They are God's agents and instruments for accomplishing the objects of civil government or, which is the same thing, for accomplishing the objects which he prescribes to us as the subjects of his own government, so far as they may be accomplished by means, which it is consistent with the nature and lies within the competency of civil government to employ. They are auth-orised and required to use all means, which are proper in themselves, and which it is competent to them to use, for the accomplishment of those objects. The authority given to them extends thus far, but no farther.

Civil rulers, being the ministers of God for the purpose now indicated, are his ministers to their subjects "for good." Their office is fitted and intended to conduce powerfully to the advancement of the interests of their subjects, by conferring upon them security of person and property, by protecting them in their rights, by affording to them the advantages which civil society, that is society regulated by civil government, offers, and also by the use of proper means, within its own province, to secure that those, for whose benefit it exists and is executed, shall possess the requisite qualifications in respect of attainments and character – the former derived from education and the latter formed under the influence of the gospel – for doing each of them his part towards the accomplishment of its design. 370

It is true that the Administration of civil government scarcely ever bears throughout and exclusively its legitimate character. It is true, indeed, that the character, which in most instances it has hitherto borne and bears now, has been and is disfigured by great and grievous blemishes. But, still, in all cases, those who administer it are the ministers of God to their subjects for good. They may accomplish for them but comparatively little of the good, which their office requires they should accomplish for them, and, still worse, they may inflict upon them or upon some of them serious evils, but, even when it is least productive of good and its operation is most seriously reversed, it is greatly preferable to anarchy or the absence of all government; and, therefore, to the extent to which it is thus preferable, those who exercise its powers are the ministers of God for good to those towards whom they exercise them. Without it society could not exist. In the absence of its restraints, outrage and violence, under their many hideous forms, would soon destroy or disperse the elements of which it is composed.

In estimating, however, the extent to which our own sovereign is the minister of God to as for good, we must remember that the government which she administers and the administration of it are, for such we conceive to be the case, the very best which any community on earth enjoys. We do not imagine they are free from defects. But, with their defects, whatever these may be – and it is not our present business to investigate them – they are distinguished by such excellence, that the subjects of the British Crown have, we apprehend, greater cause to be thankful for the civil privileges they enjoy, than the subjects of any other power whatever.

But, notwithstanding, many British subjects, instead of being thus thankful for the character of the government under which they live, are anxious to overthrow that government. It is notorious that a wide spread conspiracy exists which is directed to this object. The existence and aim of this conspiracy are not to be accounted for by anything in the character of the government or in the results of its administration. [This is evident from the fact that, while the government of the country bears the same aspect and has the same operation towards the members of the church of Rome as towards others, the conspirators, with the inconsiderable exceptions that could not fail to arise in such a case, are supplied by the membership of that church.] This fact, taken in connection with the teaching of the church of Rome with respect to the supremacy of the Pope over civil rulers, and especially with respect to the exercise of it in dealing with such of them as he regards as heretics, affords a convincing proof that the Fenian conspiracy has derived its origin and derives its

inspiration from popery. The object of that conspiracy is an object which the church of Rome is most desirous to accomplish, and to accomplish it the Pope would at once employ his own peculiar method of doing such things, if he only had the power to give it effect. He would publicly pronounce a sentence of deposition on Her Majesty as an excommunicated heretic, and would authorise and direct the faithful, her own subjects and others, to use all means to deprive her of her dominions.

Now it was in the interest of the Fenian conspiracy, as the assassin himself declared, that the attempt to murder the Duke of Edinburgh was made. It seems to be a part of the policy of those who conduct its operations to strike terror into the rulers of the country, and thus to intimidate and coerce them and make the concessions which it is their object to obtain. The attempt on the life of Prince Alfred was doubtless, with such a design. It was directed, in its intended ultimate bearing, against the government of the
country. The frustration of it acquires thus national importance.

Besides, the attempt having, in the good providence of God, been frustrated, its having been made has had the effect of imparting greater intensity to the reprobation of the conspiracy by Her Majesty's loyal subjects, of directing more earnest attention to the real source of the evil, in the teaching and influence of popery, and of arousing the portion of the community, on which the stability of the throne a the safety of our liberties depend, – the protestant portion of it, – to a more adequate recognition of what the times and the circumstances of the country demand at their hands.

These observations sufficiently indicate the special grounds on which we should cherish the gratitude which we are met to express. It is incumbent upon us to be grateful to God for the institution of civil government; for the unequalled extent to which, in the sovereign arrangements of his providence, we enjoy the advantages which civil government confers; and for the remarkable interposition by which he has averted the blow aimed among us at our Queen and her government in the person of her son. Let us see to it that we cherish the gratitude which is due from us on these grounds; and let us furnish practical evidence of the sincerity and ardour of our gratitude, and of our just appreciation of the circumstances to which the observance of this day has reference, by doing what in us lies to ward off the evils to which our country is exposed [from the efforts and machinations of the church of Rome, and, probably, still more, from the unprotestant disposition which obtains among protestants to make concessions to that church.] And let our gratitude for temporal benefits be purified and elevated by the gratitude for the blessings of salvation, which those who are partakers of them never fail to cherish.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NEW SOUTH WALES AND A PROGRESSIVE POLICY SO CALLED.

The policy, by which the formation of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales was achieved, is still advocated and pursued, – being now, from its evident fitness to conduct that Church still farther in the path by which the component parts of it, and especially some of them, reached the position. which it already occupies, designated a "progressive policy." It thus possesses more than a mere historical interest. Within the limits of the Church it has inflicted on the colony, and so far as the influence of that Church extends, it determines, in no small degree, the tendencies and aspirations of the present, and contributes, therefore, to form the character of the future. What, then, are the tendencies and aspirations which the prosecution of it implies, or is fitted to originate or strengthen? What are the results to the accomplishment of which the prosecution of it is directed?

A policy contemplates the accomplishment of a certain end, and proposes the employment of certain means with a view to the accomplishment of it. The end which the policy under consideration contemplates is a sort of ecclesiastical union, the character of which we shall be in a better position to describe after we have considered the means by which it is sought to effect it. Those means, as hitherto employed, consisted partly in treating for the time, and, therefore, so far as the principle involved is concerned, for all time, judicially declared unfitness for office as creating no necessity, and furnishing no ground for exclusion from it. Accordingly a gentleman under ecclesiastical censure was admitted into the Unionist Church, as if he labored under no such disqualification; and, to make the unscrupulousness of proceeding still more outrageous, was admitted, though not exclusively yet concurrent- ly with others, by the office-bearers of the very Church under whose unrevoked censure he lay. If that Church, which alone 371
could do this, had first cancelled the censure which it had pronounced upon him and had then become a party to his admission, its position in the matter would have been different. But, becoming a party to his admission while he lay, as he still does, under its own censure, it treated all discipline as a nullity. By pronouncing the censure, it deliberately and solemnly declared that, according to the law of Christ, he on whom it pronounced it ought not to be an office-bearer of the Church; and, when, without revoking its censure, it took part in admitting him as an office-bearer, it acted in direct and flagrant violation of the law of Christ as interpreted by itself. It is true that it did not, and, we suppose, would not, take part in admitting him as an office-bearer, until he was first admitted as such by others, the Unionist Free Churchmen, to wit, – into a provisional Church set up for the very purpose of arranging for this preparatory admission, and forming a sort of purgatory, – though, if purgation was necessary, no provision was made for effecting it, through which he might pass into the ultimate Union. But this process, ingenious as it was, and to whatever extent it may have served to cover the position which he occupied, to throw a veil over it or divert attention from it, had no effect whatever in improving or even changing it. In admitting him at the close of the mock purgation, the Church, under whose censure he lay, set at nought its own censure and the law of Christ which its censure professed to apply, just as much as if it had so admitted him at the outset.

The violation of the known law of Christ in the matter of discipline, which thus, at the very outset of the process, attended the formation of the Unionist Church in this Colony, has been continued in its subsequent proceedings. The following is a striking illustration. A minister of that Church was deposed for intemperance by the Presbytery of "the bounds." From the judgment of that Presbytery he appealed to the General Assembly, and this latter Court rescinded the sentence of deposition, restored him to his office, and appointed him to another field of labor. That the reader may be in a position to form a correct estimate of this proceeding, he must be informed that the minister in question is the recipient of a Government salary, which, of course, would lapse if he became incapable of drawing it; and we have been informed on good authority that a member of the Assembly declared his conviction that the deliverance, which we have described, violated the requirements of discipline and sacrificed the purity of the Church to avert this result, – a view in which, we think, any candid person acquainted with the facts of the case will be constrained to concur. Apparently from the same motive, and with similar disregard of the law of Christ, – his

law, in this case, with respect to the formation of the pastoral relation, – another recipient of a Government salary has been placed in a certain locality against the will of the people, and, though scarcely any attend on his ministrations, many of the Presbyterians being scattered among other denominations, he is continued there, and – draws his salary.

The cases we have now adduced illustrate a setting aside of discipline after it has been exercised, and its requirements have been officially ascertained and declared. In other cases the claims of discipline have been repudiated, as we may say, before hand. The question involved in cases of this latter class is not, as in the former, whether privileges and office shall be withdrawn from persons who have proved themselves unworthy of them, but whether persons who are unworthy, evidently destitute of the requisite qualifications, shall be admitted to them; and such persons are admitted to them. For example, a person who goes to the theatre and attends balls applies to a minister, who knows those facts, for admission, and is admitted by him, to the Lord's table; while a person, to whom privileges had been previously granted, ought to be deprived of them for such instances of con-

formity to the world. So much for the repudiation of the claims of discipline in admitting to privileges; such a case as the following exhibits great recklessness in the matter of admission to office. A meeting, which turns out to be small, though, we fear, not particularly select, is held to choose a fit and proper person to be ordained an elder; from the fact that the meeting is distinguished by the first of the two peculiarities mentioned, but not in any marked degree by the second, it arises that Mr. So-and-so nominates himself as such a person, and then sec-onds this nomination of himself by himself, and finally, we presume, does whatever voting is deemed necessary in the case. Being thus nominated by his own unaided efforts, he is, we further presume, ordained. We do not vouch for the accuracy of this narrative in every particular; hut we believe it pre-sents, with substantial and, for our present purpose, sufficient accuracy an actual case.

The Church, whose "progressive policy" we are now considering, by adopting the St. Andrew's College Act in the form in which it was passed, – if, indeed, a resolution of the General Assembly, the approval of Presbyteries having been neither sought nor obtained, can be properly regarded as its adoption of such a measure; – deliberately accepted a position of chronic and, to a great extent, helpless exposure, particularly though not exclusively, to the corruption of doctrine from which it is one great object of enlightened care in admitting to office to preserve the Church, and of the exercise of discipline to purify it. According to that act "the government in every respect of the College and all thereto relating" is to be "vested, at all times," in the Council, which is to consist of a Principal, who, "shall always be a duly ordained Presbyterian minister, holding and prepared to subscribe the standards of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales," and twelve other Councillors, "of whom four but not more shall be ordained ministers of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales," and the others members of that Church. In the first instance, the twelve councillors are to be chosen by the subscribers, and the Principal by the twelve Councillors; and "all future vacancies either in the office of Principal or in the number of Councillors" are to be "filled up by election by the remaining Councillors, and such graduates of the University as still remain on the books of the College," – no other qualification, in respect of views or character, than this specification sets forth being required on the part these latter electors, who, if the College at all prosper, will soon outnumber the Councillors.

The Councillors, thus elected, and for the fitness of eight of whom the only guarantee provided is that they must be Church members, – an extremely slight guarantee in the case of a Church that acts with great laxity in admitting to membership, – not only shall administer as we have already seen, the "government, in every respect, of the College and all matters relating thereto," but also shall choose and appoint "all tutors and professors in the College" and shall, remove or suspend, for a sufficient cause, the principal and professors or tutors, this exercise of their power being subject only to two limitations, namely, that an appeal lies in the visitor, that is the Moderator of the General Assembly, in any case involving the moral character of the officer removed or suspended, and "that, if the ground of complaint shall concern the theological or religious doctrines or teaching of the principal and tutors or professors, or any of them, the councillors shall not adjudicate thereon, but shall remit the same for trial to the Presbytery of Sydney, subject to an appeal to the General Assembly." It thus appears that the Church for which the College is provided, and whose future ministers are to receive from its professors their theological education, has no control, or but the very slightest and 372

most precarious control over it. The moderator of its General Assembly has an appellate, and only an appellate, jurisdiction in cases in which the moral character of the principal and professors, or any of them, is involved, but as a Church it cannot in any way deal even with a case of this kind; and in cases, in which the orthodoxy of any of those officers is in question, it cannot initiate any exercise of discipline, it can only deal with them on their being remitted to it by the Council. It may have greater or less ground for expecting that the Council will promptly remit to it every case of this kind that may require its interference; but, be that as it may, it labours as a Church under the sad and damaging incapacity that it cannot, in such cases, deeply as its interests must be involved, initiate proceedings, or act at all if it be not put in motion by an extraneous and independent body. For any power it possesses, for anything it can do of its own proper motion, the teaching of any of the professors, or of all of them, may be unsound to any extent, or for any length of time. It may get at the Principal by deposing him from the office of the ministry, and thus rendering him incapable of holding his office as Principal, which can be held only by an ordained minister; but the professors or tutors are not required to sustain any relation to it, either as ministers or members, that would enable it, in the exercise simply of its powers as a Church, to subject them to discipline.

We have now sufficiently shewn that, so far as regards the employment of means, the "progressive policy" consists, so far, in dispensing with much that is necessary to the purity of the church and to the preservation of its orthodoxy, and thus in disregarding the law of Christ by which the maintenance of purity and orthodoxy is enjoined. And yet, in the face of this surrender of the very characteristics of the church, which it is the special design of discipline to preserve, Mr. Laughton, in his papers on "An Australian Church for Australia," does not scruple to allege that the Church which is guilty of it occupies a far better position with respect to the exercise of discipline than either of the Churches which were merged in it, or the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia. "So long," he says, "as men, rejected by one Synod, for ecclesiastical irregularities, could find refuge in another, there was a natural hesitation in the exercise of authority, and cases were sometimes hushed up, and irregularities tolerated, if not condoned, which called for more decisive surgery. But surely it was not from such a motive that the minister, to whose deposition and restoration we have adverted, was not deposed before the union took place; for it could not well have been

apprehended that such a fugitive from discipline, or such a subject of it, would be received by any other Church, nor could the loss, that would result from his transference of himself to another Church, have been regarded in any other light than as a gain. That discipline was not exercised upon him then, and that it has not been exercised upon him since – and the recent mode of dealing with him is worse than a mere failure to exercise discipline – is to be traced, not to the operation of the motive which Mr. Laughton assigns, but to faithfulness on the part of those on whom the exercise of discipline devolved. And similar failures to exercise discipline in other cases have had the same origin. Besides, whatever may have been the case in the defunct Church of which he was formerly a minister, it is not the fact that the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia was ever chargeable with a neglect of discipline, from the motive which he alleges or from any other. It has all along exercised discipline, and it exercises it still, far more faithfully than the Church, of whose position with respect to the exercise of it he boasts, has exercised it hitherto or is likely to exercise it soon.

The truth is that, as regards the exercise of discipline, the state of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales is as unsatisfactory as it could well be. That such is the case the facts we

have already adduced afford deplorable proof. In several instances, indeed, its proceedings presented the appearance of an exercise of discipline but they did not really bear that character. From two ministers, as we understand, it exacted and accepted the resignation of their respective charges; but this was not properly speaking, an exercise of discipline. In the case to which we have already repeatedly referred, it, in the first instance, stumbled on a proper exercise of discipline, but it soon retraced its steps and withdrew from the position which it had assumed, – a procedure by which it proved itself sadly destitute of the faithfulness from which all dutiful exercise of discipline emanates. One or two other cases it hushed up. Altogether we do not remember a single instance of the legitimate exercise of discipline that its proceedings present.

The further consideration of the "progressive policy" we must reserve for our next number.

SACRED MUSIC AS A MEANS OF AMUSEMENT.

The writer of the following passage, the Rev. John Newton, refers to the performance of Handel's oratorio, "the Messiah," in "commemoration" of the composer, but his remarks, in their general bearing, are applicable to all cases of the performance of sacred music for a non-religious purpose: –

"Whereunto shall we liken the people of this generation, and to what are they like? Luke 7: 31. I represent to myself a number of persons of various characters, involved in one common charge of high treason. They are already in a state of confinement, but not yet brought to their trial. The facts, however, are so plain, and the evidence against them so strong and pointed, that there is not the least doubt of their guilt being fully proved, and that nothing but a pardon can preserve them from punishment. In this situation, it should seem their wisdom, to avail themselves of every expedient in their power for obtaining mercy. But they are entirely regardless of their danger, and wholly taken up with contriving methods of amusing themselves, that they may pass away the term of their imprisonment with as much cheerfulness as possible. Among other resources, they call in the assistance of music. And amidst a great variety of subjects in this way, they are particularly pleased with one. They choose to make the solemnities of their impending trial, the character of their Judge, the methods of his procedure, and the awful sentence to which they are exposed, the groundwork of a musical entertainment. And, as if they were quite unconcerned in the event, their attention is chiefly fixed upon the skill of the composer, in adapting the style of his music, the very solemn language and subject with which they are trifling. The King, however, out of his great clemency and compassion towards those who have no pity for themselves, prevents them with goodness. Undesired by them, he sends them a gracious message. He assures them that he is unwilling they shall suffer; he requires, yea, he entreats them to submit. He points out a way in which their confession and submission shall be certainly accepted; and in this way, which he condescends to prescribe, he offers them a free and full pardon. But instead of taking a single step towards a compliance with his goodness, they set his message likewise to music; and this, together with a description of their present state, and the fearful doom awaiting them if they continue obstinate, is sung for their diversion, accompanied with the sound of cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of instruments (Dan. 3: 5) Surely, if such a case as I have supposed could be found in real life, though I might admire the musical taste of those people, I should commiserate their insensibility.

But is not this case more than a supposition? Is it not in the most serious sense actually realized amongst ourselves? I should insult your understandings, if I judged a long application necessary. I know my supposition must already have led your thoughts to the subject of the *Messiah,* and to the spirit and temper of at least the greater part of the performers, and of the audiences. The Holy Scripture concludes all mankind under sin (Rom. 3: 9.) It charges them all with treason and rebellion against the great sovereign Lawgiver and Benefactor; and declares the misery to which, as sinners, we are obnoxious. But God is long suffering, and waits to be gracious. The stroke of death, which would instantly place us before his awful tribunal, is still suspended. In the meantime he affords us his gospel, by which he assures us there is forgiveness with him. He informs us of a Saviour, and that, of his great love to sinners, he has given his only Son to be an atonement and Mediator, in favour of all who shall sue for mercy in his name. The character of this Saviour, his unspeakable love, his dreadful sufferings, the agonies he endured in Gethsemane, and upon the cross, are made known to us. And as his past humiliation, so his present glory, and his invitation to come to him for pardon and eternal life, are largely declared. These are the principal points expressed in the passages of the *Messiah.* Mr. Handel, who set them to music, has been commemorated and praised, many years after his death, in a place professedly devoted to the praise and worship of God; yea, (if I am not misinformed,) the stated worship of God, in that place, was suspended for a considerable time that it might be duly prepared for the commemoration of Mr. Handel. But alas! how few are disposed to praise and commemorate MESSIAH himself! The same great truths, divested of the music, when delivered from the pulpit, are heard by many adm- irers of the oratorio with indifference, too often with contempt.

Having thus, as I conceived myself bound in duty, plainly and publicly delivered my sentiments, of the great impropriety of making the fundamental truths of Christianity the subject of a public amusement, I leave what I have said to your serious reflections, hoping it will not be forgotten; for I

do not mean to trouble you often with a repetition of it."

A RETROSPECT.

No. 3.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TESTIMONY.

Sir, – I concluded my last letter by noticing that the Victorian brethren committed a wrong in expelling the minority in 1857; and that this is virtually admitted by the authors of the letter I am now considering. In that letter they say: – "But we honestly tell you, that what chiefly perplexes us is your mode of dealing with the separated brethren. After all the consideration which we have been able to give to their statements and yours, we must confess ourselves at a loss to see how your procedure, in their case, can be reconciled with the usual practice of Presbyterian Church Courts, or how it was fitted to promote the edification and peace of the Church in your colony." Now, here is an admission, which, when relieved from the cautious and hesitating phraseology in which it is expressed, and set forth in its plain and obvious significance, just means that the expulsion affair was a departure from Presbyterian practice, and that it was neither fitted to promote the edification nor the peace of the Church. This will be admitted to be a serious charge to be brought against any Church. The leading men of the Free Church lay this charge against the body whom they recognised as the Free Church Synod of Victoria. If then, in these circumstances, they regard them with "*deep sympathy*," are we not bound to regard their sympathy as having reference to their guilt, in having, as a body, done a thing so irregular and unjustifiable, thereby endangering the peace of the Church? But is sympathy the only emotion excited by flagrant error? Has censure no place in such a case? Perhaps it has, and perhaps had some error of equal magnitude been committed by the minority, or by some humble individual, the thunders of ecclesiastical rebuke might have come down with telling effect. But it so happens that this piece of iniquity is perpetrated by a majority. They must therefore be still owned as the real Free Church Synod, and be softly spoken to: – "It appears equally clear to us that, if there is to be any hope of peace, you on your part, as a Synod, must be willing, to a certain extent, to go back upon the past. There may be reasons which make this impossible. We do not say that we can confidently affirm it to be possible. You are the only competent judges." How softly spoken! What silken and deferential phrases! One would have thought, that after charging them with acting unpresbyterially, and to the injury of the peace of the Church, these home magnates would have boldly cast aside all silly ninnyism, and spoken out like men, and told these transgressors to retrace their steps, and undo the wrong they had done. But no, it might be impossible; and the culprits themselves were the best judges! How gently they let them down! how soft their fall! No such oily phrases, however, for the crushed and injured minority: – "We tell the separated brethren, if our voice can reach them, that, in our opinion their position is untenable. We do not see that they exhausted all the competent, legitimate, and constitutional means of public redress, or personal exoneration, within the body to which they belonged; all which means ought to have been exhausted before their case came within sight of either secession or ejection." Now, Mr. Editor, I must here take leave to say, that I consider the passage just quoted, to be about as cool and heartless a piece of insulting rebuke as I have ever met with. What on earth can these reverend gentlemen mean by "all competent, legitimate, and constitutional means of public redress or personal exoneration?" Had not the minority openly and honestly expressed their views on all occasions when the subject of Union was discussed? For doing this, they sometimes got little thanks. What were the legitimate and constitutional means of vindicating and maintaining their conscientious views, that they failed to employ? The Synod was well aware of their sentiments; and beyond the Synod there was then no court of appeal. Again, therefore, we say, what were the means of vindicating themselves, and upholding their views, that they failed to employ? "Constitutional means of public redress!!" What does this mean? What are we to understand by a minority in a Church Court seeking public redress? Is it meant that they should have appealed to the public for a verdict in their case? Verily, there never has been a public question agitated, in regard to which this has been more faithfully or fearlessly done. Let the Unionists tell, whether the sentiments of the minority were not boldly and unshrinkingly put forth; and whether the logical acumen, and argumentative power by which this was done, by the Rev. Arthur Paul of St. Kilda, was not felt by them to involve a demonstration of right principle, and of sound ecclesiastical polity, in the light of which, their own shuffling and temporising policy could not stand a moment's consideration. Hence their rash resolve to get rid, by an act of tyrannical power, of men and of arguments, which they could not put down or silence by sound reasoning. If these reverend gentlemen, who thus ignorantly and heartlessly lectured the truest and staunchest upholders of Free Church principles in Victoria, will only read "Coalition of Interests, not the Unity of the Faith," by the Rev. A. Paul, or the "Free Church Narrative," containing "An Account of Negotiations for Union, from October 1853 till April 1857," we venture to say, they will then have before them

arguments and facts to answer, or to controvert, which will cost them fully as large an expenditure of ingenuity and sophistry, as characterises the extraordinary letter on which we are now commenting. Never, perhaps, in any controversy; has any party more fully, frankly, and forcibly put their case before the public, than the much maligned minority did, on the occasion referred to; and yet these sage counsellors, sitting in judgment on a question which they look at from a distance of 16,000 miles, charge that same minority with not exhausting the means of public redress, or personal exoneration.

But the marvellous inconsistency, so glaringly manifested in this affair, appears still more extraordinary, when we view this letter in connection with a deliverance of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland upon this very subject of union. On the 2nd June, 1857, the Assembly declared as follows: – "The Assembly having learned the proposals which have been made in Australia for union with other denominations of Presbyterians do not feel called on, in present circumstances, to express any opinion on the subject, but have every confidence that their brethren there will not consent to any proposal which compromises the principles of this Church, and trust that they will enter into no union with others, at the expense of disunion among themselves." Now let it be observed, that a few weeks after this deliverance was passed by the Assembly, the intelligence of the expulsion of the minority reached Scotland. What might naturally have been expected, would have been the feelings of those who were instrumental in passing said deliverance? Could it have been anticipated that they would take the side of those who had done the very thing which they had expressed their hope and trust would not be done? Could it have been anticipated that the party who had maintained, in their entirety, the principles of the Free Church would be condemned, and the other party sympathised with? Yet so it was. The writers of this famous letter take a course which brings them directly into a position of antagonism to the deliverance of the Assembly. Pray, where were they, when this deliverance was agreed upon? Were none of them in the Assembly? If they were, did they dissent from the finding? there is no record of their

having done so. How is it then, that when the very thing is done, which they trusted would *not* be done, they have so cordial a sympathy with the very parties that had done it? How is it, that the very men who had striven to prevent a union which would compromise the principles of the Free Church, and had taken no step to occasion any disunion among themselves, were the very men on whom the censure of the authors of this letter fell? But it is needless to reiterate such questions. The *determination to have union* answers them all. This alone accounts for such strange work. Perhaps one of the most remarkable circumstances connected with this affair, is the fact, that these excluded brethren were charged with no crime. They were accused of no violation of moral or of ecclesiastical law. They had preached no heresy. They had not violated their ordination vows. And yet they were subjected to the serious sentence of expulsion from the Church! People who are not conversant with the history of this case, may well exclaim, what then was the cause of their expulsion? What had they done? We reply, they had simply done what every member of a Church Court has a perfect right to do – they had honestly stated their views. These views were opposed to the views of the majority, and yet they dared to hold them still. They opposed the Union on the grounds proposed. This was their crime. Because, being a minority, they had the hardihood to maintain their own honest convictions, and would not bow down and worship the mighty majority, – they must be got rid of. The shortest process for effecting this, was expulsion. But, more remarkable still, the reason why they could not approve of the Union, on the basis proposed, was that they did

not think that basis sufficiently conserved the principles of the Free Church. One would have thought that this would have secured for them some favorable consideration, at least from those who professed to hold those principles. Their object was surely one which Free Churchmen might have been expected to approve of. But no, Free Churchmen had become wondrously liberalised. Colonial light had shed its happy influence over the former dimness of their perceptions, causing the lines of separation to melt away under the benign radiance of enlarged liberalism. They longed to enfold in their loving embrace, those whom they had formerly regarded as holding views antagonistic to their own; and this new-born love was all the more grand and expansive, that those whom it so generously embraced held their antagonistic views still. It had been only an ordinary love, to embrace, and hold fellowship with those who had become one with them in principle and sentiment. But there was something sublimely beautiful and magnanimous in holding out the right hand of Christian fellowship to those who scorned their opinions, and firmly held their own. This was an exhibition of Christian philanthropy, not every day to be witnessed. A circumstance may here be mentioned, strikingly illustrative of this new affection for new bedfellows. When Dr. Cairns had got his new church, in Melbourne, ready for being opened, he plainly indicated the existence and character of this new affection by passing by all his Free Church brethren in the colonies, and inviting to preach, on that occasion, a thorough adherent of the Established Church of Scotland! This was the ominous beginning of the ludicrous end. The inviting of a minister of the Established Church, to open *Chal-mers' Free Church,* and the expelling of those who strove to preserve Free Church principles intact, may have been congenial and consistent acts, in the singular process, which seemed to have had for its object, the utter extinguishment of the name and being of the Free Church in the Australian colonies.

SYNOD OF THE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF VICTORIA.

The annual meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria was held, at Geelong, on the 21st ult. Public worship was conducted by the retiring Moderator, Rev. A. Paul, who preached from Romans 8: 17. Afterwards, the Synod was constituted, the "*sederunt*" being Revs. A. Paul, Moderator, and A. McIntyre and P. McPherson, Ministers. A commission in favor of W. J. Reid, Esq, as representative elder from the session of Meredith congregation was read and sustained; and Mr. Reid took his seat as a member of Court. The Moderator then nominated Rev. P. McPherson as his successor in office, which nomination unanimously agreed to, and Mr. McPherson took the Moderator's chair. The Synod adjourned till next day. Resuming on the 22nd, the "*sederunt*" being as on the previous day, various papers, containing correspondence with the Government, were tabled by the ex-Moderator. It was moved by Mr. Reid, seconded by Mr. McIntyre and agreed, that an expenditure of £20, incurred in fencing a site at East Melbourne, which had been reserved by Government for the use of this Church, should be made a charge against the funds of Synod. It was also agreed, that a record in approval of the ex-Moderator's conduct during his lengthened term of office, drawn up by the Moderator to be engrossed in the minutes.

Mr. Paul, in fulfilment of the duty laid on him at the meeting on the 18th September last, read the draft of certain positions, intended for adoption by Synod, as a declaratory statement, defining the position occupied by the Free Presbyterian Church, and the testimony which it maintains. These propositions having been spoken to by Mr. Paul, the draft was ordered 375
to lie on the table, and copies to be sent to all members of the Synod; discussion to be resumed at a subsequent meeting.

An application, by adherents of this Church resident at Ham-ilton, was read, requesting the Synod to use means for procuring a minister to labor among them. It was remitted to the Moderator to correspond with the memorialists.

The building grant for 1868 having been allocated, the Synod adjourned till the third Tuesday of October.

The propositions tabled for future discussion were as follows: –

"Whereas the Free Presbyterian Church stands distinguished in this colony, by holding and professing the principles developed in the Claim of Right and Protest of the Free Church of Scotland; and there is now a call in Providence, obliging this Synod to declare, specifically, the meaning and effect of this distinguishing profession, as appears, from the variations which the Free Church of Scotland has shown, from time to time, in its relation to colonial Churches; as also, from the elevation and adoption of new doctrinal standards by ministers and others, in the colonies, who once professed the principles of this Church; and, latterly, from the appearance in the Free Church of Scotland itself of new views, derogatory to the standards and testimony of that Church: therefore this Synod declares:

"1. That the adherence of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria to the principles embodied in the claim and protest of the Free Church of Scotland continues, without change, as formulated in the Fundamental Act, adopted by this Synod on the 9th day of May, 1848; the power, reserved in that Act, 'of defining, determining, and, if need be, modifying, or altering its relations to other ecclesiastical bodies,' being always retained intact. And, in the exercise of this power, the Synod hereby declares, that their adherence to the principles of the protest of the Free Church of Scotland was not designed to be, and has never, in their hands, been a servile copying of, or dependence upon, the Free Church of Scotland, whether as a corporate body, or as represented by general assemblies from year to year: as though this Church

had bound itself to make of any foreign Church a pattern of ecclesiastical practice, or a regulator of religious belief. On the contrary, the adherence so given ever has been, and is, an independent act of this Church, in the exercise of its own inherent liberty; and has been used as a convenient way of testifying for important doctrines, by reference to a well known formula, possessed of special historical associations, and ready at hand. This Church, therefore, does not hold the principles of the protest of the Free Church of Scotland to any such effect, as would set that Church above its own protest, or which would necessitate this Church to follow the Free Church of Scotland in any steps of defection already taken, or which may yet be taken, in dereliction of its protest."

"2. This Synod holds the protest referred to, and their own engagements to it, as defined by the Fundamental Act, to import a testimony specially to the related doctrines of Christ's headship over the nations of the world, and of his headship over the Church, as visible in the world. Under the former doctrine, as held by this Church, is comprehended the obligation of nations and their rulers to settle the constitution, legislation, and administration of their civil affairs in such an order, as shall justly discriminate between true religion and false; and this out of a declared submission to the supreme authority of Christ, and with an express regard to his will, as revealed in the Scriptures. Under the latter doctrine is comprehended the indefeasible right of the Gospel (as the vehicle of Christ's power and the organ of his supremacy) to be preached; of its public profession and ordinances to be protected and sustained; and of its spiritual administrations in dis-

cipline and government to be exempt from forcible dictation or control. And these two doctrines are mutually related, in such a way, that the extent and character of the civil ruler's action respecting religion, under the former, are limited by the just definition, under the latter, of the functions assigned to spiritual officers, and the privileges accorded to religious assemblies, by the word of God."

"3. This Synod further declares, that the holding of both these doctrines, in their integrity, and in their mutual bearing upon one another, constitutes the vital force of the protest referred to; and, specifically, of this Church's adherence thereto: repudiates the attempt to merge the former doctrine of Christ's headship over the nations, and to elevate, as a genuine Free Church testimony, the internal freedom of Gospel administrations alone, apart from a concurrent statement of rulers and nations obligations to regulate their policy avowedly in subjection to Christ: and rejects, as Voluntaryism and no Free Church testimony, the stating of religious liberties on the dogma, that nations and rulers, as such, have nothing to do with religion; as also the making of the ruler's duty towards religion an open question; withdrawing it, that is, out of the sphere of public and united testimony in the Church and leaving it free to be doubted by office-bearers, or to be positively denied, that nations and rulers, as such, are bound to order public affairs in avowed submission to Christ speaking to them in the Word – a course taken by the so-called Unionists in this colony who constitute the Presbyterian Church of Victoria: and, as followed by them, sanctioned by the Free Church of Scotland in the General Assemblies of 1860 and 1861, in flagrant unfaithfulness, however, to the Free Church of Scotland's own protest."

"4. The adherence yielded by this Church to the principles of the protest of the Free Church of Scotland is such and, (excepting some who at different times have dishonestly corrupted and betrayed their engagements to this Church,) has ever been such, as to make the reception of ministers, holding Erastian or Voluntary views, impossible in this Synod – the former error (or Erastianism) being incompatible with an honest subscription to the doctrine of Christ's headship over the Church; and the latter (or Voluntaryism) involving a denial of Christ's headship over the nations. Though mutually destructive of one another as principles, both these errors may subsist together, by the union, in one ecclesiastical body, of such as hold them respectively; the special testimony by which this Church is distinguished being, in such an ecclesiastical union, necessarily extirpated. And this Synod declares, that such an extinction of the testimony of the Free Presbyterian Church is signally witnessed, in the constitution of the Unionist Presbyterian Church of Victoria; to which the indiscriminate admission, in terms of the Articles of Union, of Erastian ministers, from the existing Established Church of Scotland, on the one hand, and of Voluntary ministers, from the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, on the other, effectually extirpates, from the public testimony of that Church, every trace of the principles developed in the claim and protest of the Free Church of Scotland, and the Fundamental Act of this Church."

"5. This Synod asserts, that the constitution of the Free Presbyterian Church in this colony has been such from the beginning as above delineated; and that, the status and name of that Church are of right, in the hands of such as have continuously and consistently maintained the principles exhibited in the present Articles; and that this Synod alone, as being so qualified, is the representative Court of that Church."

376

PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND

The Presbytery of Maitland met at Raymond Terrace on the 2nd instant – there were present Rev. James McCulloch, Moderator, Rev. William McIntyre, ministers; and Messrs. Hugh McDonald and Samuel Porter, Ruling Elders. A call from the Graf-ton congregation to Mr. McCulloch, was laid on the table, read, and sustained.

At this stage the chair was vacated by Mr. McCulloch and taken by Mr. McIntyre. The following reasons in favour of Mr. McCulloch's translation to Grafton were laid on the table and read: –

North Grafton,
April 26th, 1868.

"Reverend Sir, – We, the committee, representing the Grafton congregation, beg to submit to your reverend Court the following reasons why the Rev. James McCulloch, of Ahalton and Raymond Terrace, should be translated from his present charge to labour in this congregation –

1st, – That on account of our not having had a settled minister for some years past, our spiritual destitution is very great.

2nd, – That in the event of no pastor being speedily settled among us, the rising generation at present connected with our Church is in great danger of being induced to join other bodies, especially the Union Church.

3rd, – That the Clarence River district, of which Grafton and its vicinity form a very considerable part, is a very important one. Indeed, as to numerousness of adherents to our Church it is by far the most important district in the Colony.

4th, – That, notwithstanding the considerable heat of the sun in this district, yet the climate is congenial to bodily health, as may be abundantly tested by the healthy and vigorous appearance of those who have been residents here for a considerable number of years.

Other reasons might be urged, such as the agricultural resources of this district, and also its rapidly increasing population, all of which are well known to the Presbytery.

We trust that your reverend Court will take the foregoing reasons into your favourable consideration, and give to them the weight to which you may deem them entitled in your deliberating on the case in hand.

It may not be superfluous to add, that, if you give us the man of our choice, we shall do all in our power to use means that will conduce to his health, comfort, and happiness."

There appeared, as commissioners from the congregation of Ahalton and Raymond Terrace – Messrs. William McQneen, Thomas Dunn, Roderick McDonald, and John McPhee. As Mr. McCulloch labours also at East Maitland and Morpeth, Messrs. Donald Campbell and John Cameron appeared as commissioners from the Maitland congregation.

The commissioners pleaded for the retention of Mr. McCulloch in his present charge, on the following grounds: – The strong attachment of the congregation to him, the acceptableness and extensiveness of his labours among them, and the fear that injurious effects would, to some extent, follow his removal. Mr. Cameron laid on the table reasons for retaining Mr. McCulloch in his present sphere, of which the following are the chief, and spoke in support of them at some length, –

"That in 1860, the congregation of Ahalton, although chiefly composed of Highlanders, gave Mr. McCulloch a unanimous call, being at the same time fully aware of his inability to preach Gaelic.

That Mr. McCulloch has since laboured acceptably and successfully in his present sphere of usefulness.

That, as Mr. McCulloch's congregation is so affectionately attached to him, it is feared his removal would tend to disperse some of those who attend his ministry to other places of worship.

That the climate of the Clarence River, being considerably warmer than that of the Hunter, the former is not at all adapted to Mr. McCulloch's constitution."

One of the commissioners in the course of his remarks stated that whilst the congregation were opposed to Mr. McCulloch's translation, they were quite willing that he should, if it was found needful, visit the Clarence occasionally. After the commissioners had spoken, Mr. McCulloch being asked if he had any statement to make at this stage, said that he wished some time to weigh the reasons adduced on both sides.

Whereupon, the Presbytery agreed to defer the farther consideration of the call until a subsequent meeting, to be held on the 4th instant.

When the Presbytery met on the 4th (Monday), Mr. McCulloch made a statement to the following effect, – That he had had but little time to consider matters since Saturday; that he felt that strong reasons had been adduced on both sides; that, according to the light he at present possessed, he could neither accept nor reject the call; and that, unless it should be thought advisable to delay coming to a decision, that there might be further time for consideration, he would leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Presbytery; that they might dispose of his services in the way they might deem most conducive to the interests of the Church. Mr. McCulloch did not insist on longer time for consideration, the Presbytery, after considerable deliberation, decided that while they sympathised much with Graf-ton congregation, they did not feel warranted to loose Mr. McCulloch from his present charge.

PAGAN WORSHIP RETAINED IN THE PAPAL CHURCH,

(*Continued from our last.*)

With regard to the pretended miracles of the Romish Church, many of the most eminent are mere copies from the pagan miracles. Middleton says, "In one of their churches here they show a picture of the Virgin, which, as their writers affirm, was brought down from heaven with great pomp, and after having hung awhile with surprising lustre in the air, in the sight of all the clergy and people of Rome, was delivered by angels into the hands of Pope John I, who marched out in solemn procession, in order to receive this celestial present. And is not this exactly of a piece with the old pagan story of King *Numa,* when in that same city he issued from his palace, with the priests and people after him, and with public prayer and solemn devotion received the *ancile* or *heavenly shield*, which, in the presence of all the people of Rome, was sent down to him with much the same formality from the clouds? . . . . The *rod of Moses,* with which he performed his miracles, is still preserved, as they pretend, and shown here with great devotion in one of their principal churches. And just so was the *rod of Romulus,* with which he performed his auguries, preserved by the priests as a sacred relic in old Rome, and kept with great reverence from being touched or handled by the people; which rod, too like most of the popish relics, had the testimony of a miracle in proof of its sanctity; for when the temple where it was kept was burnt to the ground, it was found entire under the ashes, and untouched by the flame. This same miracle has been borrowed and exactly copied by the present Romans in many instances, particularly in a miraculous image of our Saviour in St. John Lateran, over which the flames, it seemed, had no power, though the church itself has been twice destroyed by fire.

"They have a church here dedicated to Saint Mary the Weeper, or to a Madonna famous for shedding tears. They show, too an image of our Saviour which, for some time before the sacking of Rome, wept so heartily that the good fathers of the

monastery were all employed in wiping its face with cotton. And was not the case just the same among their ancestors, when, on the approach of some public calamity, the statue of Apollo, as Livy tells us, wept for three days and nights successively? They have another church built in honour of an image which bled very plentifully from a blow given to it by a blasphemer. And were not the old idols, too, as full of blood, when, as Livy relates, all the images in the temple of Juno were seen to sweat with drops of it?

"The fable of the Harpies, those furies or winged monsters who were so troublesome to Æneas and his companions, seems to be copied in the very first church within the walls of Rome, close to the Gate of the People, as it is called, by which we enter it from the north. Here there is an altar, with a public inscription, signifying that it was built by Pope Pascal II., by divine inspiration, in order to drive away a nest of huge demons or monsters, who used to perch upon a tree in that very place, and terribly insult all who entered the city.

In their very priesthood they have contrived, one would think, to keep up as near a resemblance as they could to that of pagan Rome. The sovereign pontiff (the Pope), instead of deriving his succession from St. Peter, may, with more reason and a much better plea, style himself the successor of the *Pontifex Maximus,* or chief priest of old Rome, whose authority and dignity was the greatest in the republic, and who was looked upon as the arbiter or judge of all things, civil as well as sacred, human as well as divine, whose power was established almost with the foundation of the city, – was an omen (says Polydore Virgil, sixteenth century) and sure presage of that priestly majesty by which Rome was

once again to reign as universally as it had done before by the force of its arms.

But of all the sovereign pontiffs of pagan Rome, it is very remarkable that Caligula was the first who ever offered his foot to be kissed by any who approached him, which raised a general indignation through the city to see themselves reduced to suffer so great an indignity . . . . Yet this servile act, unworthy either to be imposed upon or complied with by men, is now (1742) the standing ceremonial of Christian Rome, and a necessary condition of access to the popes, though derived from no better origin than the frantic pride of a brutal pagan tyrant.

The great variety of their religious orders and societies of priests seems to have been formed upon the plan of the old colleges or fraternities of the Augurs, Pontifices, Salii, Fratres Arvales, &c. The Vestal Virgins might furnish the hint for the foundation of nunneries; and I have observed something very like to the rules and austerities of the monastic life in the character and manner of several priests of the heathens, who used to live by themselves, retired from the world, near the temple or oracle of the deity to whose particular service they were devoted, as the *Selli,* the priests of Dodonian Jove (Iliad, xvii. 234). But, above all, in the old descriptions of the lazy mendicant priests among the heathen, who used to travel from house to house with sacks on their backs, and, from an opinion of their sanctity, raise large contributions of money, bread, wine, and all kind of victuals, for the support of their fraternity, we see the very picture of the begging friars, who are always in the same habit and on the same errand, and never fail to carry home with them a good sack full of provisions for the use of their convent, *Cicero,* in his Book of Laws, restrains this practice of begging or gathering alms to one particular order of priests, and that only on certain days, because (so he says) it propagates superstition and impoverishes families. Which, by the way, may let us see the policy of the Church of Rome, in the great care they have taken to multiply their begging orders."

This testimony sufficiently establishes the fact that idol worship, derived from pagan Rome, pervaded the system of popery, and thus that the papal states, under the instigation of the beast, "worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast." – *Baxter's Prophecy the Key of Providence.*

PRIESTLY APPROVAL OF THE FENIAN MURDER IN MANCHESTER.

The following is an extract from a sermon by Priest Dennehy at Queenstown, after High Mass for the repose of the souls of the three Manchester murderers: –

"It is said that we are praying for murderers. But such is not the feeling of the Liberal Irish press, of the French press, and of the American Press. We know ourselves that they were *not murderers.* We have consulted the journals of every country in Europe, and they agree with us, with the Liberal press of Ireland, that they were executed for a political offence. We, therefore, offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass for the repose of the souls of those poor NOBLE FELLOWS who adopted a mode of their own for *the deliverance of their country,* and who lost their lives in consequence of their devotion. I do not countenance the mode which they adopted, for I am no Fenian; but they ran every risk to support their views, which they considered the best; and they proved themselves not only ready to speak in defence of their principles, but to die for them. They protested from the dock that they were ready to give up their lives for old Ireland. Old Ireland's children assembled in their thousands *to do honour to their memories.*"

Fenian conspiracies are the results of Popery in action, and Fenian favouring priests are the worst conspirators of all. The Maynooth endowment may be thanked for much of this. Similar language to the above has been used by the Rev. Canon Cantwell and Rev. Patrick Lavelle. In the estimation of these gentlemen, the murderers of Sergeant Brett are "*religiously brave and noble victims*," and have covered themselves with "glory" by their "edifying" death. Priest Cantwell, by his own letter, acknowledges that he urged the unhappy men to persist to the last in their applications to the gaol authorities for liberty to make speeches on the scaffold, after being told it would not be permitted. Whenever a priest gets admission into any public institution, he will endeavour to break through all regulations that are in opposition to his plans and schemes. Father Cantwell speaks of the execution of these men as a "bloody, tragedy." We would send him to the grave of Sergeant Brett to learn what a bloody tragedy really is. – *The Constitution.*

PRESBYTERIAN DIVINES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

We are indebted to the *Edinburgh Daily Review* for the following extracts from an address delivered by Mr. Moncrieff, M.P., at the monthly meeting of the members and associates of the Edinburgh Young Men's Christian Association, held in January last: –

MR. BUCKLE'S COMPARISON OF SPAIN AND SCOTLAND.

When Mr. Buckle, in the second volume of his able but eccentric work, represented Spain and Scotland as examples of two countries in which the two extremes of religious fanaticism produced analogous results, he probably did more violence to notorious truth than any honest historian ever committed. No two countries ever exhibited a more striking contrast in the influence which guided them, or the results which characterised them; and nothing but the desire, which in some writers amounts to a gentle monomania, of discrediting religious earnestness, could have blinded that author's acute vision 378
to the manifest truth. The only resemblance between the nations was, that both were largely swayed by religious influences; but beyond that point all imaginable likeness ends, and the most vivid contrasts commence. In Spain, Popery bore the fruits of tyranny and bloody persecution. In Scotland, Presbytery was the cradle of civil liberty, and even in its infant and stormy days was the most humane and least sanguinary of all ecclesiastical systems. Popery in Spain subdued and stifled the genius of the people. Presbytery in Scotland made the fame of its education renowned. In a country more favoured by nature than probably any other province in Europe, the arts of agriculture, of commerce, and of manufacture, under Popery, in Spain, have languished, and been left behind in the race. In a country the least favoured by nature, in point of climate and soil, small in extent, mountainous in configuration, Scotchmen, under Presbytery, have held their own with ease in the front rank of European civilisation, and have changed their barren moors and swampy morasses into fertile and luxuriant plains. It may be said with truth there is no feature, religious, social, intellectual, or political, exhibited by Spain, to which Scotland does not present a picture in all respects the reverse. There is perhaps one exception. National complacency is attributed, perhaps with truth, to both nations, and a tendency to blow the national trumpet too loudly in the ears of their neighbours. I shall therefore sum up our general repute in the words of a fastidious Englishman, who, writing in the days of Wilkes and Junius, was little likely to flatter. Speaking of the royal and noble authors of Scotland, Horace Walpole says: – "I am not enough accused in

them to do justice to writers of the most accomplished nation in Europe – the nation to which, if any one country is endowed with a superior partition of sense, I should be inclined to give the preference in that partic- ular." There is no doubt that the Reformation acted in Scotland like the breaking up of a long and ice bound winter, unlocking the springs of the national intellect, and giving a fresh and bounding impulse to the national character. For the first time Scotland became a nation, in place of a warlike array of feudal retainers. Mr. Moncrieff then proceeded, to speak of the general characteristics of the Presbyterian party in Scotland during the struggles for independence of the people during the 17th century; and to show that they were not liable to the imputations that were made against them, the genius and the civil liberty – he did not say of Scotland only, but of the whole kingdom, were to be found in the struggles of that party in Scotland, in the 16th and 17th centuries. He remarked more fully on the

INFLUENCE OF PRESBYTERIANISM ON CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The principal object I have on view tonight is to point out, in a few very general, and indeed superficial, suggestions, the reasons which induce me to think that the influence of the Presbyterian spirit in Scotland on the destinies of England, and its direst and immediate effect on our constitutional liberties, has never yet received from historians a full measure of justice. Those who have told the story of our troubles, and the ultimate triumph of constitutional liberty, have either been like Hume, worshippers of arbitrary power, or like Buckle, dreaders of priest craft. Even Macaulay's magic pencil has failed to do justice to this feature in his otherwise majestic picture of those times. Burton's history, &c., propose to show that civil liberty sprung directly from Presbyterianism, and that principles of religious toleration sprung, as they have ever sprung, directly from the principles of civil and constitutional liberty – estimate the share of Scotland in this struggle entirely unappreciated and unacknowledged. Up to the period of the King's death, in 1649, which was the real termination of the contest for constitutional liberty, Scotland had been in the very front of the battle. She was led and represented by some of the ablest men she had ever produced – men of enlarged statesmanship, and profound

accomplishments. They have missed their sacred poets. The time when their praises should have been sung were thirty years of blood, oppression, and tears; and when their labours ultimately bore their tardy fruit, it was reaped by a forgetful and ungrateful generation. (Applause.) . . . . It is not difficult to see that the genius of Presbytery, although consonant with constitutional monarchy, was at variance with arbitrary monarchy. It always has been so. Its system of Church Government is essentially popular and representative. So far from Presbytery being Old Priest writ large, as Milton, in his zeal for the Independents, has it, the lay and popular element in Presbyterian church government preponderates over the ecclesiastical. It were not difficult to illustrate more at large that not only the form of Church government, but the views of religious truth adopted by the Scottish Reformers, tended to individual liberty. Freedom to worship according to conscience – freedom to judge according to reason – the discarding of human authority in matters of religious opinion, lead very directly to the principles of constitutional freedom. And we find that they did. (Applause.)

THE COVENANTERS THE FIRST ADVOCATES OF CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY.

There is a confused notion that the Covenanters were a gloomy, morose set of fanatics, learned in nothing but the Old Testament, and applying its texts indisciminately on all occasions to ordinary life. You will hear people in ordinary conversation using language from which you would infer that the Covenanters were identical with the Fifth Monarchy men, and were members of the Long Parliament. Now, the Covenanters, Republicans, &c., in 1640, comprised the best blood in Scotland. They were in arms for Presbyterian government in religion, and constitutional liberty in civil government. With the first of these, I am not concerned – my principal occupation is with the second. I am desirous showing you that the first elaborate exposition of the principles of constitution monarchy in that great struggle came from the Covenanters, before any English writer had distinctly proclaimed them. Afterwards, no doubt, Milton, Algernon Sydney, and Harrington elucidated these views large. But A. Sydney's book was not published until 1683, and Milton and Harrington's "Oceana" were both later than the remarkable work by Samuel Rutherford, entitled "Lex Rex." Mr Moncrieff concluded by referring briefly to the labours of Rutherford, Henderson, and Gillespie, and defending the Covenanters from the charge of intolerance.

SCEPTICISM AND CREDULITY WITH RESPECT TO THE SUPER NATURAL, AND THEIR PRACTICAL EFFECTS.

The *impossibility of the supernatural* is the real idea, latent or announced, in much of the philosophy of the time. From this as the secret basis many have started; to this, as the inevitable terminus, many are moving. Rejection of the Spirit's personal agency, denial of miracles, dislike of inspiration, Darwinian theories of self-elevation or "natural selection," are the offspring of one father. Hence, also, the worship of human intellect, the contempt for goodness apart from genius, the unconcealed suspicion that great spirituality is incompatible with great talent, and that a life or book intensely religious must be weak and shallow. Yes, while one large section of modern philosophy goes off in this direction, a considerable part diverges in another, cultivating the supernatural, professing to associate itself with the invisible world, and to fill up imperfect knowledge with the superior information of spirits. Thus, on both sides, there is departure from the divine anchorage, the Bible; the one taking from it, in order to have no natural world at all; the other adding to it, in order to have a 379

supernatural world of their own. Truly was it written, "I will choose their delusions" (Isa. 66: 4) ; and again, "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. 2: 10, 11).

> Hear the just law, the judgment of the skies,
> He that hates truth shall be the dupe of lies;
> And he that will be cheated, to the last
> Delusions strong as hell shall bind him fast.

Thus we see, in our day, sometimes the oscillation between credulity and sceptics (the poor distracted spirit flying from one extreme to the other in its search for a basis of faith); and sometimes the amalgamation of the two. The result of this is, that singular fermentation or effervescence called "progress," which is shewing itself everywhere; according to the advocates of which, religion is in a transition state, and all modern movements mere experiments or feelers. The intellect of the age, like Columbus, is supposed to be steering humanity to an unknown but golden realm. All is unsettled, and must be so viewed when we judge the chaos of modern opinion! Hence the flippancies of free thinking, the insincerities of an ill adjusted formalism, the cravings for innovation, the incoherencies of self-willed religionism, the puerilities of amateur worship, rebellion against theological systems, and the dishonesties of subscription to creeds not

believed by the subscribers, save as the means of livelihood or as a certificate of character. – Dr. HORATIUS BONAR.

RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A report has appeared in various papers of the Ritualistic performances at Christmas in several of the Popish establishments dignified by the name of London churches. We need only quote one passage relating to St. Alban's, Holborn. The writer says: –

"The office for the Holy Communion began with a procession in the usual order. Four of the banners of the church, those of our Lord in glory and the Blessed Virgin, the Eucharistic banner, and the banner of St. Alban, the patron saint of the church, were carried, preceded by acolytes swinging incense, before the choir boys, the choir, the preacher, and the celebrating clergy respectively. The two large banners were each kept in position by cords held by two boy acolytes in scarlet cassocks and short surplices. These added much to the effect of the procession; and two of these boys, together with the acolytes, went within the altar rail and acted as servers in the office which followed."

It need scarcely be said that there is no authority for these proceedings in the Prayer Book, and the promoters of them are wilful violators of the law. In due time they may learn this to their cost. – *The Constitution.*

THE POPISH CHAPLAIN OF THE SYDNEY GAOL SUSPENDED.

O'Farrell, who attempted to assassinate the Duke of Edinburgh, wrote in gaol, no doubt under the influence of his spiritual directors, a statement in which he denied that, in attempting the Prince's life, he sustained any connection with Fenians. A copy of this statement or the original of it was conveyed from the gaol, in violation of the regulations, and placed in the hands of Mr. William Macleay. An inquiry into the matter has resulted in the suspension by the Government of the popish chaplain, the Rev. J. Dwyer, as a party to this breach of the prison regulations.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 33 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, JUNE, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 33 JUNE. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

PAGE.
Christ's Sacerdotal Prayer … … … … 381
The Mutual Duties of Protesting Ministers … … … 383
Dismissal of the Popish Chaplain of the Sydney Gaol … … 385
The Unions Effected in Australia and that Contemplated in Scotland 386
Pastoral Reminiscences … … … … 387
Rev. Roderick McLeod… … … … … 389
The Presbyterian Church of New South Wales and a Progressive Policy so called … … … … … 389
Reflections on the present position of Affairs in England … 389
The Church of Rome and the Bible … … … 390
A Queensland Soiree … … … … … 390
French Protestants … … … … … 390
Pan Anglicanism and the Greek Church … … … 391
Good Books … … … … … 391
The Australian Protestant Banner … … … 391
The Daughters of Man … … … … 391

CHRIST'S SACERDOTAL PRAYER.

JOHN 17.

We propose, not without hesitation, to attempt, in a few articles, the exposition of this chapter. There is no part of

Scripture that presents profounder or more glorious views of the privileges of believers; or of which the teaching is more eminently fitted to strengthen their faith, and to sustain and elevate their hope. There is thus, from the character of its contents, the utmost inducement to bestow upon it close, while reverent, study. And, besides, the exposition of it is at present specially demanded, for the purpose of vindicating the character of the prayer which it records. While that prayer carries us into the deepest and most sacred recesses of divine truth, revealing the amazing union to God and communion with him, which Christ claims for his people and to which he raises them, it has been represented as finding its answer in external mechanical unions, reached by compromise and maintained by unfaithfulness.

But, while the contents of our passage furnish a strong inducement to investigate its meaning, no one can contemplate them, with any degree of intelligence and in the right spirit, without feeling great incompetency for prosecuting this investigation. In attempting to expound such language as this, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us," or "the glory, which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one," we are concerned, on the one hand, to rise to its evidently lofty import, and, on the other, to guard against overstraining it, and thus falling into exaggeration and error. And " who is sufficient for these things?

Our Lord addressed this prayer to his Father not only for his disciples but also in their hearing, that, while it served the purpose of a prayer presented on their behalf, it might, further, afford them instruction and encouragement. "These things," he says with respect to it, "I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves." The petitions, which they heard him address to his Father, revealed to them their wants and dangers, and their privileges and prospects. As they listened to those petitions, – and they were in some instances more than petitions, – the intercession which be then made for them on earth assured them of his continual intercession for them in heaven, and of the bestowal upon them by the Father of all the blessings which he asked for them, and he asked for them all the blessings they then need-ed or would yet need.

It will be observed that the first three verses differ somewhat in form from the rest of the prayer. In these verses, our Lord speaks of himself in the third person, whereas, in the rest of the prayer, he speaks of himself or, rather, speaks in the first person. And this difference is not to be regarded as accidental or unmeaning. The first three verses present briefly but comprehensively the Saviour's application, and may therefore be regarded as enunciating the subject of the prayer; but they present his application in a form, which, while it closely resembles that of a prayer, it does not exactly coincide with it. In presenting it he seems to refer to an agreement or covenant: "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." This covenant he had so far fulfilled on his part; and "now, the hour being" thus "come," he desires, as preferring a righteous claim in doing so, the fulfilment of it by his Father. The aspect, which, we apprehend, his application, thus bears, and which, we conceive, is indicated not only by the reference which he makes to covenant engagements, but also by the peculiarity in the form of the first three verses to which we have adverted, comes out more clearly in the conclusion of the prayer, (24-26), which is parallel to the introductory portion of it. There he says: "Father, *I will* that they also, whom thou hast given me be with me where I am." This is the language, not exactly of simple prayer, but rather of such an application as we have described.

The subject of this prayer, as it is enunciated in the first three verses of our chapter, and as appears also from an examination of the entire passage, is the glorification of the Son, viewed specially as a means to the glorification of the Father, in accordance with the covenant arrangement between the Father and the Son and in fulfilment of it. "Father, the hour

is come; glorify thy Son that thy Son also may glorify thee, as thou hast given him power over all flesh that he may give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him."

We shall, therefore, consider the prayer, in the first place, as it is a prayer for the glorification of the Son by the Father, and, then, as it contemplates the glorification of the Father by the Son.

Our Lord's prayer for his own glorification is founded on his having fulfilled the condition, on which the glorification prayed for was promised to him. "I have glorified thee on the earth," he says, using the language of anticipation, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." "The hour was" thus "come" for his obtaining the glorification promised on that condition.

The fulfilment of the condition, on which glorification was promised to him, consisted in the execution of his mediatorial offices, and he had executed them so far. As a priest he would soon die for the offences of his people, and thus satisfy the claims of divine justice on their behalf; he also often and effectually interceded for them, as he now did in this prayer. As a prophet he taught, and preached the gospel of the kingdom. With reference to the execution of his prophetic office he says "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world," (6); "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me," (8); "I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it," (26). He accomplished also so far all that devolved upon him as a king. The fact, that his exercise of his prophetic office was attended with saving effects, implied that, in conjunction with his exercise of it, he exercised his kingly office. His disciples received the words which he gave them, (8); they kept his Father's word, (6); they believed that the Father had sent him, (8); but they would not have acted thus, if he had not visited them with a day of power and subdued them to himself. And, further, in keeping them in his Father's name while he was with them in the world, he exercised his regal power and authority.

He also in all that he had done in his estate of humiliation acted as the Father's servant. He was made under the law, and rendered perfect obedience to it.

He had thus so far fulfilled the condition on which glorification was promised to him, and he would soon fulfil it in its whole extent; and, viewing himself, by anticipation, as occupying the position to which he would attain by the completed fulfilment of it, he prayed for the promised glorification. And first, he prayed for it in its whole extent, – "Father, ... glorify thy Son;" and, then, proceeded to pray for the constituent elements of it separately and

successively.

The constituent elements of it are glorification with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, glorification in his being exalted to the exercise of universal dominion as Mediator, and glorification in and by the salvation of his people. The Son of God, in entering into "his estate of humiliation," that in that estate he might procure salvation for his people, divested himself in a sense of his divine glory. From eternity "he was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but he made himself of no reputation" or emptied himself; as the word means, "and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and, being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. 2: 6-8. He had thus, in a manner, laid aside his glory as the Son of God; and now, in praying for glorification, he prayed that this glory might be imparted to him "Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thyself with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." The glorification of him thus would consist in the restoration to him as the Son of God of the glory which he had

before his incarnation, and the exaltation of his human nature to participation in this glory, or, to speak more correctly, it would consist in the glorification of his person, which now comprehended his human nature.

The glorification of him as the God-man, with the glory which as the Son of God he had with the Father before the world was, was not only a large and essential part of the glorification promised to him, but was also necessary in order to his exaltation to the exercise of universal dominion as Mediator, while this latter was necessary in order that, having procured salvation for his people, he might apply it to them. Besides, it was necessary even to his glorification as the God-man, that he should be placed in a position to execute effectually and fully the offices which as the God-man he attained. "God," accordingly, "exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." Acts 5: 31. Referring to this exaltation he testifies with respect to himself "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Matt. 28: l8. And it is in the exercise of this power, and to give assurance of the continual and effectual exercise of it, that he, immediately after he had made this announcement, said to his disciples, and to his servants in all ages as represented by those whom he then addressed, "Go ye, therefore, and teach nations, baptising them in the name of Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." He, clearly, contemplated this element as comprehended in the glorification for which he prayed; for he addressed his Father in these terms, – "glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee, as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." The glorification intended in this application to his Father, is, evidently, such glorification, in its whole extent, as would place him, in all respects, in a position to accomplish fully the design of his mediation, in its bearing upon the salvation of his people and thus on the glory of God

As regarded his glorification in and by the salvation of his people, he did not pray for it in express terms. He did, however, what was equivalent to his praying for it thus; for he prayed for the salvation his people, stating that he is glorified in them. (10.) And we learn elsewhere that he is glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe. 2 Thes. 1: 10.

Those who are saved are, first, converted or brought into a state of grace; they are, then, kept in that state, at the same time they are sanctified, and, finally, they are glorified. In this prayer Christ did not pray for the conversion of those whom the Father had given him. He adapted his petitions to the circumstances of those to whose case they had immediate reference, and in whose hearing they were presented; and these had been already converted. And, besides, so far as his prayer intended, as we have seen it was, to be overheard by his disciples, and, as overheard by them, to convey to them the important instruction and encouragement which it was fitted to afford, it is only to the converted that it could well have referred, for it is only to them that Christ could present himself as making intercession them. He prays, indeed, for others. "Neither pray I," he says, "for these," – the disciples, – "alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." (20); but those others, for whom he thus prays, cannot know that he does so until they are brought to believe on him. They may know, previously, that he prays for some unbelievers, but they cannot know that they are of the number of the unbelievers for whom he prays. And this knowledge is not necessary for them, and we may infer from

the fact that it is not imparted, and, we think from the nature of the case, that it would not be beneficial to them. What it concerns them to know and believe is, that Christ has procured salvation for sinners, and that in him the salvation which he has procured is offered to them as the gift of God, – that he himself is offered to them as all their salvation. And it is only when they have received him as he is thus offered to them, that they can view him in the light in which he presented and meant to present himself to the disciples, when, in their hearing, he addressed this prayer to his Father; and, accordingly, it is only to such as have thus rec- eived him that he presents himself in that light.

But, while, for such reasons, we conceive, as we have just indicated, he did not pray in this prayer for the conversion of those whom he saves, he prayed for all else that is necessary in order to their salvation. As we have already stated, and obviously, it is necessary that those who have been converted or brought into a state of grace shall be kept in that state. Accordingly, in the prayer under consideration, the Saviour prayed that his disciples might be kept in a state of grace, or, as he expressed it, in his Father's name, (11). When the name of God is manifested to sinners, that is, when he himself is made known to them as he is revealed in Christ, so that his name or this revelation of him affects their hearts aright, and moves them to adopt the right practical course, they are then "in" his "name," under its influence and as it were immersed in it. All who have been constituted Christ's disciples are in this position; and it is further necessary for them, that they be kept in it, – kept in God's name: our Lord therefore prayed his Father that his Father would keep them thus.

The disciples were soon to be deprived of the guardianship of Christ's personal presence with them, and it would be necessary for them, therefore, that the Father should keep them, and that they should repose the confidence in him that he would do so which this prayer was fitted and intended to inspire. From the fact that they were not of the world, as Christ himself was not of the world, the world hated and would hate them; and it would be necessary for them that God would protect them from its malice. The hatred of the world would manifest itself in persecutions and seductions; and Christ prayed that his Father would keep them, notwithstanding the double, indeed, the manifold, danger to which they were thus exposed. Persecutions would be fitted to shake their steadfastness and precipitate them into apostasy; and he prayed that his Father would sustain them,

keeping them in his name; and he further prayed that the Father would preserve them from yielding to the seductions of the world or being overcome by them, not, how-ever, by "taking them out of the world," but by "keeping them from the evil," – from becoming identified with the world, and thus involved in the evil which characterises it.

But simple preservation is not sufficient; "that which concerns" Christ's disciples must be "perfected." Our great High priest, therefore, prayed "sanctify them in thy truth." In sanctifying there is, first of all, consecration or setting apart to the service of God, – a determination and appointment that what is thus dealt with shall be applied to the service of God; and there is, then, what is sanctification strictly speaking, the making of those, who have been consecrated, holy, so that they will devote themselves to the service to which they have been set apart. It is in this that the Father's keeping of Christ's people "from the evil" is perfected.

That those whom God keeps may be sanctified they must be sanctified in his truth, his word being his truth. Being in God's name and kept in it, they are in his truth; for his truth is the revelation which he has given of himself and of his mind, and this revelation is in the fullest sense his name; and that they may be sanctified, what is necessary is, that his truth, in which they are, may be in effective operation upon them; in other words, that be-

ing immersed in the truth, they may be impregnated with it, so that their whole character shall be derived from it and shall exhibit an exact conformity to it.

Christ not only left his people in the world, so that it was necessary that they should be kept from the evil; but he also "sent them into the world," and it was therefore necessary that they should be sanctified in God's truth, so that they should not only be separate from the word, but should faithfully and devotedly deal with it on Christ's and on God's behalf.

As a further enforcement of the petition, "sanctify them in thy truth," and to impress the disciples with the necessity of sanctification for them, he urged the momentous and deeply significant fact, that for their sakes he sanctified himself, – devoted himself to the service of God in prosecuting the great ends of his mediation, that they might be sanctified "in the truth," and might thus, being devoted to the same service, be fitted for all its requirements and for the glorious issue to which it conducts.

We have already seen that, in repeated instances, the petitions which Christ addressed to his Father, on behalf of his people, were, to a certain extent, suggested, so to speak, and, at the same time, enforced, by their present and prospective circumstances, and particularly by those circumstances as determined by the twofold fact which would emerge on his withdrawing his personal presence from them, – namely, thus, that, while the world hated them, he left them in it, and sent them into it. But, as we have also seen, the special enforcement of these petitions, and of the whole prayer, or, rather, the special ground on which he applied for blessings to which he had acquired a right, in pressing on his application, for the most part, though not exclusively, the character of a prayer, was the fulfilment by him of the condition on which, in the covenant arrangement between his Father and himself, the blessings for which he applied were promised to him. It was not wholly, however, as the fulfilment of a condition that his fulfilment of that condition bore upon the success of his application. It had had the effect of bringing the disciples to recognise the character and claims of the Father as the God of Salvation, and to be rightly affected, and to assume and sustain the right attitude towards him. They were thus to the Father himself objects not only of the love of benevolence with which he regarded them from eternity, but now, also, of a love of complacency; and they, also, trusted in him, and surrendered themselves to him. This, evidently, was a fact of great force in support of Christ's application on their behalf, and we conceive he pleaded it when, asserting and shewing, no doubt, at the same time, that he "had finished the work which the Father had given him to do," he said to his Father, "They have kept thy Word; now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee; for I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee; and they have believed that thou didst send me." 6-8.

(*To be continued*,)

THE MUTUAL DUTIES OF PROTESTING MINORITIES.

The minority, in the Australian colonies, who have maintained their principles against Unionism, need not doubt that they will, eventually, be vindicated. Their cause is too just, and the pretensions of Unionism are too hollow, to admit of any other issue. The emergence of the Australian question, upon the stage of public discussion, in Scotland, is the motion for a new trial: the former verdict was against evidence, unless we are to say, that the jury were misdirected. It is morally impossible, that the sober minded portion of the Scottish people 384

should not find this question of Australian Unions thrust back upon them. They have, now, face to face, the glozing sophistries of Unionism within their own borders. They are anxiously looking round for answers, to meet, and bear back the temptation to unfaithfulness And they are discovering, to their mortification, that, while men slept, the enemy has been undermining their defences. The Australian Unions have subverted Free Church consistency, and compromised Free Church arguments, within the limits of Scotland itself.

We having, uniformly, given approval to the resistance which has been offered to Union movements in Scotland; and we are not going to retract, or modify that approval. We wish the friends of Free Church consistency in Scotland all speed; and hope that they may yet impress their views on the whole Church. But, in signifying our satisfaction with the movement of a minority against Unions in Scotland, we indicated, long ago, the flaw which some of them, at least, would discover in their armour. Not a few of the friends, who have realised the issues of Unionism, with alarm, when brought home to their own door, failed to appreciate its folly and mischievousness, when appealed to them as a colonial question. Some very earnest and estimable men, in the ministry of the Free Church, gave their votes, in 1861, in General Assembly, in favor of the Victorian basis of Union; and against the claims and representations of the Victorian brethren, who were known as "*the minority*." The opponents of Unionism, in Scotland, are now, however, just such a "minority" as that whose claims were discountenanced in that Assembly. Their arguments are the same, their instruments, of action are the same; they move under the like protestation of conscience; they issue the like manifestoes through the press; they combine under the same pledges of fidelity to past attainments. All these phenomena of the Union movement were exemplified, eleven years ago, in Victoria. Indeed the auguries suggested by circumstance are not so re-assuring as we could wish. Are there to be censures on the writer of the Statement defensive and explanatory, as on the writer of the Coalition of Interests? Are there to be votes of expulsion against the defenders? Are there to be systematic misrepresentations of the men, and the actions of the minority, industriously circulated through, and,

greedily accepted by, papers secular and religious? Are the ears of men, in other countries, to be filled with reports of the success of Unionism, and its wonderful progress, in overtaking religious destitution; while, to nearer spectators, it displays a heterogeneous assortment of opinions, combined together by nothing so much as a deferential respect to seat holders? The thing which has been, in Victoria, under the inspiration of Cairns, Tait, and Hetherington, is it the thing that is to be under Cairns, Candlish, and Rainy, in Scotland?

The situation of the protesting party in Scotland is perplexed, as we foresaw it would be, by the march stolen upon them, in 1861. The approval of Unionism in Australia, they now see (or, rather we should say, are made to feel,) has settled the *principle* for Scotland also. They have been told this by their opponents in the controversy; and they cannot answer it. We earnestly hope, they will not attempt, controversially, to answer it. Our friends, (and we cordially regard them as such,) have only one thing to do, with reference to this Australian question. They should clear their hands of it at once. They cannot defend a position which lies open behind them; and this Australian decision has taken them *in reverse.* We earnestly hope, that our brethren will not try to stand by their votes in our case. We have nothing but goodwill for them; and sincerely we counsel them to disburden themselves of this error of judgment. That "*Melbourne affair*" was the revolution installed while men slept behind the outworks of the Free Church constitution. And

they cannot afford now to speak of it slightingly. And neither can they breast the current of opinion, running against them; by putting forward the authority of Dr. Cunningham. The more it is examined, the more, we apprehend, will it appear, that the Goliath of Unionism was, from the beginning, just Dr. Cunningham himself.

We do not forget the fact, that not a few in Scotland appreciated the real bearing of the colonial question, and had the courage and fidelity to face a strong and provoking majority. These must, now, feel no ordinary gratification, in looking back at the resistance, which they offered, to the earliest advances of Unionism. And we trust, that nothing may occur to make a past divergence about an Australian question, the occasion of splitting up the party who are now unitedly testifying against Unionism in Scotland. A candid reconsideration of the whole Australian case, a calm review of the corresponding features in their situation and in ours, a generous construction of our motives, and, especially, a high estimate (for no estimate can be too high) of the worldwide value of the:principles, involved in their and our contendings, we would earnestly expect, and request at the hands of our home friends. Let them, once more, allow us to represent, that the principles for which they are now contending in Scotland, are the subject of our contendings, and our testimony in the colonies. We have held the headship of Christ over the nations, and his headship over the Church, essential elements in the life of all communities. We have not thought, that these principles were unsuited to the southern hemisphere – the earth being the Lord's and the fulness thereof. We came to the colonies, some of us, with a testimony to these truths, made incumbent on us, by ordination of the Free Church of Scotland; and others of us had set their hand to the deed of demission itself And when the proposal was made to us, in the colonies, to hold back these principles, and not insist upon them in the administration and testimony of the Church in the colonies, we refused. *That* is our offence We glory in it. On account of it we have been refused communion as Churches with the Free Church of Scotland. Our names have been expunged from the published lists of ministers owned by the Free Church in the colonies; and although it has not been denied, that we are Free Church ministers, individually, it has been too evident, that the admission was meant to convey no countenance or advantage to us. Can the now protesting minority in Scotland recall these facts without feeling that some reparation is due at their hands to Christ's cause and their own testimony in Australia?

We have said, that, the positions of the two minorities, that in Australia, and that in Scotland, are identical; and certainly they are. What of difference there may seem to be between them arises, simply, from the far greater flagrancy and wider range of Australian Unionism. *We* have all the causes for dissatisfaction which our brethren feel in Scotland; and we have our own special grievances, *in addition*. The Australian bases are thrown loose, on the doctrine of Headship over the Nations; as the Unionists in Scotland now desire that the Free Church testimony should be, Dissatisfaction with Unionism, on that head, is common to the minorities of both countries. On the other hand, Unionism in Scotland has not yet proposed, to the gate of ministerial communion to Erastians. No basis has yet been foreshadowed by home Unionists, which would admit Dr. Robert Lee, and Dr. John Cairns, and Dr. Candlish to the same ministerial status; and if such a basis were proposed, or such a relaxation of standards, as would bring in ministers of the Established Church with their erastianism undisguised, and United Presbyterians with 385

all possible shades of voluntary views, into one fold, with professing Free Churchmen, there is enough of right feeling abiding in Scotland, to explode such a caricature of ecclesiastical unity. But this is the foul thing, which we mean by "Union" in Australia. Because we would not embrace it, we have been discountenanced by Free Church General Assemblies; and all help has been denied us; and every engine of private and public influence has been set in motion to disorganize our position. And, again, we would urge on the friends of the same cause in Scotland, whether some effectual action is not due, at their hands, to restore the damage done, by a period of neglect, longer than the time of suffering, which preceded the disruption at home. The means taken to suppress Free Church principles in Australia have been only too successful. In Victoria – the most populous of the colonies – the congregations of the protesting minority have been dilapidated by the constant flux and reflux of population inseparable from colonial society; and they have not been repaired by incoming immigrants: for no Free Church minister in Scotland thinks of commending an outgoing emigrant to the communion of the colonial minority. Eleven years are the formative period that fashions a generation in Australia; and a generation has sprung up in Victoria, since the expulsion of the minority in 1857, which knows Presbyterianism, not as the robust, incisive, and intelligent witness to Christ's prerogative of rule, which it was in the hands of Knox, and Henderson, and Chal-mers – but as a tea-drinking, bazaar-holding, hymn-chanting, Terpsichorean system which has filled the colony with substantial churches and Shakespearian ministers. We are far from saying, that the Union is not well adapted to the present state of that colony. Every idol maker frames his deity with glaring weaknesses; but cleaves none the less to the work of his own hands. Let those in Scotland who hold like precious faith with us, on the principles of Christ's Kingly authority, review the bearings of the Australian question. Let them consult the letter officially

addressed to the General Assembly of 1859 by the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, and, detaching from that letter the signatory names –for *that* is now to be reckoned on the side of Unionism – let them consider, that the Free Presbyterian Synod, from which the letter emanated, still subsists; and still adheres to its past contendings in the cause. Will any one of the minority, now resisting Unionism in Scotland, take up that letter, and ask his brethren to do it justice? And are there any among the witnesses to Free Church fidelity in Scotland, who will come to Australia, and help us.

———————————————

DISMISSAL OF THE POPISH CHAPLAIN OF THE SYDNEY GAOL

Mr. Dwyer, the popish chaplain of the Sydney Gaol, has been dismissed from his office by the Government, under circumstances which afford another illustration of the impossibility of harmonising the working of free institutions with the claims and practices of the Church of Rome. This impossibility is felt more and more everywhere, especially in Great Britain and its dependencies, and will continue to be thus felt, until a crisis is reached, and free institutions and the truth, by which alone they can be upheld, suffer a temporary defeat or achieve a final triumph. The attempt to reconcile the carrying out of protestant, that is of correct views of the State with the operation and demands of Popery, in which statesmen are now so generally engaged, implies a strange and infatuated ignoring of one of the plainest and most emphatic lessons of history, and can result only in increasing embarrassment and ultimate disappointment. The only form, indeed, which the practical

prosecution of such an attempt can assume, is that of making concessions to the Church of Rome, which, on the one hand, will vitiate the character and impair the efficiency of the State, while, on the other, they will only encourage that Church to demand further concessions, if they will not enable it to extort them. Matters seem now to have evidently come to this, that Popery will either destroy constitutional government or be itself destroyed.

The assassin, O'Farrell, stated voluntarily, immediately after he was apprehended, that he was a Fenian and one of ten or more who had conspired to murder the Duke of Edinburgh. This statement, considering the circumstances in which it was made and the character and mode of operation of Fenianism, will be regarded, we should think, almost universally, by those who have no interest in promulgating a different view, as a statement of actual facts. From the connection, however, of Fenianism with Popery, and of Popery with Fenianism, the Church of Rome has an evident interest in promulgating a different view. What influence this circumstance may have had, in the matter of O'Farrell's subsequent contradiction of his own spontaneous statement to which we have referred, we shall not attempt to determine; but we think the circumstance itself ought to be borne in mind in reviewing the facts which we proceed to relate. The paper presented to the Colonial Secretary, in which O'Farrell contradicted his first statement, was written on the 20th April. On that day Archbishop Polding and Father Dwyer paid the prisoner a private visit; and the Archbishop had paid him a similar visit on the preceding day. This latter ecclesiastic, in a communication dated the 23rd April, which he sent to Mr. Macleay, states, "from his own knowledge," that O'Farrell was "advised" to write "the statement" presented to the Colonial Secretary, that it was written "for the express purpose of its being published," and that O'Farrell, "in order to secure the accomplishment of his purpose of publication, deposited in the hands of a confidential person a duplicate, written and signed by himself." It thus appears, from the Archbishop's own account of the matter, that O'Farrell's written statement originated in advice given to him; that the advice in which it originated was given to him by the Archbishop, or by Father Dwyer, either conjointly with him or alone, but in his presence; and that, no doubt from a fear that the Government would not publish the statement, the expedient of depositing a duplicate of it "in the hands of a confidential person," Father Dwyer to wit, was adopted "to secure" its publication. It is thus evident that the object, which the adviser or advisers of O'Farrell, namely Archbishop Polding or Father Dwy-er, or both, sought to accomplish by the publication of the. statement, was one which he or they had no ground to expect the Government would be anxious to accomplish, that is, one which they had no ground to expect, the Government would regard as affecting beneficially the interests of the Colony or of the Mother Country. What the object in question was is intimated by Father Dwyer, in a letter dated 11th May, which he addressed to the Sheriff. Claiming a high character for the moral teaching of Popery, – teaching, however, which he himself exemplified by violating the regulations of the department of which he was an officer, the dismissed chaplain states that O'Farrell, "having been taught from early childhood" that, "in the case of injury to good name, – of false allegations against individuals, separate or aggregate, – satisfaction must be made, the good name as far as possible be restored." That is, O'Farrell's first statement, with respect, to his Fenianism and his association with others for the murder of the Duke of Edinburgh, was calculated to expose the Fenian conspiracy and the Church of Rome as its parent to further odium; and means must be employed to avert this result. O'Farrell's second statement, in contradiction of that which he 386
first and spontaneously made, was accordingly obtained. It is true that it could not be obtained without a violation of the gaol regulations, and a breach by an officer of the gaol of the confidence reposed in him by those under whom as such officer he held his appointment. But such obstacles were nothing. And, particularly, who who would keep faith with a heretic, such as the sheriff, or Mr. Parkes, when by not keeping it the interests of "the Church" might be promoted? Besides, it could be made to appear, by a little dexterous casuistry, such as the Church of Rome has often employed, that the breach of confidence in the case was not a breach of confidence. For example, though it was a part of the confidence reposed in Father Dwyer by the sheriff that he would observe the regulation, which requires that "no prisoner," in O`Farrell's circumstances, "shall be permitted to send or receive any letter or parcel of any description whatever, excepting through the hands of the gaoler," it may be contended, and the rev. gentleman contends, that, in becoming a party to O'Farrell's sending a statement otherwise than "through the hands of the gaoler," he did not violate that regulation, because the "statement was intended to take effect after the prisoner's death;" and, of course, a letter or parcel, containing such a statement, was not a letter or parcel "of any description whatever," and, therefore, was "never contemplated" by the regulations! And, besides, the sending of the "letter or parcel" by the chaplain was simply "the act of making him an executor of a sort of last will and testament," and, therefore, was not the sending of a letter or parcel at all, while it is such sending that the regulation forbids. So Mr. Dwyer argues, in true Jesuit style, with this abatement, that he falls greatly short of the adroitness and plausibility that usually characterise Jesuit sophistry; for nothing could be more lame than his attempt to prove that his palpable breach of the prison regulations was not a breach of them.

It is gratifying to observe that the irreconcilable antagonism of the influence and designs of popery, – of popery in its most genuine and fully developed form, – to constitutional government and free institutions, though generally ignored by politicians, is

beginning to be recognized by some of our leading statesmen, as the following extracts will shew. Towards the close of a speech on the State of Ireland, delivered by Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons, on the 12th day of March, the following passage occurs. It refers to a proposal to place the higher education, provided for the popish population of Ireland, under the control of the popish hierarchy: –

"I believe it impossible for the enemies of Ireland to devise a more objectionable scheme, one which, far from healing the wounds of that country, would be more likely to cause additional mischief. We should not be making a concession to the Roman Catholic population, but to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, an Ultramontane hierarchy, which has an electioneering influence, and it is that influence which you are seeking to bribe by offering up the Roman Catholic laity. (Cheers.) The Roman Catholic laity in Ireland are entitled to the sympathy and protection of this House, and, believe me, they want it. These are not the times of Dr. Crolly and Dr. Murray. You have to deal now with the Ultramontane priesthood in Ireland. That word is now the symbol of a creed which, to persons not under its influences, is one of the most objectionable that can be conceived, a creed whch views with dislike of every-thing which tends to the improvement and welfare of mankind; it is to that power you are going to make this concession; it is to those elements of confusion and perennial discord that you are going to hand over the Catholic laity of Ireland, if, indeed, you are in earnest."

Lord Stanley, after referring, in his speech on the subject of the Irish Church, on the 30th March, to the "land question" as lying "behind the Church" question; and to "the education question" as lying "behind the land question," made the following just and important remarks: –

"And behind them all lies a difficulty more grave and permanent than any – a difficulty felt at this moment in almost every civilised country in Europe, the difficulty of reconciling the modern, the Protestant, the liberal (using that word not in any party sense) idea of administrative and social arrangements with the totally different notions of both which are held by a devotedly Catholic community under the influence and guidance of its clergy. (Hear, hear.) This, I know, is touching upon delicate ground; therefore, do not let my argument be warped to a purpose to which I do not apply it. I repeat, do by all means that which you think right and just. Only guard yourselves against that common and tempting fallacy of believing that certain political consequences will follow from what you are doing, merely because from your point of view you think it right and just that they should."

THE UNIONS EFFECTED IN AUSTRALIA AND THAT CONTEMPLATED IN SCOTLAND.

The Australian Unions are quite as objectionable as the Scottish one now contemplated. We think more so. Accordingly, when the Free Church approved of the Union in Victoria, and subsequently of that in this colony, we felt assured, and often expressed our conviction to our friends, that the mortification which, in this proceeding, had shewn itself at the extremities would sooner or later reach the heart; and it has reached it. Entertaining this view we regret that such of those who approved of the Australian Unions as now oppose the Scottish one, do not, at least some of them, recognise and confess the grievous error into which they fell in the former instance. Until they do so, they occupy their present position under a great disadvantage, for it is impossible to justify the approval in the one case and the opposition in the other. If the former was right, the latter is not so, and *vice versa.*

At the same time, it is a poor argument against opposition to the contemplated Union in Scotland, that some of those who offer that opposition approved of similar unions elsewhere. It is far better to adopt the right course in the latter of two instances, though one pursued a wrong course in the former of them, than to maintain a wretched consistency by pursuing a wrong course in both. To give, however, to the inconsistency, too seldom exhibited, involved in the abandonment of a wrong and sinful course, the character of a full and thorough acknowledgement of the claims of truth and duty, it is necessary to acknowledge and deplore the previous practical rejection of them.

On the general subject to which these remarks refer, we gladly submit to our readers, the following extract from a speech delivered by Dr. Gibson, in the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, on the 23rd March: –

"I must say a few words on the now universally admitted ground taken and defended by the advocates of the majority, viz., that of "open questions." We are told there have been "open questions" in all ages of the Church, and even in the Westminster Assembly. That is true in one sense. But as applicable to our present position it is utterly untrue. There were hundreds of questions agitated by members of the Church in very early times, and even in the dark ages. There were many questions debated, of course, in the Westminster Assembly; but will my friend who said so in this Court give me an instance in which that Assembly, or any council of the Orthodox Church, after deliberation and solemn judgment, came to the conclusion that such and such an article, – say the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, the doctrine of justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ, the doctrine of strictly substitutionary atonement, nay, the doctrine of the civil magistrate as held by all the Reformed Confessions, – though in their creed 387
and solemnly professed, was to be an open question; will my friend who made the statement give me such instance? Could any assembly of divines be so absurd as say we believe, confess, and solemnly declare and set our hand and seal to it, and yet add, we neither say whether we believe or not? We have been told by a learned Aberdeen professor that the millennium – by which, I suppose he means the personal reign of Christ on earth – is an open question. It may be so between that gentleman and the individual gentlemen who take an opposite view, and I have no wish that they should not remain good friends; but what has that to do with points that are part and parcel of our creed, and which he has solemnly engaged to hold and to teach as the condition of his office, and to defend against all opponents? But the same gentleman tells us that circumcision was an open question in apostolic times. Does he mean that we are to hold that an open question still, between Jews and Gentiles? Rather serious question. But I deny the fact. It was not left an open question. The Council at Jerusalem pronounced upon it as "subverting" men's souls. It was the very thing which Paul condemned as a "going about to establish a righteousness of their own, and not submitting to the righteousness of God;" and, again, that any man who held it must seek salvation by the works of the law, and be judged by the law. But supposing it had been, and never received into the creed of the Church, would that justify the Church in rejecting from its creed the doctrine of justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ, received by faith alone? or declaring it a question of no moment. I am quite aware that Melancthon proposed the theory of open questions with a view to heal the divisions of the Church, and maintained that many of the points in debate were matters of indifference, and ought therefore to be received at the command of the Emperor – a principle which, under the air of moderation, has often been the source of tyranny and persecution, because, resisting constituted authority on points of indifference has not even the

plea of conscience, and is simply resistance to lawful authority. It was the root of the persecutions in England under Elizabeth and the Stuarts; and if it be true, as our union men now venture to assert, that the principle of Establishments, whatever you define that principle to be, is not found in the Confession of Faith, and is, in short, a matter of indifference, the men of the Disruption, who for years resisted the civil courts, and agitated the country on a point not of their faith, were, what their enemies asserted, rebels against constituted authority. I for one decline to pass such a sentence on myself. What right had they to continue to resist the decisions of the civil courts, and to agitate the country to maintain a principle and a position which was no part of their faith? They needed no Claim of Right to allow them to be Dissenters. You have no right to oppose civil authority on a matter of indifference. Melancthon carried this principle so far as to include among things indifferent such fundamental things as these – the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the necessity of good works to eternal salvation, the number of the sacraments, the jurisdiction of the Pope and the Bishops, extreme unction, the observance of religious festivals and several rites and ceremonies. Did his device heal divisions? Not at all – but originated and intensified them and for many years greatly retarded the Reformation. Has this device of open questions or articles of peace, prevented divisions in the Church of England? Is it not rending it and tearing it in pieces and producing and sheltering every spasm of heresy; nay, of infidelity itself. On these grounds I dread, and I have all along declared I would never consent to a union, or rather, I should say, a coalition or conglomeration on the theory of open questions – a theory most dangerous and fitted to lead to scepticism. The Bible tells us what may be open questions – such as eating herbs or eating flesh – or having long hair or short hair – matters having nothing either religious or moral in them. But

from beginning to end of the Bible there is nothing that declares that it is right to hold any truth of God – believed to be a truth of God, confessed and sworn to – an open question, or question of indifference. I do not think it worth while to answer the peddling attempt to draw an argument from what the Assembly did in the case of the Australian union. I never agreed to it. Sixty-four men voted against it. I get credit for consistency in having done so, but am taunted with the fact that the Assembly did not take my advice. No, it did not – and we now see the fruits, and where our Assembly and our leaders are driving. I take credit for a little more than consistency. I take credit, however, for nothing more than this – viz., believing that a good or a bad principle must lead to corresponding fruit. And others are now consistent enough, in so far, though they must go further in following out their new principles to their legitimate results, and whatever Dr. Cunningham or any other man may have said or done on that occasion, all who justify it on the principle of open questions should go through with it, and at once join the Establishment, and make that an open question too, for it is undeniable that it included those who still maintain connection with the Establishment of this country, and receive from it the supply of ministers."

PASTORAL REMINISCENCES.

Mrs. D., the subject of this sketch, was the daughter of a pious, well respected old man, who rented a farm on the estate of O. M., in F. –shire. Her husband died when the youngest of her children was some four or five years of age. It has been truly said, that a father's death often brings many woes, and this saying in the case of Mrs. D. and the younger members of her family was in one sense verified. Still, although she and her children had their troubles, they had also to tell it to the praise of the glory of Almighty grace, that God's promise was fulfilled in their case, which says, "I will be a father to the fatherless, and a husband to the widow." After spending a good many years upon the farm which had been occupied by her husband, Mrs. D. and several of her daughters removed to a neighbouring town. There, notwithstanding occasional ups and downs, they enjoyed a considerable amount of worldly comfort, and a large amount of domestic peace. This was especially the case for several years previous to Mrs. D.'s departure. For a considerable period towards the close of her pilgrimage, Mrs. D. was frail, and scarcely able to go out of doors, but it was her delight to sit with her family and employ herself in reading God's blessed Word, or any other instructive book concerning the great subject of salvation. When confined to bed, which she was during the greater part of the last summer of her earthly sojourn, she was on the whole comparatively free from extreme suffering, although greatly weakened by occasional attacks of cramp; but she bore whatever was laid upon her with patience and resignation to the Divine will. Mrs. D. was naturally of a modest and retiring disposition all her life, and as was her disposition so was her piety. She was peculiarly unobtrusive in her profession of religion, rather living it in her conduct, than saying much about herself or her state. Towards the close of her days, however, she seemed to shake off in some degree her reserve, and to speak more freely out of the abundance of the heart what she felt concerning Div- ine things. It appeared indeed that she made rapid advance in likeness to her Redeemer. She seemed ripening in no ordinary manner for the garner. Every day, as she lay on that bed which ultimately proved a bed of death, she gave unmistakeable evidence, that while the outward man was failing, the inward man was renewing day by day. As her body became frail and feeble, there seemed to gather on her the dews of spiritual youth and vigour, so that as she drew nearer and nearer to the end of her 388
journey, she grew readier and readier for her rest. It was encouraging and comforting in no ordinary degree to those who came in contact with her, to see how her spirit became, as it were, more full of light and buoyancy as she ascended up from the wilderness, and came in sight of the promised land. Before she was laid on her last bed, her Bible, which she had so long loved, had been her constant companion, and many a precious promise taken from its sacred pages had she treasured up in her memory, and which she would recall during her illness, as it were to refresh her heart with their consolations. It was delightful, as well as edifying, to witness her profound thankfulness to God for all his mercies to her, both of a temporal and spiritual kind. It was evident that while she was yet here below, she had a foretaste and a sort of anticipation of the great employment of the soul in heaven; a large portion of her time being spent in praising God for his loving kindness to her, poor and unworthy though she felt herself to be. Many a time did she repeat with deep emotion the passage of Scripture which says, "The mercies of the Lord endure for ever. They are new every morning, and fresh every evening." Mrs. D. also took great delight in repeating various portions of the shorter catechism, such as those concerning effectual calling and sanctification. She would say slowly and with deep solemnity of manner, Effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and in renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the Gospel. Or, again, sanctification is the work of God's free grace whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness. Those who heard Mrs. D. at those moments when she was repeating these precious declarations

which speak of that blessed change which takes place upon those whom God is preparing for himself – those who heard Mrs. D. at those moments had no doubt that she herself knew what it was to be effectually called; and that she was experiencing in her own case, that through grace she was dying to sin more and more, and living unto righteousness. One day she said that there was a verse of a hymn which she thought she had repeated in her sleep, and she would like some members of her family who happened to be beside her to hear it. When she repeated the lines, it was thought likely that the idea of their having come to her in her sleep was correct, as no one remembered having seen them before. The lines were these –

Lord, wash me in thy crystal fountain,
Make me clean from every stain,
And bring me to thy holy mountain,
Where with Jesus I shall reign.

Mrs. D. for a long time took little interest in worldly things. Concerning these she would say, in the beautiful language of the 23rd Psalm, "The Lord is my Shepherd – I shall not want. Goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life." During a few of the last days of her life she spoke but little, but her mind was in a peculiarly happy frame. She had quite overcome the fear of death, and would say in regard to it, "Jesus has deprived death of its sting, and the grave of its terrors to me. God has become my salvation; though I walk through the valley of the Shadow of Death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." She was happy in the prospect that she would not be long before she would be with her Lord and her Saviour, whom she loved. Jesus, she would say, is my all in all. On the last day of her earthly history she was heard to exclaim, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Say to my soul, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." Speaking of death as near, at another time, she said, "Lord, make that event happy to my soul, for Christ's sake." Again, "Death is swallowed up in victory. Oh, death, where is thy sting! Oh, grave, where is thy victory. Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Oh, heaven is a glorious place, for my Saviour is there." Mrs. D. often tried to cheer the hearts of her family, who were weeping around her, with the consideration that the separation would not be long, and they would all soon be meeting again, she hoped, at God's right hand, to join in singing his praises for evermore. "Put your whole trust," she would say, "in God, and he will provide for all your wants. I have trusted in him, and he has been a gracious God to me." "Remember," she would say to her daughters, "remember all the Lord's goodness to us unworthy creatures, and when you are sitting at your work speak about it, and see that you set him always before your eyes, and he will never leave you nor forsake you." She spoke with feeling of such of her family as she would never see again in the flesh, and left her blessing to them with many a fervent prayer on their behalf: During all the time of Mrs. D.'s illness God was peculiarly gracious to her, and scarcely for one moment did she experience the least shadow of despondency to becloud her mind. On the other hand all was light, and love, and peace. Only once, as far as appeared, was she troubled with fears about the withdrawing of God's presence from her, when it came to the last struggle. In the view of this she was heard praying with the greatest earnestness, "O Lord help and succour me. Lord help and succour me." "Oh, yes, mother," said one of her daughters, "he's your God and Saviour. He will never leave you, never forsake you." "Ah," was the reply, "Eliza, we know that our blessed Saviour himself, when in his agony on the cross, was troubled with the hiding of his Father's countenance, and we must be earnest, that it may not be thus with me." Soon, however, the cloud again passed away, and all was peace. In the midst of increasing weakness she would say, "He knows our feeble frame. He remembers that we are dust. I will sing of the mercies of the Lord for ever, and with my mouth I will declare his faithfulness." Her last words,. which were uttered when she was being held up for a little relief, were, "Oh, happy, happy," – and this with a look which it would be impossible to describe. Thus passed away, in her 83rd year, a mother in Israel. She had shewn much love for her children while she was with them; she left them her blessing and counsel when she died; and it is not too much to hope, that, through divine mercy, those of them who survive will seek to follow her dying counsel, and meet her at the Lord's right hand, where there are no pangs at parting, but where all are for ever together in the divine presence. The above account was mainly furnished to the writer by one of Mrs. D.'s family, who had always been with her, but still, after all, it comes far short, inasmuch as it is impossible to give in words the true idea of the manner and spirit by which in the latter part of her journey she was characterized. Another member of Mrs. D.'s family wrote a number of stanzas some time after her death, in connection with the event, a few of which may be given. After speaking of her removal from her family, and of her place of burial, he says, –

Like pilgrims, oft we visits pay
To that home of the dead,
To think on her who peaceful sleeps,
There in grave's silent bed.

We find the stone, where sculptured words
Tell whose dust lies below,
At once emotion swells our hearts,
And makes our eyes o'erflow,

We feel, while standing by that stone,
We too beneath may lie,
That soon the grass may o'er us wave,
And wild night winds may sigh,

But there anew, we long, we pray,
That we may surely stand,
As she when dying counselled us,
With her at God's right hand.

REV. RODERICK McLEOD.

Knowing that many of our readers sustained a connection more or less close with the ministry of the late Mr. Roderick McLeod, of Snizort, Isle of Skye, Scotland, and held him in deservedly high estimation as a faithful and honoured minister of the Gospel, we publish the following minute respecting him, adopted by the Free Presbytery of Skye and Uist, on the 25th March. We are aware that Mr. McLeod was led to adopt erroneous views with respect to the Australian unions, but we are greatly mistaken, if, now that the question involved in those unions has become in Scotland a home question, he would not have proved faithful to the principles of the Free Church, as others who fell into the same error have done. But, be this as it may, notwithstanding the error to which we have referred, we cordially concur in the estimate of Mr. McLeod's worth and services formed by his Presbytery, while, on the other hand, though excellent and eminent men fell into that error, and too many of them still adhere to it, we condemn it none the less decidedly on that account. The minute of the Presbytery is in the following terms: –

"At this their first meeting since the sad event, the Presbytery desire to record an expression of their deep sense of the loss sustained by them, and by the Church of Christ, through the removal by death, of their beloved father and brother, the Rev. Roderick McLeod, Snizort. Naturally gifted with mental

qualities of a high order, and early called by the grace of God to serve him in the ministry of the Gospel, he for nearly half a century witnessed faithfully for Christ, by whom he was honoured in being instrumental in the salvation of many souls, and in the building up of the Lord's cause in this island. As a member of this Court he was justly regarded as a wise counsellor, whose judgment could be safely followed; as a member of society, he was universally res-pected as a Christian gentleman; and to all who enjoyed the privilege of his intimacy he was invariably found a true and warm friend. The Presbytery desire also to express their deep sympathy with his sorrowing family and flock, and would earnestly pray that the Lord may be to them a fountain of consolation under their severe bereavement."

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NEW SOUTH WALES AND A PROGRESSIVE POLICY SO CALLED.

In an article under this heading in our last issue, we proceeded to consider the, "progressive policy so called of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, and, as a policy contemplates the accomplishment of a certain end, and proposes the employment of certain means with a view to the accomplishment of it, we directed our attention, in the first place, after indicating generally the character of the end of which the policy under consideration seek the accomplishment to the means on which that policy relies. These, we found, consist largely in a grievously defective administration of the government of the Church in maintaining orthodoxy of creed and purity of communion. As regards the maintenance of orthodoxy, we shewed that the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales has accepted an arrangement with respect to the training of its future ministry, in the contemplated college of St. Andrew's, which deprives it of almost all power to preserve orthodoxy at the very point at which deviations from it would have the most disastrous effects. We shewed also that its administration of its government in the direction of preserving and restoring purity of com-

munion is characterised by something worse than laxity. We referred to one case in which it deliberately disregarded a grave censure in which the exercise of discipline resulted, a case in which the very Church which pronounced the censure, – the Church under the spiritual superintendence of the Synod of Australia – disregarded it. In cases, in which it was too evident that discipline ought to be exercised, a milder mode of treatment was substituted. We adduced a case of this kind, in which our information led us to believe that a minister, who is in the receipt of a Government salary, was deposed by his Presbytery, and, on his own appeal, kindly restored by the General Assembly to his office and thus to a capacity to draw his salary. It appears, however, that the miscarriage of discipline, the failure to exercise it, was still greater than this. His Presbytery did not depose, it only suspended him; and it was by another agency than his own that his case was carried to the General Assembly. That court, however, restored him to the exercise of his office, and to the enjoyment of his salary, only transporting him to another field of labour.

In illustration of the sort of means, the employment of which is the distinctive mode of operation of the "progressive policy," we may refer to the admission of congregationalism to some extent, so far at least that congregations may use or abstain from using hymns and instrumental music just as they please. We regret we must defer the further examination of the "progressive policy" till our next issue.

REFLECTION ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND.

We make the following extract from the fourth of a series of letters addressed to the Bishop of London by Mr. Edward Harper, and published in the *Constitution,* The letter from which we quote is dated 28th December, 1867, and appeared in the *Constitution* of the 1st January last.

"The year now closing has witnessed many a scene of sorrow and suffering in this United Kingdom, and in other lands the awful power of God has been displayed in terrible majesty. In this highly favoured country there has been a terrible shock given to the feelings of the people by the pernicious workings of the mysterious conspiracy of Fenianism, the counterpart and complement of that other disreputable plot which has been concocted towards destroying the liberties of the people, and introducing, by means the most base and dishonorable, the exploded dogmas. and practices of Romanism. The one aims at the existence of the nation's life, and the other of the nation's religion. Both are evidences of the Divine displeasure on our continued transgressions against God. We, as a nation, rebel against our Supreme King; and, we marvel that others rebel against us? We spend the public money on the promotion of idolatry; what wonder if we should be scourged by idolaters? We allow the Church's springs to be poisoned at their source, why should we be surprised at God withdrawing the light of His countenance from us? The sooner we depart as a nation from doing iniquity, the sooner may we expect the renewal of His favors toward us.

We have very vague ideas in these days about God's government of nations, but the principle of His government is the same now as it was thousands of years ago. He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and He will visit peoples and nations for transgressions of His law. England has inherited the blessings and promises of God's favored people of old, and she has also received of His chastisements when she rebelled against Him. He is the only stronghold and defence in times of trouble and danger. Troubles and dangers are the inevitable result of backsliding and apostacy from Him. In whatever shape they come, whether in the dark winged pestilence, or dreary famine, or 390

civic tumults, or open war, or in any other form of Calamity, the chastising hand should be recognised with a humiliated spirit, and the lesson which it teaches should be seriously laid to heart. Otherwise God is provoked to inflict fresh punishments until the rebellious heart of man be tamed, and the nation be taught to know that there is no power but from Him.

Sad, indeed, is the present state of this country. Its Parliament seems to shut out of view all high religious considerations. Its Government have abandoned chart of truth, and are drifting hither and thither, the sport alike of wind and wave. The heads of the English Church allow a body of mutineers on board to seize the vessel, to the imminent danger of crew and passengers, the life of whose souls they are bent on destroying. Do the people will *not* to have it so? On the answer to that question the fate of England as a nation depends.

To call out the Protestant feeling of the three kingdoms, to unite it on the side of God's truth and the people's liberties; to renew the cry of the giants of the Reformation, aggressive on error, tyranny, and superstition, "No Peace with Rome," to unfurl the flag of Protestantism, on which is never a stain, and which has never been stricken down in fair conflict, to range on the side of the Lord all who would take Him as their Captain, and His Word as their rule – this, under God, is the hope of the nation; for this should every human exertion be made in faith and prayer, and in this sign we shall conquer." This is the test of Protestant faithfulness; this of English

earnestness; this of Christian patriotism. This is the policy that will be beneficial to all, because pleasing to God; and this only the policy that will bring down His blessing on the nation."

THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE BIBLE.

At the annual meeting of the National Bible Society of Scotland, held in Glasgow, on the 28th January last, the Duke of Argyll, in the course of the address, with which he opened the proceedings, stated the following facts with respect to the circulation of the Bible, facts from which it appears, on the one hand, that the church of Rome still as of old dreads the Word of God, and, on the other, that there are comparatively few countries in Europe from which it is able to exclude it. –

"Comparatively a few years ago the operations of this society were excluded from a great part of Europe – especially for example, in the empire of Austria. I find it stated in the report that so lately as 1853 the British and Foreign Bible Society had to mourn the banishment from Austrian territory of every copy of the Scriptures in its depots at Buda, Pesth, and Vienna; 329 bales and cases, containing 58,000 copies of the Holy Scriptures, were conveyed beyond the frontiers, under a guard of soldiers. In 1868 there is no portion of the empire in which Bible agency cannot be employed. Considering the great extent of Europe over which the Austrian empire extends, this is surely a great gain to the free Christianity of the world. I observe, also, that in Italy the operations of this society are freely extended over almost the whole of that peninsula. We have agencies in Leghorn, in Pisa, in Florence, and in various parts of Tuscany; we have agencies in the ancient kingdom of Naples, in Piedmont, of course, which has been long free, in the marches of Ancona, in Lombardy, in Venetia, and in the island of Sicily. I need hardly point out, as regards Italy, that there is one great exception to this list. I do not find in the list of cities and towns in which we are free to circulate the Scriptures the name of that great city which has been so long the capital of the world, and is considered by many the capital of the Christian world. There is no freedom in the city of Rome to circulate the Holy Scriptures. Now, gentlemen, considering the facts to which I have just referred – that there is complete toleration for the circulation of the Scriptures over almost

the whole of the rest of Europe – considering that France is in the main a Roman Catholic country – that the greater part of Belgium is Roman Catholic – that a very large part of Germany is also Roman Catholic – and that Austria is certainly predominantly a Roman Catholic country – we cannot fairly say that the Roman Catholic Governments of the world, so far at least as the laity has influence over them, are now reluctant to allow the free circulation of the Scriptures. It is only from Rome, where the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church has its capital and its head, that we are still excluded as regards the operation of this society."

A QUEENSLAND SOIREE.

The following is rather a mild specimen of the new method of raising funds for religious purposes; but, still, the medley it presents is sufficiently nauseous. "The soiree," says the *Brisbane Courier,* of the 2nd instant, whose account we abridge, – "The soiree held in the School of Arts, in aid of the funds of St. Stephen's Presbyterian Church, was a decided success in every respect. Upwards of five hundred persons partook of tea, and all appeared to appreciate the good things, and to enjoy themselves heartily. At seven o'clock, about an hour having been spent in feasting, the tables were cleared away, and the intellectual entertainment of the meeting commenced. The Rev. Mr. Levers, pastor of the church, presided, and read a financial statement. Mr. J. F. Sloman was then called upon, and read with correctness, and in a very pleasing and feeling manner, Tennyson's beautiful poem, 'The May Queen.' He was warmly and deservedly applauded. Mr. McGavin read an interesting paper upon the Scriptural rules and arrangements regarding contributions to religion, which, he contended, were strongly in favour of the voluntary system, which he expounded. He was loudly applauded in conclusion. The anthem, 'Great and Marvellous,' was then sung by the choir. Mrs. J. McDonald, jun., here sung *the beautiful song,* 'Too Late' (accompanying herself on the piano), in a manner which quite enchanted the meeting, and elicited an *encore,* which was also rewarded with hearty rounds of applause. Mr. J. McDonald, jun., then read a piece called 'Absalom,' which was well received; and the Rev. Mr. Gardiner, Wesleyan minister, and Dr. Challinor, made remarks expressive of their sympathy with the Church and the object in view. 'Rejoice in the Lord' was then sung by the choir, after which the Rev. Mr. Caldwell delivered a brief sympathetic address. Mr. J. McDonald then sung. '*The Resignation*,' which was *also warmly received.* A collection followed, and upwards of £64 was subscribed. Mr. S. Hawthorne then explained the financial position of the Church in a short address, and concluded by proposing a vote of thanks to the ladies, which was duly acknowledged. The National anthem was then rendered by the choir in a spirited style, and the meeting concluded in the usual manner."

FRENCH PROTESTANTS.

Mr. Richard Burgess writes as follows to the *Times.* – "In 1864, M. Edouard Borel published a pamphlet entitled *Statistique des Associations Protestamtes Religieuses et Charitables en France,* and he enumerates 220 *oeuvres Protestamtes dont le champ d'activite est en France,* besides numerous provident and benevolent institutions. These have all been brought into existence. within the last 50 years, but by far the great majority since the abdication of Charles X. M. Borel adds that these 220 pious works of Protestants, not reckoning the aid that comes from foreign countries, spend 2,000,000f. (£40,000) per annum, being an average of one franc at least for each Protestant is France. – M. Borel then

believed that the Protestants of France were 2,000,000, and this is the estimate which is now received as the true one by almost all the Protestant communities. Now, there is this difference between 2,000,000, or even if we say 1,500,000, and 800,000, which the census returns, to be accounted for. The enumerators, in taking the census and making the religious distinction, put down all who were born and baptised Roman Catholics as of that religion; they do not allow conversions to reckon for anything, but only return as Protestants those who are the children or descendants of Protestant parents; but if at the next census the actual number of Protestants be fairly dealt with, a very different return will be shown. To say that the Protestants have not increased in the last sixty years, in numbers as well as in piety and consideration; is to ignore the plainest facts. Sixty years ago it would hardly have been possible to find a Protestant congregation in the north of France; now there are upwards of 100. The number of pastors of all the Protestant denominations in France thirty years ago did not exceed 600; now, taking the Reformed Church of France, the Confession of Augsbourg, and the free churches not recognised by the State, the number of pastors will not be less than 1000. The number of schools has risen in proportion, as well as the number of places of worship. It delights Monseigneur Segur and the brethren of St. Vincent de Paul to repeat in their periodical journal, '*Protestantisme est mort*,' and yet they have formed a special association for the purpose of resisting the alarming

spread of Protestantism. Protestantism, as represented by the orthodox portion of the Reformed Church of France, has taken of late years a strong hold on the minds of the French people, where there is any care for religion at all. No work of any importance has for some years proceeded from the Roman Catholic press in France. The great writers of the age – Guizot, Weis, St. Hilaire, Bonnechose, E. de Pressensee, are all Protestants, and now that the Protestants have nearly gained religious liberty (in all the great cities and towns at least), the mass of the French population is being leavened with such principles of religion as are in antagonism to those of Rome, whatever be the name by which they are called."

PAN-ANGLICANISM AND THE GREEK CHURCH.

We (*The Constitution*) quote the following resolution of the adjourned conference of the Pan-Anglican body for the purpose of protesting against it as in any sense indicating the feeling of any honest member of the English Church. The resolution, which refers to the death of an idolatrous priest, Archbishop Philaret, of Moscow, runs thus: –

"That his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to convey to *the Church* in Russia an expression of the sympathy of *the Anglican Communion* with that Church in *the loss* which it has sustained by the death of *his Eminence* Philaret, the *Venerable Metropolitan* of Moscow.

This is an attempt, by a side wind from Lambeth, to identify the Church of England, as part of the so-called "Anglican Communion," with the superstitions and abominations of the Greek Church. With either the Churches of Greece or Rome the Church of England can have no peace. Peace with them would, in fact, be war against heaven. The primacy of Dr. Longley-*cum*-Wilberforce is only too likely to be a disastrous one to the English Church, but, at all events, there is a melancholy satisfaction in protesting against those violations of the principles of the English Church of which those in high places are guilty.

GOOD BOOKS.

A great evil meets us on every side – the multitude of worthless books with which the world is flooded. The public cry for fiction, and they get it – fiction in the newspapers, fiction in the magazines, fiction in the Sabbath School libraries, fiction wherever you look for popular literature. Whose fault is it? No doubt the vicious taste arises partly from the newspaper tales furnished so regularly by most of the press. But then a taste for stories of that sort must have existed previously, or the newspapers would not have ministered to it. We do not object to the perusal of the best class of works of imagination. But the sad thing is to see Sabbath School children eagerly seeking for works of fiction in preference too biographies and histories. Weak, trashy "tales" are eagerly devoured, while sober narrative is overlooked or rejected. It is high time that teachers set their faces firmly against this tale reading mania. Libraries should be selected with the great-est possible care, and the trashy fiction to which we refer should be carefully rejected and kept out. If we train our Sabbath School children to read good, sensible, true books, the taste will follow them when they come to years, and the next generation will not have such a horror of solid reading as the present. A taste for good reading is one of the most valuable attainments to which the young can aspire, or can be trained. The Sabbath School should in this respect prove the nursery of the Church. – *Pres Witness* (*N. Scotia.*)

THE AUSTRALIAN PROTESTANT BANNER.

The first number of this periodical appeared on Saturday last. In the article in which it introduces itself to the public it describes its object in the following terms: "We are Protestants, and we mean to assert and defend our Protestantism. But it is necessary to say that Protestantism has two aspects – civil and religious; nor is it in this peculiarity different from Popery – that, too, has both a civil and a religious character. It will thus appear that we shall only act in accordance with our professions, if we meet the twofold character of Popery with our own twofold character." According to this representation, its object is to maintain Protestant, that is scriptural, views on religious subjects so far as it deals with them, and to advocate the application of Protestant principles to administration of civil government. This is a highly important object; and, so far as we can judge from a first number, we anticipate the *Protestant Banner* will render good service in prosecuting it.

THE DAUGHTERS OF MEN.

(Gen. 6: 2.)

Judge not what is best
By pleasure, though to nature seeming meet;
Created as thou art, to nobler end
Holy and pure, conformity divine.
Those tents thou saw'st so pleasant, were the tents
Of wickedness, wherein shall dwell his race
Who slew his brother; studious they appear
Of arts that polish life, inventors rare;
Unmindful of their Maker, though his Spirit
Taught them; but they his gifts acknowledged none.
Yet they a beauteous offspring shall beget;
For that fair female troop thou saw'st, that seem'd
Of goddesses, so blithe, so smooth, so gay,
Yet empty of all good, wherein consists
Woman's domestic honour and chief praise;
Bred only and completed to the taste
Of lustful appetite, to sing, to dance,
To dress, and troll the tongue, and roll the eye; –
To these, that sober race of men, whose lives
Religious titled them the sons of God,
Shall yield up all their virtue, all their fame,
Ignobly, to the trains and to the smiles
Of these fair atheists; and now swim in joy,
Ere long to swim at large; and laugh, for which
The world ere long a world of tears must weep. *Milton*

Discovery of Pikes in a Church. – An extraordinary discovery has been made at Kilteely, county Limerick. The police, having received information that a number of pikes were concealed in a Roman Catholic chapel at Kilteely, proceeded to the place, and found concealed under the flooring of the altar about one hundred well finished pikes. The Rev. Mr. Heaney, the parish priest, has always, it is said, expressed himself as opposed to the Fenian movement, and has repeatedly warned his flock against taking part in it. The matter has been reported to the Lord-Lieutenant, and is undergoing investigation.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 34 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, JULY, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 34 JULY. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

The Free Church and the Union Question … … … 393

The Presbytery of Maitland … … … … 403

FREE CHURCH AND THE UNION QUESTION.

The Free Church has fairly got on the inclined plane of Union negotiations. The initiating of such negotiations, though not at the outset intended or regarded as being intended to express a willingness to make concessions, will almost certainly, in the course of subsequent discussions and controversy, be at least represented as possessing such significance, as involving, indeed, a virtual engagement to remove by compromise, if the removal could not be effected otherwise, any "bar to union" created by known points of difference. And it is more particularly from the negotiating Church, that, in respect of testimony and attainments, occupies the most advanced position, that the fulfilment of this alleged virtual engagement will be demanded. To the Church that sustains this relation to the other negotiating Churches, more than to any of these latter Churches themselves, the remonstrance will be addressed, that it ought not to have entered on Union negotiations at all if it was not prepared to make concessions; that, for example, if it meant to insist that any Church that might result from the projected Union should hold the principle of a civil establishment of religion, it ought not to have

entered on Union negotiations with Voluntaries. It will be taken for granted that it was not at all to be expected that they would correct or abandon their erroneous doctrine, and that, therefore, with-out some abatement on its part of the maintenance of its scriptural doctrine, or the relegation of that doctrine to the category of "open questions," no adjustment could reasonably be regarded as practicable.

It is a curious and, as we conceive, a humiliating instructive fact, that it is mainly in the form of a lowering and contracting of it that the modification of testimony with a view to Union is uniformly demanded. In attempting to account for this fact, are we to refer to the natural gravitation of the human mind towards error, and, in connection with this gravitation, to the feeble hold which the truth has of many who outwardly, in ordinary circumstances, adhere to it, and the want of adequate sympathy with it on the part of many such? We apprehend we are. And, further, those who are in error, and, sympathising but too fully with their erroneous views, cannot easily be convinced that they are erroneous, and, until they admit this conviction, they cannot, of course, without conscious dishonesty, profess to abandon them; while, on the other hand, many, who profess sound views, fail to appreciate adequately the claims at least of some of those views, and their own responsibility with respect to them, and consequently may, without much difficulty, be induced to become parties to the displacement of them from the Church's testimony, – a proceeding attended with this advantage, such as it is, that a good deal of plausible sophistry, whether honestly or dishonestly employed, may be made available for the justification of it. When some of the office-bearers of a negotiating Church, particularly when a large number of them, are found to be in favor of such a curtailment of its testimony, the prospect, that a negotiating Church, which rejects in the meantime the portion of truth which such office-bearers are ready to treat with disparagement, will be brought to embrace it, will be greatly impaired.

This stage was reached more than a year ago in the Union negotiations in Scotland. Since the General Assembly of 1867, and even from an earlier period, a majority apparently of the office-bearers of the Free Church have been, if not desirous, at least willing to erase from the testimony of the Church the doctrine of the civil establishment of religion; and thus to substitute so far the testimony of Voluntaryism for that which the Free Church has hitherto borne. To justify this procedure, it is alleged that the United Presbyterian Church holds the same views with respect to the duty of the civil magistrate towards religion and the Church as the Free Church holds, though it does not concur with the Free Church in holding that, under certain circumstances, the endowment of the Church is comprehended in the discharge of his duty towards it. But are views of this department of his duty, which exclude from the discharge of it the endowment of the Church under any circumstances, identical with views of it by which the endowment of the Church under certain circumstances is included in the discharge of it? We apprehend not. The two Churches in question may, no doubt, devise a general statement of the duty of the civil magistrate towards the Church, in which they will both concur, and they may thus seem to agree; but they will only seem to agree, for, while they will both adopt one statement, they will understand it in different senses.

Free Church Unionists go even the length of maintaining

that it does not form a part of the testimony of the Free Church, that, under certain circumstances, it is the duty of the State to endow the Church, and that, therefore, the Free Church will not in any way modify its testimony, though it agree to be merged in a Church by which this view of the duty of the State will not be held. But, without adverting to the emphatic and incessant maintenance by the Free Church, throughout its entire history and especially during the earlier portion of it, of this doctrine with respect to the duty of the State or the civil magistrate as its organ, we would simply ask does not the Free Church claim to be the representative of the Church of Scotland does it not claim to be itself the true Church of Scotland? But the Church of Scotland, prior to the disruption at least, was an Established Church, and thus not only taught but acted on the doctrine, that it is the duty of the State to endow the Church, in such circumstances as those in which it endowed it in Scotland. It bore testimony in the most explicit and unequivocal manner, that in such circumstances it is the duty of the State to endow the Church; and, surely, the testimony, which it thus bore so prominently and without interruption, formed a part of its whole testimony. If, therefore, it does not form a part of the testimony of the Free Church, the claim of that Church to be the true Church of Scotland must be rejected.

A very able discussion, bearing chiefly on the points to which we have now adverted, took place in the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh on the 26th February and on the 2nd March. Among the speakers who advocated the maintenance in Scotland of the principles which we maintain here, were Drs. Begg, Horatius Bonar, James Buchanan, Thomas Smith, Professor Smeaton, and the Rev. Mr. Maine. We cannot better consult the interests, which it is the object of the *Testimony* to promote, than by devoting a large portion of our space in this number to extracts from some of the speeches delivered by those gentlemen. We wish we had it in our power to place them all before our readers. The discussion was opened by Dr. Bonar, who moved the following overture: – "Whereas the prosecution of the negotiations for union upon their present footing threatens to issue in the compromise of the distinctive principles of this Church, and is already producing most serious internal dissensions, it is humbly overtured by the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh to the ensuing General Assembly that said negotiations be discontinued, the Assembly at the same time recommending the cultivation of brotherly intercourse and co-operation in every work of faith and labour of love, in which the negotiating churches can, consistently with their principles, unite." In moving this overture Dr. Bonar maintained "that nothing was ultimately gained by making light of real differences, and remarked that it was not wrong to be jealous in their guardianship of what they held to be 'the true,' for that which was true was not theirs, but God's. The thoughts of 'men were sometimes widened with the process of the suns.' But they were narrowed, too; narrowed according to God's standard, though broadened according to man's. They should like to be very sure as to the narrowing or the broadening before setting their seal to the change. He continued – That there may be differences which we can

afford to set aside or submerge, I do not deny. But let us be very sure what these really mean before thus treating them; let us try to ascertain these three things concerning them – (1) what is their theological value? (2) what is their ecclesiastical value? (3) what is their national value? We are assured that due regard will be paid to the principles of our Church. But there are two ways of showing our respect to these. One is by setting them on high as our fathers did, treating them as living principles, and making them do the work which they were meant to do. The other is by starving them to death, and then giving their

remains the honour due to departed worth, a decent burial, and their memories a felicitous eulogium, recounting the many services rendered by them when they were in the land of the living. But

> Can storied urn or animated bust
> Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
> Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust?
> Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?

If there are to be these ambiguities substituted for our distinctive principles; if there are to be these virtual erasures from our creeds, let them not be all on one side. Dr. Chalmers' expression as to 'Making a bonfire of our differences' is often cited as something very noble; and I refer to it not for the purpose of discussing it, but merely of remarking that it is generally used in a very one-sided way, a way not just the same as that which its noble speaker meant. I find that the 'differences' referred to by those who quote it in our present discussion are, simply and purely, Free Church principles, and that it is of them exclusively that the bonfire is to be made. The rest are to be spared and honoured, so that by this annihilation of Free Church principles wider scope will be afforded to all others. If the 'due respect' to be shown to these principles be simply that of martyrdom, and martyrdom in the face of Christendom, we decidedly decline the honour – at least we protest against bearing it alone. Let the proposal embrace all creeds and all churches, and then we shall know its object. We shall see whether it be love to Christ and to the members of his one body that dictates the perilous suggestion, or whether that liberal suggestion be not simply one of the forms in which modern thought is bringing up the old question, 'What is truth?' And let say that it is upon the ashes of martyred men, not martyred truth, that the Church of the Reformation and the Church of the living God are built, (Hear, hear.) Yet, after all this conflagration of creeds, I suspect that the well known line would be found true –

> Ev'n in our ashes live our wonted fires.

(Hear, hear.) It will not be possible, till the Disruption is forgotten, with its three centuries of Scottish history behind it, to prevent these principles from continually seeking resurrection; and every time they make the effort it will be to revenge themselves for the treatment they have met with at the hands of those who first proclaimed them before Christendom till Europe rang again, and then, before that same Christendom, gave them to the flames. (Hear, hear.) Our negotiating brethren are not disposed thus to give their principle to the flames. They make no change. 'Become like one of us,' they say, 'and we will give you and your church the right hand of fellowship.' They are consistent; and it is their consistency that has mainly contributed to bring about the present crisis. They have held their principles, not for twenty-five years, but for twice twenty-five at least, and honour them as much as ever. The statements which they now make are very much the same – only more pronounced against Establishments – as in the sad controversy with Dr. McCrie and his four noble friends, whose gallant bearing in those old stormy days it is the wont of some now to call bigotry. The events of that time, specially taken in connection with the ferment of opinion created in this country by the French Revolution contain a comment upon many of the ecclesiastical movements of subsequent years. I am not pronouncing any opinion as to whether Dr. McCrie was right or wrong. But he found that he could not remain in a Church where certain doctrines as to the magistrate were held, and these doctrines found that they could not allow him to remain. Either he must cast them out or they must cast him out. This was the alternative then. The 395
doctrines that cast him out remain the same. Was it the bare question of endowments then? I have no wish to make our differences greater than they really are, but such episodes of ecclesiastical history show us, by the way in which these differences work, that they are not trivial. Apart, however, from this, I wish to understand what they are, and whether they still retain the same ingredients as produced the strifes and the depositions of 1806. The painful history of that period makes me ask the question with all earnestness – Do we really understand the principles under discussion in their full bearing both on Church and State, both on minister and magistrate? And I ask not only do we thoroughly understand each other, but do we understand ourselves? I find speakers flatly contradicting themselves – (hear, hear) – not explaining away their terms, but roundly asserting the opposite of what they had formerly done – urging us one year in the most solemn language that a man can utter to believe one thing regarding our principles, and next year, or a few years after, with equal solemnity, as before God, to believe the opposite. Is this not perplexing? Without resorting to any uncharitable imputation, may I not conclude that some of these have neither understood the belief of others nor mastered their own. They may have taken hold of Free Church principles, but have Free Church principles taken hold of them? Dr. Bonar went on to remark that he could see that in certain abstract propositions there was a certain amount of approximation between the two Churches, but in the application of these there was complete divergence – nay absolute contradiction. He blamed no one, no committee, no Church, but still there must be a mistake somewhere. He wanted to get below the surface of apparent resemblances, and investigate wherein the true difference lies, how far the proper likeness extends, and where the mutual fallacy commences. He was not, he said, singular in his belief that there was a more serious difference between the two Churches than they now admit, though at the Disruption they did admit it to the full. Referring to the distinctive principles of the United Presbyterian Church, as they were fully and ably expounded at the consummation of the union in 1847 between the two bodies which then became the United Presbyterian Church, he quoted the following sentence from a speech then made by a man whom he truly honoured for his genius, no less than his worth – he meant Dr. William Anderson of Glasgow – 'I feel that the difference betwixt my principles and those of a Baptist, and still more those of a Congregationalist, is but as a molehill compared with the mountain which separate my principles from those of a man who holds that it is lawful for the kings and statesmen of the world to put forth their hand, in their official capacity, any more for the intended helping forward of the Ark of the Covenant than for forcing it backward.' This statement (Dr. Bonar continued) is a strong one; and, I will add, a remarkable one. I do not cite it to express either concurrence or dissent; but to show that there are among our negotiating brethren some who have the same suspicion as

myself regarding the nature of our distinctive principles, viz., that they go far deeper down into the constitution both of Church and State than many are willing to submit; and that there are, in the present day, problems beginning to emerge, the solution of which will take us down to the very roots of government, civil and ecclesiastical, as well as back into the very heart and core of our own past history, both of Church and State; demanding from us a more thorough search into the Word of God, as well as a far more deliberate and thoughtful judgment on many points of polity than have yet been given. (Hear, hear.) And that is, I confess, one of the reasons why I should have liked to see Dr. Bannerman's overture of last year carried out. The thorough consideration of principles both as they appear above and

below the surface (apart from a determination or wish to make the result serve a particular purpose), would have been of the greatest service, not only to both Churches, but to the State as well. For the right regulation of a kingdom such as ours, especially in days when, by reason of Church divisions, statesmen are bewildered and paralysed, both in legislation and in government, is a subject, not for a party debate either in Parliament or Presbytery, but for deep consultation among calm men whose single desire is to get hold of the true principles which will work for the welfare both of kingdom and of Church. It may be that the *fontes solutionum* have not yet been reached, nor the *status quæstionis* properly adjusted. It may be that a cooler investigation would bring about a better understanding and a more stable basis, and one would dread compromising himself or his Church rashly; one would shrink from hastily accepting a position in the midst of so much heat and conflict that would commit him to a final settlement of present questions in opposition to the judgment of three Reformed centuries. Our reversal, even on one point of such a time honoured judgment (if it must come to this at last), should not be a hasty sentence, got up to serve a purpose or tide over an emergency, but a grave judicial act worthy of the successors of Knox and Melville and Henderson and Rutherford and Gillespie. (Applause.) What such men affirmed should not be lightly condemned by their successors, especially when the condemnation will be the inauguration of a new line of ecclesiastical polity quite irreversible, and to tell for evil or for good upon our Church and land when we shall be no more. National patriotism as well as admiration for our Church in her past marvellous history suggests prudence and delay. Christ has His crown rights as head of the Church and giver of her laws. These have been fully searched out and proclaimed by our Church in days past. But Christ has His crown rights as king of kings, king of nations, heir of all things, Prince of the kings of the earth. It is the full consideration of these latter that must precede any right adjustment of the present controversy. There may be a false ideal as to these crown rights, an ideal reflecting rather the imaginary of modern politics or the visions of an advanced philosophy than the Divine conception of true royalty as embodied either in the past or future of Scripture revelation. If so, it becomes us specially in a time like ours, which is breaking loose from past anchorages, to investigate the subject and understand what God has revealed and what we ourselves have hitherto believed concerning these crown rights of Christ, given him by the Father as Lord of all. Dr. Bonar, proceeding next to point out that there might be a false idea as to union, remarked that the subject of union had become, not wide as Christendom merely, but wide as the world. Not only was it discussed by High Churchmen, and Low Churchmen, and Broad Churchmen, and Nonconformists, but it had been taken up by the philosophy of the age, which had undertaken to set up a standard, as well as to give advice to the Churches – a modern philosophy which, in return for its patronage to Christianity, demanded universal union; a union to be accomplished by the fusion or annihilation of all creeds, and the absorption of all distinctive principles into one hapless formula, in which nothing articulate was either believed or denied. (Hear, hear.) Proceeding next to refer to that part of the overture which speaks of the distinctive principles of the Free Church, he maintained that the principle referred to in the present case – the duty of the State to legislate and govern religiously, and specially to apply its revenues to religious uses – was a distinctive principle in the Free Church. He quoted from the volume entitled "The Principles, Contendings, and Duties of the Free Church,' wherein 'John Smyth, D.D.; James Hen- 396

derson, D.D.; Robert Buchanan, D.D.; John Brown, D.D.; John Forbes, D.D.; Chas. J. Brown, D.D.; Thomas Guthrie, D.D.; Robert S. Candlish, D.D.; H. Wellwood Moncrieff, Bart.; and Robert Craig, A.M., Rothesay,' vouched such statements as the following to be part of the distinctive principles of the Free Church: – 'As so much influence is conferred on rulers and magistrates by Him who is the source of all power, both civil and ecclesiastical, they are bound to serve Him much. And for them to refuse, or withhold from Christ's service, the influence which belongs to their high position, is to give a practical denial to the supremacy of Christ over all individuals and nations, and also to the supremacy which the religion of Christ claims overall that a Christian is and all that he has, and other similar statements. But not only did those ten brethren vouch for the statements he had read, as 'distinctive principles,' but they declare that 'it is a duty incumbent on the Free Church to hold up to the world (the world is wider than Christendom) and make known to all men her distinctive principles, her rights and claims.' But must not a distinctive principle have its *ipissima verba* in the Confession of Faith? If it be not found within its thirty-three chapters, had they any right to give it such a name? Now, let it be observed that those ten brethren declared, in 1853, that to be a distinctive principle which some of them in 1867 declared to be outside the Confession, which showed that they did not think that a distinctive principle must necessarily be explicitly stated there. But there were distinctive principles in every Church which were not announced in their creeds, but left to be ascertained in some other way. They had such in the Free Church, – principles not in their Confession, but imported into it, or made a vital part of it, by logical deduction from the language itself and the comparison of other articles; or by supplementing documents, or by texts quoted in proof. Referring next to the magistrate's duty to provide for the Church, Dr. Boner said – The third paragraph of the twenty-third chapter of our Confession has been always understood as containing the principle of national establishments, not only by their friends but by their enemies. These latter objected to that clause, not simply because it seemed to teach persecution, but because it taught the principle of national establishments, If they hold, just as we do, the magistrates' duty as to all other things,. and if endowments are not in the Confession, why object to sign that paragraph? But that the framers of our creed intended that passage to contain all that, historically, it has been supposed to do, is evident from the texts they quote, and from the express statement in our Larger Catechism. But there is more than this to be said. Not only were the framers of that article sitting at Westminster in the pay of the State, and most of them parish ministers, but our own Assembly took care to put the matter beyond a doubt. In January, 1847, the Confession was transmitted from London to the Commission of the General Assembly, The Commission ordered it to be

printed and sent down to presbyteries, as Stevenson expressly tells us, and as we find from Acts of Assembly. On the 27th of August of that year, the Assembly approved of the Confession, and ordered copies to be printed and circulated. They then took up the twenty-third chapter on its supposed connection with the conflicting ecclesiastical theories of the day; and 'appointed certain brethren to prepare articles or propositions for the vindication of the truth in these particulars.' It was then that the famous hundred and eleven propositions were drawn up by George Gillespie, which the Assembly ordered to be printed, sent to the four theological faculties of the four Universities to be reported on by them to the Assembly, and sent down to presbyteries for their judgment, The Assembly meanwhile summarised these 111 propositions under eight heads, of which the fifth is as follows – That as the rights, power, and authority of a civil magistrate are
to be maintained according to the Word of God and the Confess-

ions of the Reformed Churches, so it is no less true that Jesus Christ, the only Head and King of the Church, hath constituted a Church government distinct from the civil magistrate,' referring both to the twenty-third chapter and the thirtieth of the Confession. Of these propositions, thus epitomised and approved by the Assembly as their exposition of the articles in the Confession relating to the magistrate, the following are a few specimens: – Prop. 41. 'The orthodox Churches believe and do willingly acknowledge that every lawful magistrate may and ought first and chiefly, to take care of God's glory, to provide a learned and godly ministry; schools also, and synods.' Again, 'it is the duty of the magistrate to afford places fit for holy assemblies, and other external helps by which the sacred matters of the Lord may be performed.' Again, 'He taketh care for maintaining the ministry and schools, and supplieth the temporal necessities of God's servants.' I need not add to these quotations They are the Assembly's commentary on the twenty-third chapter of the Confession; and assumedly that Court did not believe the doctrine of Establishments to be 'outside,' but most distinctly within; it did not mean to leave that point an open question. The frequency and explicitness with which it is asserted in connection with the Confession then laid on the Assembly's table, must strike every reader of the history of that period. The Assembly, in homologating these propositions of Gillespie, seem to have been specially anxious to identify themselves with the Churches of Europe on the question regarding the religious duties of the magistrates. And these Churches are singularly explicit in their statement of these. They have not made an open question of them. And were we to do so, and to found a new Church on such an open question, we should stand alone among all the old Churches of Protestantism. We should be proclaiming in the face of Christendom, not merely that we had altered our creed, but that the Churches of the Reformation were wrong. Whatever uncertain sound the Christendom of the present may hear from us, the Christendom of the past has heard: but one sound (and that no uncertain one) from us, and we from it, regarding the religious relationship between Church and State. (Applause.) Such are the distinctive principles in question, and such the proof that they are entitled to that name. It proposed to open these, and it is this specially that seems to me a compromise. Dr. Boner proceeded to remark that while, however clearly Dr. Bannerman's overture last year affirmed that the principles which ought to regulate union had still to be investigated and fixed, it had since been announced that those principles were settled from the outset, that concession was implied in negotiation, and that the true solution of their difficulty was compromise or open questions. Open questions, he said, were all to a certain extent compromises, but the special evil of the pres-ent compromise was that it opened questions which their Church had hitherto closed; and he maintained that the opening of those closed questions, while it would be a denial of their important – nay, the possible denial of the doctrine itself *in toto* by every office-bearer and member of the Church – very considerably modified the constitution of the Church, both ecclesiastically and civilly. Yet it will not, he said, be found easy to dispose of these truths that are to be called open questions. They are after all positive beliefs, and such beliefs refuse to be silent. They must speak. They are irrepressible. They must get vent in action. They demand personification; and will not consent to be treated as negative dogma. To 'open' them in theory would be to close them in practice. To this they will submit even though we should. They will not let us alone, even though we should let them alone. We may lay stripes upon them, and thrust them into the inner prison and make their feet 397
fast in the stocks; but their voices will be heard even at midnight; and the foundations of their prison shall be shaken. (Loud applause.) A compact might be proposed, securing liberty to every one to act out what nobody was required to believe. And which party would such a compact satisfy? Our 600 schools are the expression of these positive beliefs; so are our mission schools abroad; so are our normal schools; so is our payment of the Annuity tax; and what would be the nature of the compact required to regulate these practical expressions of positive belief, so as either to arrest them altogether or to prevent the Church from being made responsible for them. Individual conscience and Church conscience would come into collision, or else the conclusion must at last be faced, that for open questions no such public and practical personifications can be tolerated. The question would be shut and our hands tied. (Applause.) Let me in a sentence or two illustrate the exact nature of that compromise which these open questions would bind us to. Our Disruption claim thus states the special point which will come first of all to be made an open question: – 'This Church highly valuing, as she has ever done, her connection with the State, and her possession of the temporal benefits thereby secured to her for the advantage of the people, &c.' If open questions are introduced, this paragraph of course must be cancelled. Again, the 'claim' declares that 'it shall be free to the members of this Church or their successors to claim the restitution of all such civil rights and privileges.' The introduction of open questions would require this to be altered into 'it shall not be free.' In our protest we repeat the same truth with equal solemnity, 'firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrates to maintain, &c.' This 'firm assertion' must, of course, be given to the winds in the day of open questions. But perhaps, the most solemn declaration of this distinctive principle is that which is embodied in the prayer which concludes our claim, 'That God would give strength to this church, office-bearers, and people, to endure resignedly the loss of the temporal benefits of an establishment, and that in his good time he would restore to them these benefits, the fruits of the struggles and sufferings of their fathers in time past, in the same cause, and there after give them grace to employ them more effectually than hitherto they have done for the manifestation of His glory.' It is a serious thing for a Church to reverse its own prayers. (Hear, hear.) To unsay our speeches – (hear, hear) – to cancel our Acts, to tear up our protests, are by no means so serious as this contradicting of our prayer for the last twenty-five years, the prayer with which we summed up the declaration of our purpose to perpetuate the Disruption. (Hear, hear.) That prayer has been uttered aloud in the ear of Christendom; the deeds to which it refers were done in the face of Christendom. And what will that Christ-endom

to which we appealed, and which so enthusiastically responded to our appeal think of a Church that, within twenty-five years, strikes out the most solemn passages from her authorised documents, opens questions which she declared closed, compromises her distinctive principles and contradicts her prayers. We appealed to the Churches of God throughout the world, when we promulgated our distinctive principles; and our recantation or retraction of some of the most forcible of these will take these Churches by surprise. It does concern the character of this Church and the interest of religion that the solemn protestations which the Church made twenty-five years ago as to her distinctive principles in the face of all Christendom should not be compromised. Christendom does not expect a change of our distinctive principles every quarter of a century. (Hear, hear.) It deprecates an uncertain sound and a shifting creed. If it looks for consistency anywhere it is from the Free Church of Scotland. (Hear, hear.) Dr. Bonar proceeded to contend that whatever Christendom might think, this was no time for unsettling questions, for remov-

ing the ancient landmarks which their fathers set up, or for abandoning the old ways in which the Reformation Churches had walked, as disintegration was going on fast enough with-out their help, and beliefs were giving way on all sides, both in the Church and out of it, as if corroded by some universal solvent, and maintained that the Church, which tried to consolidate itself by the decomposition of its creed under the name of 'open questions' would find that it had surrendered the secret of its strength for the cohesion of a Church depended on the distinctness of its truths. He pointed out that the real difference between the Churches lay, not in endowments, but in that of which endowments was the mere temporary exponent – the duty of the magistrate to regard his authority simply as a trust for Christ and himself as the 'minister of God,' deriving his power from God, and bound to lay all national resources and revenues at the feet of the Son of God – and he contended that the question of endowments, though it looked a secular one, went down into other questions far profounder than itself – it held a host of others in solution."

Dr. James Buchanan seconded Dr Bonar's motion, in a long and able speech, from which we take the following extract.

"In considering this overture, it was peculiarly necessary, in the first instance, to settle the precise *status questionis* with reference to the proposed Union. The question might be stated in substance simply to amount to this – whether the lawfulness of national religious establishments, constituted on sound principles, shall continue to be, as it has hitherto been a part of the public confession and testimony of this Church; or whether it shall now cease to be one of our distinctive principles as a Church, and be left as an 'open question,' with a view to the accomplishment of the proposed union? He spoke of national religious establishments, and not merely of national endowments; for although some had spoken as if the whole question were a mere question of endowments or of money, he was unwilling to narrow the discussion to that one point, because a national religious establishment, while it is inclusive of endowments, where these may be found necessary or expedient, embraces many other points of equal and even of greater importance, while it is not necessarily exclusive of any method of providing for the support of a gospel ministry. So far was the question of national endowments from being the only point at issue that a Church might be supplemented to a large extent with its own internal resources, without ceasing to be established. In point of fact, at this moment they found the ordinances of religious worship maintained in the Establishment in a great diversity of ways. Some congregations receive support out of the teinds, which are a charge on the landed property of this country. Other congregations are endowed by private benefactions and bequests. Other congregations still had been aided out of a central endowment fund which corresponds entirely, in principle, with the Central Sustentation Fund of the Free Church; and other congregations still were left entirely to depend on their church door collections and seat-rents, so that there was every variety in regard to the method of supporting the gospel ministry within the Establishment, and yet they all continued to be Established churches. There was nothing in the nature of a national religious Establishment which was necessarily exclusive of this diversity in the method of supporting a gospel ministry, for the mere method had always been an open question in the Establishment itself; and the only doctrine which abridged Christian liberty in this respect was that which affirmed it to be sinful, according to the rule of God's Word, to derive, any part of the Church's revenue from national endowments, or even to be associated in the ministry with those who accept them. It was a remarkable fact 398

that the unlawfulness of national religious establishments, how-ever zealously it might have been maintained by individuals, had never yet, so far as he knew, been made a part of the public confession and testimony of any Church which recognised a standing ministry and the duty of maintaining it. He held that the most strenuous nonconformity did not necessarily imply the unlawfulness of all national religious establishments, and the United Presbyterian Church had never made that doctrine a part of her public confession and testimony; while it is, and had always been, a prominent part of that of the Free Church, and if they now made it an 'open question,' they would abandon one of their distinctive principles as a Church, while, as a Church, the United Presbyterians would remain precisely as they were. (Hear, hear.) It was deeply to be regretted that the Assembly should have declared that there was no insuperable bar to union in the first head of the programme, before any agreement was come to on the important point – the lawfulness or unlawfulness, according to the rule of Scripture, of national religious establishments. Surely if the question were fully and candidly considered on its merits, the committee might be able to come to a conclusion in regard to it, on the one side or the other. Both doctrines could not be true, for they were contradictory; and one or other must be at variance with the rule of God's Word. (Hear.) To that unerring standard both parties appealed, and frank, brotherly conference should not be given up in despair, although there might seem for a time to be little prospect of immediate agreement. The Joint Committee had already arrived at a common understanding – whether their respective Churches agreed with them or not – on some important points, affecting the duties of nations and their rulers in relation to Christ and his Church, in regard to which they had previously been supposed to be at variance; was it too much to expect that they might yet come to agree more fully than they seemed to do at present on the questions which still remained undecided? Far more difficult points had been discussed and determined in the Westminster Assembly, although it was composed of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents, and met at a season of great political and religious excitement. It was chiefly because the premature deliverance of the Assembly threatened to interrupt the conferences on these points, or to place them at least on a different and less favourable footing than before, that he had been brought, very reluctantly, to contemplate the discontinuance of further negotiations with a view to an incorporate union; and if it were possible for next Assembly in

re-appointing the committee to relieve them from obligation in respect of that deliverance, he would willingly consent to their being authorised to continue the conferences, subject to the original instructions. But the negotiations could not be continued on their present footing without the danger of compromising the principles of the Church, and creating dissension, or even disunion, among themselves. He could not consent to the Church compromising a principle involving the headship of Christ. In the view of the ignorance, ungodliness, dishonesty, profligacy, and crime of the pre-sent day, which none of the Churches had been able to check, he could not assent to the Church ignoring or failing loudly to proclaim the duty of Government to devise and employ some more effective means than hitherto for the moral and religious instruction of the whole body of the people; for they were fast sinking into a state of moral degradation, and verging towards a crisis of social anarchy. Nations could only be governed by moral influence or physical force. No Church was entitled to say to the Government *laissez faire,* let things take their course, unless it was prepared to undertake the improvement and instruction of the poorest of the people. Now the principle of national religious establishments was to be made an open question. Open questions there must be in every Church; but what questions should be left

open; what principles should guide them in deciding one point and leaving another undecided; and what liberty, not only of speech, but of action should be allowed in regard to those subjects on which the Church had pronounced no deliverance? These were important topics which had seldom, if ever, been made the subject of deliberate inquiry. They formed a wide and very difficult problem. The question had a general and a more special aspect. Looking, in the first instance, at all the Churches of Christ throughout the world, and their relations to one another, it was manifest, he thought, that it was not the design of the Head of the Church, in so far as His will is either revealed in His Word, or made known by His providence, that all His Churches should be united under one external organisation. The highest of all union might exist where there is no external union, and mere external union might exist without eith-er implying or manifesting that higher unity. A geographical boundary, or a diversity of language, might be sufficient to cause and to justify such a separation between different Churches, and it might well be believed that other bars to external union might arise from far more important differences in respect to doctrine, and worship, and government. With reference still to this general aspect of the question, may it not be said with truth, that the tendency of the present age, so far from running in the direction of a firm adherence to principle, at the expense of external uniformity, points rather to external uniformity at the expense of principle? Is not the prevailing cry for Union at any price, and the public demand for open questions, instead of definite articles of faith, one of the worst and most ominous signs of the times? (Hear, hear.) Do we not see two distinct movements of this kind in England at the present day? Is there not one movement, zealously promoted by Broad Churchmen, which has for its object the union of all shades of religious opinion within her own pale, by superseding subscription to any definite creed, and introducing a system of indiscriminate comprehension? thus making the Church of England a huge menagerie of all kinds of beasts, clean and unclean. (Laughter.) Is there not another movement zealously promoted by High Churchmen, which has for its object the re-union of all Christendom, by renouncing every distinctive principle of the Protestant Reformation, and effecting an amalgamation of the Anglican, the Romish, and the Greek Churches; and has not this movement made such rapid and extensive progress as to be able to support a literature of its own – a 'Union Review,' a Union Almanac – (laughter) – 'Essays' and Sermons on the Re-union of Christendom, and, even Prayers for it, 'approved by English, Greek, Roman, Scottish, and Colonial Bishops.' (Hear, hear.) it need scarcely be said that such a union is possible only on the supposition that definite articles of belief are to be exchanged for 'open questions.' Looking now to the more special question which relates to separate Churches co-existing in the same country and planted on the same soil, it seems to be admitted in the proposal which is now before the Church that there must be a limit somewhere both to the extent of union, and also to the number of open questions, for this is evidently implied in the very proposal to negotiate with only two Presbyterian Churches, while several other Churches are left out of view. But the reasons which require and justify the limitation in particular cases should be distinctly specified. One valid reason for the existence of separate Churches in the same country, and even in the same neighbourhood, arises from a difference of doctrinal belief in regard to the saving truths of the gospel; and this explains and vindicates our separation, for example, from the Socinian body; for although some of the remonstrants in Holland, who professed to believe in the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity, were willing

to fraternise with the Socinians, and to treat these articles of faith as 'open questions,' it was soon found that union on that basis was impracticable as well as unlawful. Another valid reason for the existence of separate Churches arises from a difference of belief on some point of practical duty, even where there is no difference in regard to the saving truths of the Gospel; and this explains our separation, for example, from the Baptist churches; for holding, as they do, the unlawfulness of infant baptism, they could take no part in its celebration, and even if they might be brought to hold communion with those who had been rebaptised, they could not make the doctrine itself an open question; for even Robert Hall, when he advocated free, in opposition to strict communion, and in the true spirit of a large hearted catholicity laid down the broad comprehensive principle 'that no man or set of men are entitled to prescribe as an indispensable condition of communion what the New Testament has not enjoined as a condition of salvation;' and again, 'nothing more abhorrent from the principles and maxims of the sacred oracles can be conceived than the idea of a plurality of true Churches, neither in actual communion with each other, nor in a capacity for such communion,' did not, on that account, deny the lawfulness or even the necessity of their remaining separate, and continuing to adhere to their distinctive principles; but, on the contrary, laid it down as a fixed and unalterable rule, 'that every attempt to reconcile the differences among Christians which involves the sacrifice of truth, or the least deliberate deviation from the revealed will of Christ, is spurious in its origin and dangerous in its tendency.' Another reason for the existence of separate Churches in the same community arises from a difference of opinion in respect to Church order and government, which makes it practically impossible to carry out their respective views in a state of union with each other; and they explain our separation from Episcopal- ians on the one hand, and Independents on the other, although we believe them to be Christian Churches notwithstanding. And another reason still for the separate existence of a Church may arise from her past history, from her having been called in providence to bear a special testimony for some important truth, and to maintain it as one of her distinctive principles; and this explains the separate existence of the Free Church when she left the Establishment, and justifies her continued separation from it,

till the great truths for which she contended and suffered are practically acknowledged and acted on in the National Church. From the earliest period of her history the Church of Scotland seems to have been singled out from all the Churches of the Reformation to bear witness to the royal prerogatives of Christ, as head of the Church which is His body, and head over all things to the Church as sole king in His own kingdom, and also as 'King of kings and Lord of lords.' That testimony she bore unflinchingly in many a dark day of persecution and trial, and it was only renewed and repeated at the era of the Disruption, when the Free Church assumed the responsibility of maintaining it, and transmitting it unimpaired the generations following. If that testimony was worth all, and more than all, the sacrifices which we were called to make, and if it was sufficient to justify our separation from the Church in which we were born and bred, and around which some of our fondest memories and most hallowed associations were intertwined, then it is equally worthy of being retained in its integrity still, for all truth is eternal and unchangeable; and it will equally vindicate our distinct existence as a Church, if union with other Churches cannot be effected without a compromise of the sacred principles which it involves. Our distinctive testimony as a Church is twofold. We bear witness, first to the lawfulness of national religious establishments, constituted on sound principles; and, secondly, to the specific nature of these principles, as the indispensable conditions of its lawfulness. Let it be remembered that we do not contend, and that we have never contended, for the lawfulness, according to the rule of God's Word, of all national religious establishments; we have contended for the lawfulness of such only as are constituted on sound principles. But here we are met *in limine* by an objection which must be removed before we state what these principles are. It is objected that national religious establishments cannot be constituted on sound principles, according to the rule of God's Word; and if we ask why not? three reasons are usually given – First, that they are at variance with the divinely appointed method of supporting the gospel ministry; secondly, that they are condemned by the scriptural principle that the free spiritual kingdom of Christ cannot be maintained or extended by force; and, thirdly, that, whatever may be the terms of their connection with the national Government, the mere fact of their being established by law, while that law must be subject to the interpretation of the civil courts, involves an unscriptural subjection to human authority, and a sinful surrender of their independence as Churches of Christ. Were these objections well founded, they would, of course, be conclusive; but in reply to them I would just suggest three corresponding questions, conceding all that is sound in principle, but correcting the application of them by some analogous cases. Let it be admitted on both sides that the support of a gospel ministry rested entirely at the beginning, and still continues to rest primarily, on the members of the Church itself, the question arises, whether that primary obligation necessarily excludes the lawfulness of a national provision for maintaining the ordinances of public worship everywhere throughout the land, any more than the duty of charity which rests on every Christian man, excludes the lawfulness of a national provision for the support of the poor, or than the duty of educating his children, which rests on every Christian parent, excludes the lawfulness of a scheme of national education? Let it be admitted, again, on both sides, that the free spiritual kingdom of Christ cannot be maintained or extended by force, since force is inapplicable to matters of faith, the question arises,whether that sound general principle necessarily excludes the lawfulness of a National Church, which coerces none, but co-exists with the great law of religious toleration, and makes no use of force whatever, except in so far as it is applicable, under the common law of the land, to all property, whether belonging to Established or the Dissenting Churches? Let it be admitted, again, on both sides, that the national Government is bound to recognise and respect the inherent powers and liberties of the Church of Christ, the question arises, whether the mere alliance between the Government and the Church is necessarily destructive of her spiritual independence, merely because the statutes by which she is established are subject to the interpretation of the civil courts, any more than the fact that all our rights are secured by the law of the land, which must be interpreted by the civil courts, is destructive of the privileges of Parliament, or the liberties of the nation, or the right to the electoral franchise, or even the rights of conscience under the Act of Toleration? These three questions are sufficient to indicate the line of argument by which the preliminary objection to the lawfulness of national Establishments on scriptural grounds may be repelled. But some have looked on the question of national Establishments, not from a religious or scriptural, but from a mercantile or economic point of view. They have picked up a few phrases of political economy, and without considering to what subjects, or within what limits, these phrases are properly applicable, they speak of the great law of 'demand and supply' as if it, and it alone, should regulate the support of gospel ordinances and are even bold enough to advocate what they call 'free trade in

religion! Woe to the Churches of Christ should religion ever become a trade! The law of demand and supply is equally sound in itself and beneficial in its operation when it is applied in its only legitimate sphere to the exchange of one material commodity for another, but it is utterly unsound when it is held to exclude the operation of higher laws than those of mere commercial exchange with regard even to temporal interests of men, and it becomes destructive to the highest interests of society when it is transferred to their spiritual wants. On the principle of demand and supply we may advocate free trade in corn and free trade in land or free trade in any other commodity which is exchanged by sale and purchase; but even with reference to man's temporal necessities, that principle must not be allowed to exclude the operation of far higher laws – the laws of the moral world; for during a stagnation in trade or a season of famine or pestilence the mere law of demand and supply becomes utterly powerless for the relief of even temporal want; it was not that law, but the instinct of humanity and the influence of Christian principle that came to the rescue of the starving cotton-spinners in Lancashire; it is not that law, nor any law of mere commerce, that is even now providing relief for the peasants in the east of Prussia, and the destitute in the east of London. The law of supply and demand is equally powerless to provide for our higher intellectual wants; it is applicable only to the exchange of one material commodity for another, not to the exchange of two commodities so different as money and thought; or what are our literary and scientific institutes, what our patent laws and our laws of copyright, but so many means of protecting the higher interests of mind, and checking the grasping selfishness of trade? When mere mercantile principles are transferred to our spiritual wants, there are two other relations which are far more important than that of supply and demand – the relation between supply and need on the one hand and the relation between need and demand on the other. There may be the greatest need where there is the least supply; and not only so, but there may be the greatest need where there is the least demand. In both cases the two are often found to meet in an inverse proportion to each other, and long ago Dr. Chalm-ers

exposed the fallacy of applying Adam Smith's principle of demand and supply either to literary or ecclesiastical institutions. There may be room for the operation of that principle to limited extent among the upper and middle classes of society where means are ample, and where a desire has already been awakened for literary culture and religious instruction and worship; but in the poorer districts of the country, and the masses collected in our large cities, here are often no means for securing a supply and still more frequently no sense of need to prompt a demand; and if a Christian ministry comes to them at all it must come like Christianity itself, as an aggressive movement, originating from without, and to a large extent sustained from without, with no other mission than the blessed mission of love, 'to seek and save them that are lost.' But after all preliminary objections to national religious establishments have been repelled, it will not follow that they are lawful according to the rule of God's Word unless they be constituted on sound principles. It remains, therefore, to inquire what these principles are? and the answer to this question constitutes the second, and not the least important, part of the distinctive testimony of the Free Church. These principles may be briefly comprehended in a single sentence: – National religious establishments, are lawful only when they are constituted with due regard to the claims of revealed truth – to the rights and liberties of Christian congregations, and to the independence of ecclesiastical office-bearers in the exercise of their spiritual functions. This short sentence includes all the principles which are essential to a lawful Church Establishment. The first clause, 'with due regard to the claims of revealed truth,' excludes the indiscrim-

inate endowment of truth and error. The second clause, 'with due regard to the rights and liberties of Christian congregations,' excludes the intrusion of unsuitable pastors on a reluctant and reclaiming people; and the third clause, 'with due regard to the independence of ecclesiastical office-bearers in the exercise of their spiritual functions,' excludes all Erastian encroachment on the internal principles and government of the Church. That is the sum and substance of our testimony in regard to the right constitution of a National Church. Now, the second part of our distinctive testimony, as well as the first, is swept away if the lawfulness of National Establishments be made an 'open question;' for these principles, as they were maintained by us, pre-suppose an Establishment and refer to it. It may be said that, so far as these principles are concerned, there is no difference between us and the other Presbyterian bodies in Scotland, that they all hold in common with us the sinfulness of an indiscriminate endowment of truth and error – of the violent intrusion of ministers on reclaiming congregations, and of the Erastian encroachments of the civil courts; and that, if we agreed to make the lawful uses of national religious establishment an open question, we might still continue to maintain these principles. And it is true that they hold, and that we might still continue to hold, these principles with reference to Churches considered simply as Churches of Christ; but we have heretofore testified for them with reference to Churches established by law, and our peculiar and distinctive testimony declares that it is the duty of the national Government, as subject to Christ and the rule of His Word, to have regard to them in establishing the Church. Every part of that testimony, whether it was directed against indiscriminate endowment, or the intrusion of ministers, or the encroachment of civil courts, rested on the lawfulness of National Establishments, constituted on sound principles, and had a direct bearing: on the incumbent duty of the civil magistrate, as well as on the inherent rights of the Church. We contended for these principles while we shared in the temporal advantages of the Establishment, and shall we cease to contend for them now when we derive no benefit from her endowments? The prospect of their being recognised and acted on by our civil rulers may be remote and doubtful, but they are unchangeably true, and would it not be of some practical moment, in the possible event of the dissolution and reconstruction of our existing establishments, that there should be at least one Church of Christ to give an independent and unsuspected, because disinterested, testimony to their truth? What was it that imparted authority and weight to the noble testimony which was borne by the late Dr. McCrie to these principles, but the fact that he adhered to them steadfastly 'through good report and bad report,' while he was so far from having any personal interest in maintaining them, that, in the exercise of a rare self-denial, he remained in an obscure position at a time; when his talents and learning might have secured his promotion to the highest preferments in the Church or the University. But if the lawfulness of national religious establishments be made an 'open question' all these cognate principles, in so far as they relate to the right constitution of Churches established by law, must also be superseded and set aside; and, in point of fact, they have never been acknowledged in that connection by our brethren of the United Presbyterian Church. They have been held by them with reference to Dissenting, but not with reference to Established Churches, and the distinctive peculiarity of our testimony is that they have reference to both. It affirms the free constitution of the Church of Christ, and proclaims the duty of civil rulers to recognise it as His ordinance, and to treat it with reverence as instituted by Him, when they establish and endow 401

it. Such was our testimony before the Disruption while we belonged to the Established Church, and it is our testimony still now that we have left it. But it never obtained the cordial concurrence, or called forth the active support of our United Presbyterian brethren, except in so far as it related to churches not established by law. They often argued as if they thought that a Church ceased to be a Church of Christ, or forfeited at least her right, to the liberties of a Church of Christ, by the mere fact of her being by established by law, that she was thereafter to be regarded and treated chiefly, if not solely, as a mere civil institution, created by the will and subject to the control of the State, and that she could only be relieved from that servitude by relinquishing her position, and taking her place along with other Dissenting Churches under the general law of toleration; they held, in fact, very much the same language towards us as did our Moderate brethren. How often were we told by both, that however sound our views might be with reference to the Church of Christ, they were not applicable to a national establishment, and that if we wished to realise them, we must come out and be separate from it. The event proved they were right in so far as concerned the mere matter of fact, that the Government were not prepared to recognise a Free National Church, but it did not prove that our testimony was at variance either with scriptural truth or with constitutional principle; and never was that testimony more needed than in the present times. But if you make the lawfulness of nat-ional religions like establishments an 'open question,' every shred and fragment of that noble testimony disappears along with the fundamental principle which alone can sustain it; and your unanswered protest and claim of rights are henceforth mere waste paper. We must learn to regard them as Athanase Coquerel tells us the Protestant Church of France regards her old confessions, which she has ceased to subscribe, 'simply as venerable heads of the science and piety of their fathers,' but with this difference, that in our case the documents were framed by ourselves only twenty-five years ago; and we must

bury them out of sight and build their monument with our own hands. Nay, we must abandon our very name as 'The Free Church of Scotland,' for why was that name assumed? It would have been sheer arrogance and presumption in us had we called ourselves 'The Free Church,' or the 'Free Presbyterian Church,' in contradistinction to the other Presbyterian bodies, for they are not less free in their external relations, and in their internal government they are perhaps more free, in some respects, than ourselves; but we assumed the name of the Free Church of Scotland in contradistinction to that which we had left, because we held it to be fettered by Erastian bonds, and that name will no longer be applicable to us if *de jure* as well as *de facto* we cease to be a national Church. It has been said by a learned professor in the west that we are in a state of sin as long as we remain separate from the other Presbyterian bodies. This statement cannot have been intended to apply to individual ministers or members of the Free Church, for in that capacity no one it required or expected to continue in known sin; it can only have been made with reference to the Church considered as a collective body. But if the Church is convinced that, so far from being a *sin,* it is a *duty* to maintain her separate existence and adhere to her distinctive testimony, she cannot be said at least to be knowingly and willingly in a state of sin; at all events, she has continued in the same state for the last twenty-five years, and the great original sin must have been committed on that memorable 18th of May, 1843, when we separated from the Established Church for reasons which appeared to us to warrant and even to require such separation, but without uniting with any of the other Presbyterian Churches, which were then, as now, planted on the same

soil. Why did that solemn procession which issued from St. Andrew's Church direct its steps to Tanfield Hall, and not to Broughton Place? And why was it not arranged beforehand, that the United Presbyterian Synod should be in session, to receive us at once into her maternal bosom, and to give us the right hand of fellowship? Why, but because we believed, and they knew that we believed, that we came out from the Establishment bearing a peculiar and distinctive testimony, and protesting equally against Erastianism on the one hand, and against Voluntaryism on the other. And will any one venture to say that, if we had announced our intention to unite with any class of Voluntary Dissenters, that procession would not have been miserably thinned in point of numbers, as well as deprived of much of its moral weight, by the absence of not a few of our able and best men who were willing to sacrifice much for their principles, but not willing to abandon or even disguise their principles for the sake of any union whatever.

From Professor Smeaton's speech we make the following extract: – "I hailed the commencement of these negotiations, and took part in the private meeting where the subject was first mooted. It seemed right and proper to enquire whether these Churches, while maintaining firmly what they believed to be the truth, possessed so much ground in common as would render it possible and advantageous to act through the same Church Courts as common organs. It was right to make a tentative experiment with this end in view. It might have been ascertained, indeed, at once, without the tediously protracted course of negotiation which followed, and which has taken the form of a debating society, or of a process of laboriously artificial adjustment which gave so much and asked so much, which put in weights, and put out weights, in a manner unworthy of the truth and unworthy of the Churches, which surely must either, confess or deny at once any given article, The experiment has failed, and all I want by this overture is that the Church shall honestly, and without equivocation, avow the fact. The negotiation has failed, unless we go on to put ourselves in a false position to the historic Church of Scotland, and to repudiate our testimony, which I could show we have no power to do, without the consent of the entire constituency of this Church. It is of no use to tell me that such a conclusion is to be avoided by all possible means, and that to avow to the Church that the whole matter has failed is to incur a great responsibility. The fact is so; and the fact must be admitted. The negotiations have failed unless we revolutionise our constitution. Now, as we began this matter as an experiment and nothing more, free to recede if it was found unworkable, I will allow no man to make a religion of it now. No one put the matter at the commencement of these negotiations on any very transcendental grounds. No one had any idea that outward ecclesiastical union was such an imperative obligation that we must have it at any cost, and with any amount of concession. The notion which I see expressed in certain quarters of the Church, that you cannot recede without sin, just means that some men have invented a new code of ethics on the subject of external ecclesiastical union unknown to the Protestant Church, that they have succeeded in fettering their own consciences and that they are proceeding as far as in them lies, to do the same ill turn for their neighbours. I will not allow the question of external ecclesiastical union, even though it be Presbyterian union, to be made a religion of, or to bind the conscience of the Church, when it is not synonymous either with union to Christ or with union to His people. It is a matter desirable, indeed when it is practicable, convenient, and workable. But every Protestant Church has been acting on the principle that many things pre- 402
vent it; that language, national boundaries, such as the River Tweed, and many other elements, put an end to it. The true regulating principle is simply this – if it is workable, well; if not, it is no duty at all, and we have more important things to do in God's world than to fret ourselves about it. Now, as I am persuaded that this projected union is not workable, I wish the Church for the present to suspend these negotiations in a friendly spirit. But it may be said, Why propose to suspend the negotiations when some middle way may be found out that may adjust all? An admirable friend proposed, for example, that the whole negotiations should be re-constructed and re-adjusted on six points, which I may here mention. 1. That the Church shall be held uncommitted by the proceedings of last Assembly. 2. That a new element largely representing the protesting brethren be introduced into Committee on Union. 3. That the Assembly henceforth shall pronounce no opinion on single articles till the whole programme of union shall be before it. 4. That when the report is finished, the General Assembly, before proceeding to judge of it, shall send down the report to Presbyteries for suggestions. 5. That after these are received the next Assembly shall be at liberty to pronounce a deliverance. 6. That then any deliverance come to shall go down to Presbyteries and pass the Barrier Act before a final judgment is given by the Assembly. I was disposed at first to regard with favor this attempt at re-construction; and possibly it might make the Union negotiations seaworthy for another year or two. But it is only putting off the day. We are endeavouring to find out the North-west Passage, which, whether found out or not, can never be available. This union is, in present circumstances, unworkable; and the sooner we say so, the better for all parties concerned. It would be unwarrantable to travel again over the ground which was taken by Dr. Buchanan in his admirable speech, with all the great and leading principles of which I am cordially at one, and they have been expressed in a manner worthy of the man to whom we all used to defer so much in pre-Disruption times. To go over that

ground again would be only to weaken the deep, indelible impression which that speech was fitted to make It would be *agere actum.* Only one thing will I add. It is this. We either hold these principles as a Church at this day as we once did, or we do not. If we do believe them, then, I would ask can we come to any conventional arrangement or diplomatic compact whereby we shall sopite our testimony to them or our ecclesiastical action in that direction on a proper occasion. They are either truth to us or they are not. If they are not, let the Church say so, say that she has changed her mind, and not palter in a double sense. If they are truth, then I ask in the name of truth, conscience, and the fear of God, do men know what they are doing in ceasing to confess to them, or in proposing to sopite the confessing to them.

We conclude with one or two short extracts from Dr. Begg's speech: –

One almost forgets one's own identity in the discussions which have lately arisen. I thought I understood, at least to some extent, the principles for which we struggled during the Ten Years' Conflict, and in connection with which I had occasion more than once to address meetings in almost all parts of Scotland. But I was beginning to think that somehow or other there must be some mistake, and was therefore greatly refreshed by the noble speech of Dr. James Buchanan, who was selected by the convocation of ministers to write an appeal to the people of Scotland and induce them to join us in connection with the Disruption struggle. I apprehend he should understand our principles, and I subscribe to every syllable in that admirable speech which he delivered at the opening of the present debate. Now what are those principles? Our principle is, that the kings and governments of the
earth are bound to acknowledge the supremacy of Christ, bound to acknowledge his Church, and, in proper circumstances, to sup-

port that Church. That is the principle for which we strug-gled during the Ten Years' Conflict, and for which we appealed to the people of Scotland to join us. Not only did we tell the people of Scotland that we held the principle of an Established Church to be founded on the Word of God, but we told them that we would never abandon that principle; and on the strength of that declaration we asked them to join us. Here are our words: –

'Whereas God, in His Providence, has been pleased to bring the Church of Scotland into a position of great difficulty and danger, in which, by acting according to the dictates of conscience and the Word of God, imminent hazards of most serious evils, personal as well as public, is incurred; in these circumstances, it being above all things desirable that, in the face of all contrary declarations and representations, determination to stand by one another and by our principles should be publicly avowed, and by the most solemn sanctions and securities before God and the country; or confirmed and sealed.'

After stating the two principles of spiritual independence and non-intrusion, the document proceeds –

'To these principles we declare our unalterable adherence, and, applying them to the present position and the present duty of the Church, we think it right to state still more explicitly what we conceive to be implied in them.'

Amongst other points of enumeration is the following: –

'With reference to the question respecting civil establishments of religion which we believe to be deeply and vitally concerned in the present contendings of the Church, we feel ourselves called upon to bear this testimony, that holding sacred the principle of Establishments, as sanctioned by reason and by the Word of God, recognising the obligation of civil rulers to support and endow the Church, and the lawfulness and expediency of the Church receiving countenance and assistance from the State, &c.'

After a number of other statements the document proceeds to say: –

'We do most earnestly and affectionately invite our friends and brethren, members of the Church of our fathers, to come to our help and the help of the Lord, to declare their concurrence in the great principles for which we are called to contend, and their determination to do all in their power, in their station, and according to their means and opportunities, to aid us, in maintaining and defending these principles; so that they as well as we shall consider themselves pledged to uphold the Church in her present struggle, &c.'

Why, I went from town to town, from parish to parish, proclaiming these things, asking the people to join us on these principles; and I say that if we now turn round and disown them, the people of Scotland are entitled to say we have brought them out under false pretences. (Applause and hisses.) That is the ground I take, and I am not prepared for any such responsibility. I shall quote the statement of a man you will all respect in reference to the purport of the whole discussion – the late Dr. Cunningham – whose name has been, as I could prove, most unfairly used in connection with this discussion: –

'It is most natural and convenient to begin with considering this Voluntary principle, as it has been called, since, if true, it supersedes all further inquiry. It has been very fully discussed of late years. In common with many others I took part in these discussions, and I have certainly not changed my opinion concerning it. I still believe it to be a portion of Divine truth fully sanctioned by the Word of God, and therefore never to be abandoned or denied, that on obligation lies upon nations and

their rulers to have respect in the regulation of their national affairs and in the application of national resources to the authority of God's Word, to the welfare of the Church of Christ, and the interests of true religion.'

Did that man make those frivolous distinctions betwixt a representative government and a patriotic government? Did that man not know that the Word of God, in its general principles, is applicable to all kinds of governments? And did that man make the distinction we are now making between the recognition of the Church and the support of the Church? That is a distinction which has been lately invented; it had no existence at the time of the former struggle. Reference has been made to Dr. McCrie, and I can dispose of this reference in a very satisfactory way. I hold in my hand the Life of Dr. McCrie, by his son; and, in a letter to a brother anxious to vindicate the Reformation cause without committing himself on the subject of Church Establishments, he says: –

"I can only say that I am fully satisfied, not only of the lawfulness of Establishments in the abstract, but also of that which was adopted by our Reforming ancestors. I consider it as entering essentially into the Reformation, for which Seceders have always contended; and I am persuaded that any defence of it which excludes this must not only be defective, but must be inconclusive and unsatisfactory to all intelligent persons of whatever sentiments. I despair of seeing any satisfactory defence of the permanent obligation of our covenants that does not proceed on this principle."

He condemned the abuses which clung to our Establishments, not the principle of an Establishment. Not only so, 'but (says his son) the sentiments he held both on the Voluntary question and that of returning to the communion of the Established Church are expressed in the address by the Synod of the Original Seceders, entitled 'Vindication of the

principles of the Church of Scotland, in relation to the questions presently agitated' – published in 1834 – which passed through his hands before it was submitted to the Synod or the public. That address has become very scarce, but I have a copy of it in my hand. Here, under a variety of heads, Voluntaryism, in all its phases, is most emphatically condemned by the Synod of Original Seceders, and amongst other reasons, it is condemned as an unscriptural scheme. The extract is as follows: – 'As we have already remarked, Dr. McCrie's sentiments on this question went much deeper than merely approving of a civil establishment of religion, in the ordinary sense of that expression. The grand principle for which he contended was, that it is the right and duty (two things which he viewed as iden-tical) of a nation in its collective capacity, as well as of a man in his individual capacity, to decide on the true religion, and having decided, to recognise and countenance the profession of it. He was persuaded that the Voluntary principle was not only untenable, but was incapable of defence, except on grounds inconsistent with a belief in divine revelation, and indirectly, but infallibly, leading to infidelity. The civil ratification of a peculiar form of religion he looked upon merely as a corollary from the principle we have stated; and as to the endowment of the Church, this he regarded merely as a subsidiary arrangement, highly desirable where it could be obtained, but the expediency of which, in all circumstances of a Church or State, he was not disposed to maintain.'

The close of Dr. Begg's speech, which consisted chiefly of extracts, some of them proving that leaders on the opposite side have sadly changed their views, or are now ready to compromise them, was in the following terms: – And now, Moderator, I shall say a word in conclusion. Men seem to imagine that their neighbours are excited when they themselves show considerable indications of excitement. I do not profess to be very excited. I have had a long apprenticeship at this kind of work. (Laughter.) But I must say that I felt more keenly after last Assembly than ever

I did at any event in the whole course of my life – except deaths in my own family. I felt most bitterly, as if the whole vision which had floated before me – a vision of glory in connection with the Free Church of Scotland – was gradually veiled in darkness. (Hear, hear.) I made some sacrifices in joining this Free Church. I do not refer to my pleasant manse at Liberton – to the bringing out of my family on a wet and stormy day, for I had determined to come out on that very day and I could stay no longer. (Applause.) But I left some of my dearest relations behind me – my father, my brother, my father-in-law, my brother-in-law. I came out almost alone, but I did it because I could not do otherwise. [At this point Dr. Begg became much affected and was obliged to make a considerable pause, during which he received the cheers of the audience.] You may say hard things about what we are doing or attempting to do for the purpose of arresting what we believe to be a mighty calamity for Scotland and for the world. – (Applause.) But, Sir, I would, with my views, as soon subscribe a renunciation of all right in the Covenant of Grace, as I would be a party to anything by which the glory of Christ as King of the nations should be called in question. (Applause.) I look to that as next to the Headship of Christ over the Church, the grandest truth in the Word of God, the hope of the Church, and ultimately the jubilee of the world. I never will cease to look forward to that event – I never will compromise – I never will lay down that testimony. In the threatening signs of the times I hear the loudest call to our Church after the struggle of centuries, 'Hold fast that which thou hast, let no man take thy crown;' and, for one, I hope to have grace to be faithful, and to re-echo till death the beautiful language of two of our greatest poets – 'Come forth from thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth; take up that unlimited sceptre which thy Father hath bequeathed thee, for now the voice of thy bride calleth thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed.'

'Come then, and, added to thy many crowns,
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,
Thou who alone art worthy! It was thine
By ancient covenant, ere Nature's birth;
And thou hast made it thine by purchase since,
And overpaid its value with thy blood.'

Referring to the debate from which we have given the preceding extracts, the *Watchword* remarks, 'It must be very gratifying to the opponents of unscrupulous union to observe the number of distinguished men who, for the first time, declared themselves on that side of the question, – in particular,the open adhesion to the cause of such men as Dr. James Buchanan, Dr. Bruce, Dr. Duncan, and Professor Smeaton, cannot fail to have great weight with the country!

PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND.

This court met at Raymond Terrace on Wednesday, 1st instant, and was duly constituted with prayer by the Moderator. *Sederunt,* Rev. James McCulloch, Moderator, Rev. W. S. Donald; and Mr. Samuel Porter, Elder. The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed. A numerously signed call from the congregation at Rockymouth, Clarence River, in fav-our of the Rev. Duncan McInnes, was laid on the table and sustained. The call was then put into the hands of Mr. Mc-Innes, by the Moderator. Mr. McInnes having craved time to consider the matter, the Presbytery agreed to defer the final disposal of the call until next meeting of the court, which was appointed to take place at East Maitland, on Wednesday, the 15th instant, Mr. Donald was appointed to give ministerial supplies at Singleton on the 6th, and at Clarence Town and Seaham on the 12th instant.

404

The Presbytery met at the Presbyterian Schoolhouse, East Maitland, on the 15th instant. There were present, Rev. James McCulloch, Moderator, Rev. W. S. Donald, and Messrs. McDonald and Porter, Elders. The Presbytery resumed consideration of the call from the congregation at Rockymouth, Clarence River, to the Rev. D. McInnes. Mr. McInnes, on being asked, intimated his acceptance of said call. Whereupon the Presbytery proceeded to prescribe to him trial discourses with a view to his ordination. Mr. Donald was appointed to preach at Singleton on the 19th, and at Clarence Town on the 26th inst.; and Mr. McInnes was appointed to preach at Seaham on the 26th inst. The Presbytery is to meet (D. V.) on the 24th inst.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 35 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, AUGUST, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES.

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 35 AUGUST. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Confession of Sins … … … … …	405
The Discussion on Union in the Free Church Assembly … … 407	
Pastoral Reminiscences … … … …	410
The Use of Instrumental Music in the Worship of God … …	412
The Use of Uninspired Hymns in the Worship of God … …	413
Correspondence – Moderatism in Victoria … … …	414
Ecclesiastical Intelligence … … … …	415

CONFESSION OF SIN.

If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. – 1 John 1: 9.

We are familiar with the truth – that sin is the cause of all the evils that have overtaken us, and of our exposure to future and further evils. When man was first created God blessed him and he was therefore blessed – happy as well as holy. But when he sinned he fell, – he fell under guilt and under the curse attached to sin; he fell under the power and into the pollution of sin, and thus into a state of degradation and misery. By one man sin ent- ered into the world, and death, – evil in all its forms, – by sin.

Of the power which sin thus has, and which sin alone has, of bringing evil upon us, it cannot be and never is deprived, until God "forgives us our sins and cleanses us from all unrighteousness" But God will deal thus with us only when we confess our sins. Thus the confession of our sins is of absolute necessity and will be attended with unspeakable advantage. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." We propose now to consider the confession here intended, to present considerations by which you should be influenced to make it, and to give you same directions respecting it.

I. The confession of our sins is the acknowledgment of them to God, with the right views and feelings with respect to them. God charges us with the sins of which we have been guilty, he represents to us the sinfulness and ill-desert of them, and to con- fess them is to acknowledge to God with the right exercises of soul, that we are chargeable with them, and that the sinfulness and ill-desert of them are such as he represents them to be, – that, while all sin is exceeding sinful, there has been much to aggravate the sinfulness of our sins, and that by them we have deserved the death which is the wages of sin.

Such is the general character of the confession of sin. To impart greater definiteness to our views of it let it be observed –

1. That confession should be full, – diminishing nothing from the number or from the sinfulness of our sins. Confession to be full must be the confession of all our sins, and not of some of them only. If, from ignorance of the character and law of God, or of our own character and ways, or from self partiality, or any other cause, we fail or refuse to regard some of our sins, at sins, our confession is not full. There are various sinful practices which multitudes refuse to regard as sinful, – various forms of sin which they refuse to regard as forms of it. They may have misgivings respecting them, but they do not allow those misgivings to assume the character and acquire the force of convictions; for then a practical change to which they are averse would become inevitable. Now persons who thus flatter and justify themselves in ways that are not good, cannot make a full confession. It may be objected that a full confession is impossible inasmuch as many of our sins are unknown to us., Many of them escaped our notice, and, many of them of which we took notice we have forgotten. If, however, we have been awakened to a due sense of sin we see enough in the state of our hearts, and in what we know of our lives, to discover to us that the portion of our lives, which the notice we have taken and our remembrance of it does not enable us to survey, has been full of sin; from what we know we learn the character of what we have forgotten or failed to observe, and thus, as it were, know our unknown sins. Such was the case with David when he said – "Innumerable evils have compassed me about: mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head: therefore my heart faileth me." Ps. 40: 12

And as we must diminish nothing from the number, so we must diminish nothing from the sinfulness of our sins. Instead of framing apologies for them, and seeking to extenuate and excuse them, we must have an adequate sense of there exceeding sinfulness; and, particularly we must recognise that they deserve and that we deserve for them the punishment of eternal death; that God is "justified when he speaks" in condemnation of us, "and clear when he judges. Ps. 51: 4.

That our confession may be full, it must extend to the depravity of our nature as well as to the sins of our lives. Thus David in his confession says, "Behold I was shapen in ini-quity, and in sin did my mother conceive me;" and the Apostle Paul says of himself and of his fellow believers of

the Jewish nation, "among whom we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Eph. 2: 3.
406

2. Confession must be sincere and ingenuous. A mere verbal confession, – a confession that does not proceed from the heart, and that is therefore hypocritical, is of no avail; it is a mocking of God. In confessing our sins we must remember that we have to do with the all seeing God, with him who searches the hearts and tries the reins of the children of men, and who "requires truth in the inward parts."

That our confession may be thus sincere and ingenuous it must express the feelings with which sin ought to be regarded, such as sorrow on account of it and hatred of it. If it does not grieve us in our hearts that we have sinned, – that we have borne the character and acted the part of enemies to God in our minds and by wicked works, and that we have thus dishonored him, and if we do not regard sin as an abominable and hateful thing, we cannot confess it,

Thus our confession must be the expression of love to God. It cannot grieve us that we have dishonored him by our sins if we do not love him.

3. We must confess our sins in faith. It is when sinners look on him whom they have pierced – obtain a view of Christ – that they mourn for their sins. When Christ says of the spirit that "He will convince the world of sin," he adds, "of sin, because they believe not on me." Now men cannot feel that they are sinners because they believe not in Christ, until they recognise the duty of believing in him; and when they really recognise the duty of believing in Christ, they already believe in him. It is only when men attain to a knowledge of the mercy of God in Christ – and none attain to that knowledge without faith – that their hearts are melted to penitence, and that they confess their sins. Such is the nature of the confession here intended.

II. Let us now direct our attention to some considerations by which you should be influenced to make it; and first to the benefits attached to it. "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Here it is proper to consider the benefits themselves, and the connection between the bestowal of them and the confession of sin. The evils which sin brings upon us are twofold – (1) guilt and exposure to wrath and punishment, and (2) spiritual death and the corruption and defilement which it implies. Accordingly, the benefits by which those evils are removed, and the operation of sin in producing them abolished, are also twofold – (1) forgiveness of sin, and (2) cleansing from all unrighteousnness.

In forgiving sin God cancels the guilt contracted by committing it, and remits the punishment due to it. Sin is recorded before God as in a book, and, when he forgives, he blots it out – obliterates the record of it. Sin is before him as a memorial reminding him that punishment is due to those who committed it, and crying or the execution of this punishment, and then he forgives it, he blots it out as a cloud, and as a thick cloud, so that no trace of it any longer appears. To convey the same idea, he is said to cast it behind his back and remember it no more. Those to whom God forgives their sins are no longer liable to any of the penal evils attached to sin. But, in forgiving them their sins, God does more than deliver them from liability to those evils. He makes them accepted in Christ, and thus confers on them a right to all the blessings of salvation. God ever justifies those to whom he forgives their sins.

2. The second benefit is cleansing from all unrighteousness. By unrighteousness is here meant unrighteousness of the moral character, and by cleansing from it is meant purification from the defilement of sin, and restoration to holiness. When God forgives sin and makes those to whom he forgives it accepted in Christ, he gives them a right to the inheritance of the saints in light, and, when he cleanses them from all unrighteousness, he

renders them meet for that inheritance. It is the inheritance of the saints and he makes them saints.

The bestowal of these benefits by God is guaranteed by his faithfulness and justice. He has promised to bestow them upon all who will believe in Christ, as those who confess their sins do, and he will fulfil his promise. "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good." – Num. 23: 19. His justice also requires that he bestow them. Those who confess their sins and believe in Christ become interested in his atonement, and thus entitled to the blessings which he purchased for his people with his blood. There is thus a twofold connection between confession of sin and the bestowal of the blessings specified and promised. The confession of sin fulfils the condition on which these blessings are promised. Those who confess their sins, and, – for this is implied in their confessing them, – believe in Christ, acquire a right to the promised blessings.

While you shall gain so much by confessing you shall gain nothing by not confessing them. You shall not by not confessing your sins preserve them from being known. They are known already to God to whom you are required to confess them. He knows all things. To his eyes all things are naked and open. He knows not only such of your sins as assumed the form of outward acts, but even such of them as consisted in thoughts and desires, in dispositions, inclinations, and principles. He knows all your sins of every kind, and all the circumstances of all your sins. He knows them far more fully and thoroughly than you by confession can lay them before him. Thus by not confessing them you do not gain any advantage you might have by concealing them. You cannot conceal them; they are already known.

By not confessing our sins you increase the guilt you contracted by committing them. When you do not confess them you still cherish the spirit from which they emanated, and by doing so contract guilt. But further when you do not confess your sins you justify them, – you virtually say that you do not regard them as sins, that you do not regret your having committed them. By thus justifying them and approving of them you virtually repeat them.

On the other hand, by confessing your sins you assume the right attitude towards the sins you confess and towards all sin. You do so in two respects. You regard your sins with sorrow, and all sin with hatred. You regard your sins as committed against God, and recognise the necessity of dealing with him respecting them, and, accordingly, you express to him your abhorrence of sin, and your sorrow for the dishonor you have done to him by it. You come thus to be of one mind with God respecting your own sins and all sin. By confession you enter into communication with God, and bring your heart and life under the influence of his realised presence, authority, and claims.

III. Directions. 1. Acquaint yourselves with your sins. That you may confess you must know them. That you may know them and form a correct estimate of them – (1) Review your past lives – study your own history – survey the opportunities you have enjoyed and have not improved, or have not improved adequately, the obligations under which you have been laid and which you have not discharged – in a

word set in order before you your sins of commission and omission. (2) See that you regard all your sins as sins. The habit of denying with respect to many sins that they are sins is very prevalent, and does much mischief. Men's casuistry is often very perverse and deceptive. By its aid they regard certain 407 sins as no sins; and certain other sins, which at the outset they admit to be sins, they so extenuate, excuse, and justify that they persuade themselves and would persuade others that, in the circumstances and all things considered, they are no sins. The language they hold with respect to them is to this affect, – such a proceeding certainly is not quite right, but, still, in the circumstances, there was nothing else for it; such a course cannot be fully defended, it was open no doubt to some objections, but then – and the sin justifying casuistry follows. Now you must have done with this, and regard as sin all that is sin. (3) Consider the aggravations of your sins. They were committed against right. They were committed against strong inducements to act a contrary part. They were committed in violation of promises and engagements, baptismal promises and engagements, promises made at the Lord's table and by being there, promises made in times of affliction and in circumstances of danger, promises made when hearing God's word and when dealt with seriously by friends. (4) Recognise that your sins were committed against God and that you have to come to an understanding with him respecting them.

2. Acquaint yourselves with the mercy of God in Christ. The believing contemplation of it will soften your hearts, will discover to you the exceeding sinfulness of your sins, and will encourage you to approach God to confess them.

3. Recognise that God knows your sins and that he will shortly, if you do not obtain the pardon of them, deal with you in judgment with respect to them.

THE DISCUSSION ON UNION IN THE FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLY.

It might seem incredible that a large majority should maintain, in the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, that the doctrine of a civil establishment of religion is no part of the testimony of that Church; yet such is the fact. The General Assembly of 1867 declared by a large majority, that it is "no bar to union" between the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church that by the latter Church this doctrine is denied; that is, in other words; that it will be right and proper for the Free Church to take part in forming and to merge itself in a Church, by which this doctrine will not be held. In support of this view it is urged that the doctrine in question, inasmuch as the office-bearers of the Free Church are not required, on the occasion of their ordination, to profess in express terms that they believe it, is not comprehended in the testimony of the Free Church, – that it does not form a put of that testimony. This mode of arguing, however, we are constrained to regard as little better than mere quibbling and logomachy. The office-bearers of the Established Church of Scotland, by becoming office-bearers of an Established Church, declared in the most distinct and unequivocal manner that they held the doctrine of a civil establishment of religion. It was not necessary, therefore, that; in the questions put to them and in the formula which they subscribed on the occasion of their ordination, they should make this declaration in terms. But the Free Church of Scotland claims to be the true representative of the Church of Scotland; it claims, indeed, to be itself the true Church of Scotland, and therefore it calls itself the Free Church *of Scotland*, and not the Free Church; it claims to be identical with the historical Church of Scotland in everything whatever but this, that, because of the injustice with which it has been treated, it does not now enjoy the benefits of civil establishment. Accordingly, if it is indeed what it thus claims to be, its office-bearers, by becoming office-bearers of it, irrespectively of the questions they answer and the formula they sign, declare that they hold the doctrine of a civil establishment of religion. Prior to the disruption the office-bearers of the Church of Scotland made this declaration by the very fact of their becoming office-bearers of it, declare, by doing so, that they hold that doctrine, the Free Church is not identical with the ante-disruption Church of Scotland.

The testimony of a Church is just its *testimony*. If a Church *testifies* and maintains, in any of the ways in which this may be legitimately done, and, especially, if it *testifies* and maintains with great earnestness and throughout its entire history, that certain doctrines are true and important, those doctrines, even though it do not by the express terms of its formula take its office-bearers bound to hold and profess them, are, clear-ly, a part of its testimony. The Church of Scotland, of which the Free Church claims to be the true representative, always held that, under certain circumstances, it is the duty of the State to establish and endow the Church, and that, the State agreeing to perform this duty, it is right and proper for the Church to accept establishment and endowment at its hands. It deliberately and earnestly taught the civil magistrate in Scotland that, in the circumstances in which the reformation placed that country, it was his duty to establish and endow the Church, and, the civil magistrate proceeding to act on this view of his duty, it gladly accepted the advantages which his establishment and endowment of it conferred. It thus *testified,* in the most explicit, emphatic, and solemn manner that, under certain circumstances, it is the duty of the State to establish and endow the Church. This testimony, accordingly, is not only a part, but a most prominent part, of its whole historical testimony. It was early constituted and all along it continued to constitute such a part of its testimony.

To get rid of this conclusive proof that the doctrine of a civil establishment of religion formed from the outset a part of the testimony of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Candlish seems to ascribe the fact, that that Church sought and obtained for itself, from the commencement of its history; the position of an established and endowed Church, to the influence of traditional prejudice or imperfect enlightenment. "Let it be remem- bered," he says, "that from the very beginning the Church of Scotland was *de facto* – in point of fact – an established and an endowed Church. The idea of any other kind of Church was not entertained. It was never dreamed of in these times. The Church, as constituted at the Reformation, was the only sort of Church that men then could have any idea of – namely, a national Church, – namely, a Church established and endowed by national authority and by national resources. That was the beginning of the Church." Yes, it was its beginning; but it was its beginning because it intelligently and deliberately, under the guidance of the Word of God, chose, and used means to secure, that it should be its beginning. It began its course as an established and endowed Church, not, as he alleges, – paying by the allegation but a sorry compliment to the founders of it, – because "the idea of any other kind of Church was not entertained," but because "the idea" of such a Church was acquired from the Bible, – acquired thus both by the Church and the State. Accordingly, by occupying the position of an established and endowed Church, it testified, in the clearest and most deliberate manner, that, at least in such circumstances as were dealt with in its own case, it is the duty of the State to establish and endow the Church.

But evident as this is, – and it could not well be more evident, – Dr. Candlish, under the influence apparently of

conveniently, we do not say intentionally, erroneous views as to what constitutes testifying, denies it. "What," he asks, "was the testimony which the Church [of Scotland] had to bear from the very beginning? What was the first point on which the Church had to testify – the doctrine of a civil establishment and endowment of the Church of Christ? Nothing of the sort. She

was in the position of an established and endowed Church at the time. But nobody raised this question. It was never raised in those days." But it is not all necessary in order that a testimony may be borne, that the doctrine which it proclaims should be called in "question" or controverted. When a Church proclaims any doctrine, whether the doctrine proclaimed be controverted or not, and especially when it so proclaims it that it acquires and bears permanently the character of a Church by which it is proclaimed, it *testifies* or bears a *testimony* in terms of that doctrine. Now the Church of Scotland, by claiming, accepting, and occupying the position of an established and endowed Church, proclaimed in the clearest and most unequivocal manner that it is the duty of the civil magistrate, under such circumstances as its case presented, to establish and endow the Church; and, therefore, it testified or bore a testimony in terms of that doctrine. It bore this testimony not only notwithstanding "it was in the position of an established and endowed Church," but by the very fact that it was in that position. The assumption is wholly arbitrary and inadmissible that the due and steadfast proclamation of the truth is not a bearing of testimony if opposition be not encountered. The proclamation of the truth is in its own nature a bearing of testimony. Men naturally are ignorant of the truth and dislike it. They are naturally unwilling to submit themselves to its influence and control. And even those who embrace it are by no means free from a tendency to relapse into their former relations to it. Besides the truth asserts the claims of God; and men are naturally disposed to reject his claims. Thus, there is always much to be counteracted and overcome by the truth; in other words the truth always encounters opposition, and, therefore, on Dr. Candlish's own theory, which, however, we do not adopt, the proclamation of it always constitutes a bearing of testimony. Accordingly, while Dr. Candlish is right, and we concur with him, in recognising that the Church of Scotland was engaged in "testifying, testifying, testifying," as he expresses it, "from year to year, and from generation to generation, ... for the independence of the Church and the sole authority of the Lord Jesus in his own house," the distinction, by which he seeks to confine the "testifying" of the Church to cases in which, as in maintaining its own independence, it encountered open developed opposition, is wholly arbitrary and baseless. The Church's entire exhibition of truth for the purpose of imparting and preserving a thorough-ly scriptural character to men's views and practice is a bearing of testimony. Accordingly the Church of Scotland, by claiming and occupying the position of an established Church, testified for civil establishments of religion; and it testified for them also in "testifying for the independence of the Church," for it bore this latter testimony in the way of contending for its own independence, not simply as Church, but as an established Church.

If the Free Church, therefore, is the true Church of Scotland, a testimony for the civil establishment of religion is an integral and essential portion of its historical testimony. And it has again and again since the disruption borne in the most articulate and solemn manner the testimony which it has thus inherited. This is notorious and has often been proved. It was proved by Dr. Begg in the Union debate in last Assembly, as the following extract from his speech shews.

"It has always seemed to me that in reference to our Free Church we must not look merely at the Confession of Faith, important as it is, but, fairly to consider the question, we must look at the whole circumstances connected with the origination of our Free Church, and the public assurance given in regard to the principles which this Church would maintain. As an honest man, having gone over various districts of Scotland, and expounded to the best of my ability the principles of the Church in connection with which I asked the people to join her, I feel bound by these

declarations, apart from the fact of having subscribed some of them. Now, for example, I should like to know if the engagement entered into in 1840 is supposed to have lost all its virtue. It says: – 'Further, with reference to the question respecting civil Establishments of religion, which we believe to be deeply and vitally concerned in the present contendings of the Church, we feel ourselves called upon to bear this testimony that we hold sacred the principle of Establishments, as sanctioned both by reason and by the Word of God, and recognize the obligation of civil rulers to support and endow the Church, and the lawfulness and expediency of the Church receiving countenance from the State.' On this solemn intimation by our ministers, the great body of the people were asked to join the Free Church. I hold that document imperatively binds us unless some reason can be given to the contrary. Then we have the reasons of the Convocation of ministers, and I discovered lately two documents which seem to me to be of very peculiar interest. I refer, first, to the pastoral address issued by authority of the Special Commission of the Church of Scotland, 'in terms of the deliverance of 21st March last,' on 25th April, 1843 – less than a month before the Disruption. Part of it lays down in the strongest terms the principle of a Church Establishment: – 'In his ordinary civil administration, the civil magistrate, owning Christ as the King of Kings, and Prince of the kings of the earth, is bound to have respect to His laws, and to aim at the advancement of His glory. The spirit of Christianity ought to pervade all the political institutions, and all the public transactions of his kingdom, and whatever is done should be sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer (Ps. 32: 3, Ps. 85: 2, 2 Sam. 23: 3). But, in addition, the Christian mag-istrate, as one of the kings of the earth, of whom Christ is Prince, is to interest himself directly in the affairs of Christ's kingdom, and to act as the guardian of religion in the land. In that capacity he has many important functions to discharge in reference to the Church ; and he has authority, as the minister of God for good, to take measures for preserving peace and order in the Church – for reforming abuses, and remedying grievances, for guarding purity of doctrine and discipline, and for supplying the means of grace in efficiency and abun-dance through the ministrations of the Church to the people under his dominion (Isa. 49: 23, 2 Kings 18: 4, 2 Chron. 19: 8, John 18: 37. and John 19: 11).' That was sent down to the members and friends of the Free Church by the General Assembly, and was signed by Dr. Gordon, the Moderator. I ask – did we, when we sent it down, expect our people to believe it, and are we now to say, that the doctrine has no binding obligation upon us? Here is another document, of the existence of which I was not aware till lately, but it is very significant. You have often heard repeated the speech of Dr. Chalmers, from the chair of the first Free Assembly, on the subject of Voluntaryism and Establishments. In his speech, sent down by special authority on the 20th May, 1843, and by authority of the General Assembly, there occur the following sentences: – 'To be more plain let me be more particular. The Voluntaries mistake us if they conceive us to be Voluntaries. We hold the duty of

Government to give of their resources and their means for the maintenance of a Gospel ministry in the land, and we pray that their eyes may be opened, so that they may learn how to acquit themselves as the protectors of the Church, and not as its corrupters or its tyrants.' By and by we had a difficulty in obtaining sites for places of worship, and one of the last things he did was to appear before the Committee of the House of Commons, where he was catechised by the noble lord now on the other side of this House: – '6377. I believe we may generally say, that during all your life you have been a strong friend of the mainten- 409
ance of the institutions of this country. In your opinion do you look upon the Free Church as safe and salutary with respect to the political and established institutions of this country, or do you consider that any danger may be apprehended in reference to those institutions, from the Free Church being allowed, by granting sites and other legitimate indulgences, to follow the course which the consciences of the people feel to be the right one? – I think that all the doctrines and all the doings of the Free Church are on the side of social order and the wellbeing of society; and I cannot imagine that the existence of the Free Church can have anything like a hostile influence upon the established institutions of the country. And I may observe, that is not exclusively ours, for I believe it belongs to the English Methodists as well as to us, and also to older dissenting denominations in Scotland. We of the Free Church are not Voluntaries, and I confess to you that I should look with a sigh to the demolition of the framework either of the framework either of the Scotch or English Establishment. Grant an Establishment upon right principles, and, if well worked, it is the most efficient of all machinery for pervading the people with religion; and it marks the exceeding strength of our principle, that we have dissented from the Establishment in Scotland, not *quasi* an Establishment, but from such an Establishment – a vitiating flaw having been inserted into it, which we think fatal to its character, and fatal also to the efficacy of its ministrations; so that I believe there is not a body in Christendom who gives such a strong testimony in favour of the principle of an Establishment as the Free Church of Scotland. Here we are incurring the utmost dislike from the Voluntaries on the one hand, and from the actual friends of the Establishment on the other, and yet we will not let go the principle that it is the duty of the Government to provide for the religious education of the people, and it is thus, too, that best effect is given to the territorial principle, by which to reclaim the masses. '6378. Sir J. Graham – On principle, you are a great friend to the Church established in connection with the state? I am.' Well, I say it is necessary to look at these documents as well as the more formal documents of our Church, in order fully to understand our principles. It has always seemed to me that, notwithstanding what has been said frequently, our Confession of Faith does bind us in a very direct way to hold not only the Headship of Christ over the nations, but also that principle as applying to the theory of Establishments. The passage I refer to is the 23rd chapter, 3rd section, regarding which Dr. Cunningham says: – The words do not naturally or commonly mean more than that the civil magistrate is entitled and bound to aim at or seek to effect the different objects here specified, which are all comprehended under the general heads of the welfare of religion and purity and prosperity of the Church of Christ. This is just the principle of National Establishments, which we believe to be not only true but important! (Hear, hear.) I have always believed the same, and I am not moved in the slightest degree by the argument which has been adduced on the subject of the text; for if the text can be capable of such a construction as has been put upon it, can be pointed in the direction of persecution, we are protected from that by the terms of the formula, but we are not protected if we deny the doctrine of ecclesiastical Establishments itself. Dr. Candlish has told us that if we hold these texts we must hold the texts in reference to the old Jewish Sabbath, which implied capital punishment in the case of a man who violated it. I was astonished to hear such an argument from Dr. Candlish. We know there are two views of the moral law in the Old Testament. The moral law was not the theocracy; by the civil law, also, men were punished for violating the Sabbath, on the ground of having violated the statute law of Judea; and the moral law, as it is now, stands dissociated from the peculiarities of the system which prevailed at that time, both as a theoc-

racy and as a system of types and shadows which have been fulfilled. Therefore there is no force whatever in that idea. Dr. Candlish says, more-over, that the Free Church of Scotland has always contended for the doctrine of the spiritual independence, for the Headship of Christ over the Church. No doubt, but why? Because that is the doctrine which has been chiefly opposed since the Reformation in Scotland; but now it seems as if the other doctrine was the one which would constitute the present truth. It is the doctrine which is is called in question, and I hold the church is just as much bound to testify specially for it, as she has always testified for it as part of her testimony. She is specially bound now, because it is called in question."

Dr. Begg's concluding observations refer to the practical bearing of the virtual voluntaryism advocated by the majority, and are far more important than the great bulk of those to whom they were addressed seemed to recognize.

"It will not do," he said, "to say that this is only a question of endowments. Besides that, you have a very large question; and it is that one which is agitating this nation at the present moment; for if you make open questions of the principle of a Church Establishment, and of the duty of the State to recognize the Church and the creed of the Church, then I say you are at the beginning of a revolution. (Loud cries of 'Oh, oh,' and some cries of 'Yes, yes.') And when those various institutions, none of which I will defend on its merits (cries of 'Hear, hear') – except the Presbyterian Church of Ireland – when these institutions are not only disendowed but disestablished – and it is a very singular thing that the people outside understand the distinction – when the Government of the country are prepared to say that they hold no doctrine in regard to the Divine Word as between Protestantism and Popery when they are placed between their Voluntary friends on the one side and their Romish friends on the other – when you have the State in that position of professed neutrality, then, I say, you have a state of things in which no rulers can remain. Has not Christ said – 'He that is not with me is against me' – and 'he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad' (Applause.) You will find that the Romanists will leave their allies when they come into that state, and then you will not only be at the beginning of the rebellion, but you will see, as has already been the cue, an assault made on the throne itself. (Loud hisses, general cries of 'oh, oh,' and faint applause.) Yes, I repeat, that an assault has been made on the Throne; and I defy any true voluntary to defend the Protestant succession on his own principles. (Applause, drowned by hisses and demonstrations of impatience.) Is the Queen not to have her own mind in regard to religion as well as her people – (loud cries of 'Oh, oh') – and if the State is to be neutral, and not to recognize Protestant truth in some form as opp- osed to Popish error, then I say the Constitution is subverted, and we see the beginning of the end. (Applause and renewed demonstrations

of impatience.) Let those who are concerned for the best interests of their country, and those who have anything to lose, look well to it – (oh, oh) – for rest assured you are dealing with a question which has great issues even as regards our own land; and what of the world? what of the vast interests of the immense family of mankind? That passage – the Kings shall be nursing fathers, and their Queens nursing mothers – has not reference to the past, but to the future. And all those glorious promises of the Old Testament remain yet to be fulfilled in the experience of nations and of the Churches. (Hear, hear, and applause.) But, in the meantime, the greatest sin of nations is just casting off the authority of Christ – is just the saying, 'We will not take the Bible as our statute book, and we will not have Christ, the Prince of the Kings of the earth, to reign over us.' (Loud cheers.) And I hold 410

that our incumbent duty, not only as a Church of Christ, but as a Church of Christ whose special honour and glory is to maintain the testimony of the whole Headship of Christ, and that too at the present moment, when the testimony of other Churches is suspected, because they have an interest in maintaining the temporalities – I say that, in these circumstances, it is all the more our incumbent duty, when we can do it without suspicion, and without a shadow of reproach, to stand fast by this great truth, and to lift up this banner before the nations. (Loud applause:) And rest assured, whether we do so or not, deliverance will come from another quarter, (Hear, hear.) He 'will overturn, overturn, overturn,' but at length 'He shall come whose right it is to reign.' (Applause.)

His name for ever shall endure,
Last like the sun it shall;
Men shall be blessed in Him, and blessed
All nations shall Him call.
And blessed be the Lord our God,
The God of Israel,
For He alone doth wondrous works,
In glory that excel;
And blessed be His glorious name
To all eternity,
The whole earth let His glory fill,
Amen – so let it be.

(Dr. Begg resumed his seat amid loud cheers.)

PASTORAL REMINISCENCES.

There is something venerable about old age which tends, under certain circumstances, to produce reverence and respect. It is true that there are some whose declining years are spent in carelessness, or even in the practice of some degrading vice; and when this is the case, although one may pity an old grey-headed transgressor, descending to the grave in his transgression or carelessness, yet one can hardly respect him. We talk of sad sights, or mournful sights, but it will be long before we see any sight so mournful as a hoary-haired offender impenitent and unconcerned on the eve of his dissolution. This sight has been well described in the affecting lines, –

Behold a man three score and ten,
Upon his dying bed;
He's run his race, and got no grace –
An awful sight, indeed!

The Scripture teaching on the subject of old age is, that it is to be honored. We are to stand up, it is said, before the face of the old man, and reverence the hoary head. There is a beautiful illustration of this teaching carried into effect mentioned in the book of Job. The account of the matter is as follows; – Now Elihu had waited till Job had spoken, because they were older than he. And Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, answered and said, – I am young and ye are very old, wherefore I was afraid, and durst not show you mine opinion. I said days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom. Behold, I waited for your words, I gave ear to your reasons. Such was the way in which this youth of olden time treated those who were his seniors, and his example is well worth the attention and imitation of youth in these modern days. It may be said, however, that as a general rule, there is something in the character and demeanour of those who are truly pious, which ensures respect for them in their old age, whether they be poor or rich. One of these venerable servants of God, who was well known and universally respected in the district where he resided was a was a bright example of what divine grace can do in producing meekness, gentleness, long suffering, and peace. It is thought by some that there is something about old age which tends to induce

a querulous fractiousness in those who are spared to see it; but one who was almost constantly with this old disciple during the three last years of his life, does not remember of having seen a frown on his face, or of having heard a murmur from his lips. Although he died in his ninety-third year, his mental faculties were in full vigour until within a few months of his departure; and it was a rare treat to hear him catechising his tenants on the Sabbath evenings, and explaining to them the various subjects which formed the matter for examination. Till within a few months of his death this aged patriarch was also regularly in the habit of conducting the worship in the family himself, and no one who was privileged to be present could fail to be impressed with the unction, and even with the correctness and beauty of the expressions employed by him in leading the prayers. It was truly wonderful in one who had seen the summers and winters of more than fourscore and ten years pass over him. It put one forcibly in mind of that saying in Psalm 92. – "The righteous shall flourish as the palm tree; he shall grow as the cedar of Lebanon. They shall bring forth fruit in old age. They shall be fat and flourishing." The time came at last when this aged disciple, like Simeon in the Gospel, was called upon to depart, having seen the salvation of God. When the stroke of the last Enemy smote him he endured great pain, but, as was to be expected, he endured it with becoming resignation and submission to the divine will. One of his family, when witnessing the severity of his sufferings, happened to say, "Oh! I am sorry to see you suffering in that manner." "Yes," said he, "I am suffering, but the cup which my heavenly father hath given me shall I not drink it?" During the three or four days that he lin-gered before giving up the ghost, he shewed while dying, as he had done while living, that he was to die the death of the righteous, and that his last end was to be like his. The individual already referred to as being constantly with him, while mourning, on the morning of his death, over the bereavement which had taken place, felt fully assured that the departed had entered into his rest, and had joined the general assembly of the first born above. Thus this aged Christian was cut down as a shock of corn fully ripe, and was gathered into the garner. Mark thou the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the latter end of that man is peace. The case which the writer would chiefly refer to in this paper, is that of an individual who died when he was somewhere about ninety years of age. This individual, whose name was B., was a plain uneducated man, being able to do little more than read his Bible, and write out in a poor hand his accounts. When he first came under notice he had a mill and a few acres of land on the estate of P. He usually went, according to his occupation, by

the designation of The Miller. He was well skilled in his profession, and was greatly respected for the thorough honesty with which he conducted his business. Owing to this latter qualification people had the utmost confidence in sending their oats to his mill, because they were sure that the worthy old man would neither take more than his proper allowance of *moulter*, nor mix their meal with any less valuable commodity. The Miller's business of meal making and meal selling brought him into contact both with the well-to-do farmers, and also with the poor labouring people in the neighbourhood; and he did not fail to form his ideas of men and things from what he saw in the management of his trade. His sympathies, perhaps naturally enough, were with the poor who had to buy food for themselves and their families, and who various occasions had scarcely the wherewithal to do so. One year in particular was remembered in the district – the times were very bad, and the price of meal – the poor's 411
staple of food – was excessively high. In these circumstances those who had to sell in any quantity made a good thing of it, but the labouring part of the people were very sorely tried; and it was with difficulty that they were able to pull through the long, dreary months of winter and spring. Next year, as it happened, the tables were turned, and the price of food was lowered to perhaps a third of what it was the previous season. This, of course, made the hearts of the poorer classes sing for joy, although it made some of the more grasping of the farmer class put on long faces, and complain that they were throwing their crop away, and that they would never be able to stand it, if such prices continued, and so forth. The worthy miller, whose mill had visits from both classes, heard the grumblings of the one, and the congratulations of the other, and he made his observations accordingly. On one occasion when talking over the matter and expressing his satisfaction at the turn which, in God's gracious providence, things had taken, he said that the rich folks were this year making a far greater outcry about the low prices, than the poor things did about the high prices the year before. He could not in his old kindly heart sympathise with the outcry about the low prices, as he had too much satisfaction in knowing that the poor things, as he called them, had abundance of the staff of life for themselves and their children. While in the mill the miller had, comparatively speaking, a full hand, and rarely, if ever, did the wayfaring poor go away unassisted from his door. But in this passing world there are many ups and downs, many changes and vicissitudes, and so it was the miller's lot to experience. In course of time his prosperous days came to an end. He had his years of plenty, and in God's providential dealings with him, he was called upon to endure years of scarceness, at least so far as his own means were concerned. After he had paid rent for the very long period of forty-nine years on the same estate for his mill and the few acres attached, a higher rent than he could afford to give was offered, and he was compelled to leave. After this, by one casualty or other, he lost in a few years all he had of earthly substance, and was reduced to live on charity. His previous good character then stood him in stead, shewing the truth of the Scripture declaration, that godliness is profitable for all things even for the life that now is. Those who formerly had dealings with the miller, and those who knew him and respected him for his worth, did not fail from time to time to minister to his necessities. It pleased God, therefore, that although this aged man and his wife, for perhaps as much as eight or ten years, lived, it may be said, entirely on charity, still they lived in comparative comfort. The old man, in speaking of this on one occasion when his minister took him some money, said with a full heart and a watery eye, that in God's gracious providence they had never wanted, that they had aye been provided for. Rich people who have all that heart can desire at their command, and who do not go a visiting among the poor, cannot and do not understand how the pious, God trusting poor feel upon receiving some seasonable supply of a few shillings or the present of some of life's necessaries from the hand of beneficence. The pious poor see the hand of God in these gifts as plainly almost as if they had had a revelation to the effect that God had sent them. Their hearts swell with an emotion, and with a sense of God's gracious care over them to which, perhaps, in their more prosperous days, they were strangers. They realise with a gush of feeling which cannot be described, that the Lord hath seen their distress, and that he has thought the thoughts of peace towards them. With all this they are not ungrateful to, or unmindful of, the instrument by which their wants have been relieved. It is quite the opposite. They are deeply grateful to the instrument, only they are most grateful to their Heavenly Father who, as they believe, put it into the instrument's mind to give them help. The writer has often listened with emotion to tales of

which the providential care of God was the theme, from the lips of those who were the subjects of that care, and who spoke of it to the praise of the glory of Almighty God. As an instance. It was related by a pious, devoted disciple, a widow lady, named Mrs. A., that after her husband's death she lived with her father and a sister. She stated that, while they were thus living together, the father, who had been a catechist in the highlands, and who was an eminently pious man, had fallen into bad health, and was sent, as the only resource, to some watering place in the hope that peradventure he might improve. Mrs. A. stated farther, that they were in straitened circumstances, and that when the time for the return of the father arrived, the two sisters found themselves altogether unable to provide the means for defraying the necessary expenses. In this difficulty the two sisters were one day sitting, talking over the distress they were in, and contriving what steps they could take in the matter, when a knock came to the door. Mrs. A. went to the door and found a respectable looking person standing there. He asked, are you Mrs. A.? and upon being answered in the affirmative, he said, I owed your husband some money, I was not able to pay it before he died, and I am now come to pay it to his widow. The money was paid and the stranger departed, and the two sisters fell down on their knees, and with thankful hearts and tearful eyes they acknowledged the gracious hand of God in thus so unexpectedly providing for them. These two sisters had not the slightest doubt that it was their father's God and their own God who thus manifested his tender mercy and loving kindness towards them. But to return, while the miller ascribed the temporal support which he received from many different quarters to the providential care of his Heavenly Father, he did not fail to look beyond the things which were seen and temporal, to the things which were unseen and eternal. It was most affecting to hear him, with his voice faltering with emotion, speaking in the broadest Aberdeenshire dialect of the suffering and dying of our adorable Saviour in the form and stead of such poor miserable sinful creatures as we are. There was, indeed, sometimes a wonderful impressiveness about his language when conversing on religious subjects, and giving his views of matters connected with eternity. On one occasion, for example, when he was talking with his minister about the last day and the solemn events then to be enacted, he said in his own language: It is an awful description of the day of judgment which is given by St. Peter in his epistles. He says that the heavens are to pass away with a great noise, and that the earth and all the things that are therein shall be burned up, but he added, The Lord will hide *a* his *ain* in the *neuk* of his tent, and naething will be permitted

to touch them – the'll be *a* safe. When the old man said that the Lord would hide all his own in the *neuk* of his tent, he no doubt had reference to the psalm which says, that he will hide us in his pavilion, and cover us with his feathers. One day when the miller was speaking of passing through the valley of the shadow of death, and of the solemnity connected with removing from time to eternity, he gave expression to the comfort which he personally had in the view of it, by saying, "but you see we know where we are going." In course of time he went the way of all the earth. He died an old man and full of days, and was gathered unto his people. His body, worn out and weary by the length of his journey, now sleeps in the graveyard of F., where six or eight children, and a number of grandchildren also slumber, until the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and come forth, some to the resurrection of life, and some to the resurrection of shame and everlasting contempt. Oh! that men were wise that they did consider this, that they laid to heart their latter end. It would be a blessed thing if 412
many like this man knew where they were going, and that there were none so hardened as neither to know nor care. Lord, so teach us to number our days as that we may apply our hearts to wisdom.

THE USE OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

The *worship* of the Christian Church has not been left to be determined by the mere judgments and imaginations of men. There are principles laid down, there are precepts given, there are examples recorded, which show the mind and will of Christ in this matter; and the statements of Paul, in regard to "will-worship" (Col. 2: 18-23), decisively prove that those who violate the purity of Christian worship, are not only those who introduce practices which God has *forbidden,* but those who introduce what God has not *authorised,* or *commanded.* There can be no meaning attached to the term, "will-worship," but that such "worship" rests, not on the "will" of *God,* but on the mere "will" or fancy of *man.* Now, in opposition to the divine enunciation in regard to "will-worship," the Church of England has admitted into its articles this principle, that it belongs to "the Church," of her own authority, to "decree rites and ceremonies" (Article xx). As a matter of historical fact, this principle was never agreed to by the Convocation that adopted the Thirty-nine Articles; this sentence being found neither in the first printed edition of the Articles, nor in the draft of them that passed the Convocation, and which is still in existence, with the autograph signatures of the members; but is believed to have been surreptitiously inserted by the hand of Queen Elizabeth herself, who had much of the overbearing spirit of her father, Henry VIII., and who, as Head of the Church, which the English Constitution made her, was det- ermined to have a pompous worship in that Church, under her ecclesiastical control. But, however that clause was introduced – once introduced, it has been the grand means of overlaying that Church with ceremonies which have no foundation in the Word of God, but are of the very *essence* of will-worship. Where, for instance, could any warrant be found in the Word of God, for men wheeling to the east in the midst of their devotions, making the sign of the cross in baptism, or kneeling in the Lord's Sup-per? Some of these things have been borrowed from the Papists, some from the Pagans, but, assuredly, none of them from the Scriptures. Where, also, in the worship of the Apostolic Church, is there the least hint of the use of instrumental music? In the Old Testament dispensation, such instrumental music was *appointed* in the service of God; but that was inseparably bound up with the worship of the *Temple,* which, says Paul, was "a worldly sanctuary" (Heb. 9: 1), which, with its (Gal. 4: 9) "beggarly elements" and "rudiments of this world" (Col 2: 20) was intended to last only "*until the time of reformation*" (Heb. 9: 10). That "time of reformation" came, when the Lord Jesus appeared to abolish the "worldly sanctuary," and set up the more "spiritual" dispensation of the Gospel Church. The "worldly sanctuary" of Judaism, with its sacrifices, and incense, and instrumental music, had a "glory" for the time that the wisdom of God saw fit that it should last – that is, while the Church was under age (Gal. 4: 1-3). But it had "no glory in comparison of the glory that excelleth," when the Church came to its full age, when the "worldly sanctuary" was done away, and when the spiritual sanctuary, or Gospel Church, was filled with the glorious indwelling of the fulness of the Spirit. With the abrogation of the "worldly sanctuary," the instrumental music, which, as much as the offering of sacrifice, was identified with it, and which was not used in the service of the synagogue, was equally abrogated. So certain is it that the instrumental music of Judaism was identified with the Temple service, that the Jews themselves have, ever since the destruction of the

Temple, till very recently, held it utterly unlawful to introduce such music into their synagogues; and when, about the beginning of the present century, an organ was, for the first time, introduced, nothing but the influential position of the individual concerned in its introduction, saved him from being summarily excommunicated. With this opinion of the Jews, in regard to the position of instrumental music, the practice of the Apostolic Church most exactly corresponded. We have reference in the New Testament, again and again, to the worship and praise of the Gospel Church – we read of "psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs," but never once do we read of these being accompanied by any instrument of music. In the Apocalypse, no doubt, we read of "harpers harping with their harps;" but the book where this occurs, is a symbolical book; and it would be absurd to understand it in any other than a symbolical sense. If the "harpers" are to be understood literally, the offering of "incense," referred to in that book, must be understood literally too. The beast with the seven heads and ten horns must be a literal beast, and the woman that sits on the back of it must be a literal woman. Who, in his senses, would contend for such a principle of interpretation in regard to these? But this must be contended for, and maintained, before any argument can be drawn from the "harpers" of the Book of Revelation, in favor of the use of instrumental music in the Gospel Church. We have statements from uninspired men, coming down to the end of the third century, and even later, in regard to Christian worship and psalmody; and, even till then, there is evidence that there was no such thing as instrumental accompaniments to the praise. Of course, I do not adduce the evidence of these early Christian writers, as if *their* authority was any proof of the right or the ,wrong on this question; but only as bearing testimony in regard to a matter of fact, about which they could not be mistaken; and which, once admitted to be a fact, can be accounted for only on the supposition, that the instrumental music of the Jewish worship fell with the "worldly sanctuary" of Judaism. Yet, notwithstanding of all this, the English Church, by virtue of her power to "decree rites and ceremonies," and to introduce unauthorised modes of worship, imitating the Church of Rome, has introduced the loud pealing organ, to make her worship more attractive to the carnal mind, than the simple spiritual worship of the New Testament Church could be. This, however, was not the mind of the first Reformers even in the English Church; for, in the Book of Homilies, they have left unequivocal evidence of their opinion on this subject; and there they characterise "piping, and

playing upon organs," as well as pictures and images, as a "*filthy defilement*"of God's "holy house and place of prayer." If any one says, "But what great harm after all, can there be in this?" I answer, "There is all the harm of 'will-worship;' which the Lord so emphatically condemns." If there was no such thing as an organ, or any instrument of music, used in the worship of the Apostolic Church, and if it be supposed that instrumental music is really helpful to the devout feelings of a Gospel worshipper, then see what is the inevitable inference: *Either* the Apostles, who were commissioned to teach the Churches " ALL things whatsoever" that Christ had "commanded them," failed in their duty, and omitted a very important part of their instructions, in which case, the very men on whose testimony the truth of the Gospel narrative essentially depends, are found unfaithful, and consequently, may have been "false witnesses of God:" *or,* the Lord Jesus, himself, was so deficient in wisdom, or in kindness, as to omit an instruction which was indispensable to the happiness and spiritual improvement of his people, and which it was left for the Papacy, in the dark ages, to discover! In every case, "will-worship," is of a most malignant influence, 413
and most presumptuous in its very nature. In the early days of the Church of England, the best men in that Church were fully alive to the sin of "will-worship," and none could more earnestly lament than Hooper and Coverdale, Fox and Jewell, "the dregs of Popery" and "relics of the Amorites;" which, to adopt the language of the last named bishop, were retained in it. But now with rare exceptions, Episcopal divines even though evangelical in their doctrines, cling to these very "dregs" and "relics of the Amorites," as if they formed a part of the distinguishing glory of the Church of England. There are, here and there, exceptions, however, still; and it is refreshing amid so much of an opposite kind, to find such a testimony, on this subject, as the following, borne by the late distinguished Dr. Arnold, of Rugby: "The more I think of the matter, and the more I read of the Scriptures themselves, and the history of the Church, the more intense is my wonder at the language of admiration with which some men speak of the Church of England, which certainly retains the foundation sure, as other Christian societies do, except the Unitarians, but has overlaid it with a very sufficient quantity of hay and stubble, which I devoutly hope to see burnt one day in the fire." Such is the testimony of one of the most learned divines of the Church of England itself. If there be such a "quantity of hay and stubble overlaying" the truth in that Church, does it not deeply concern its members to be aware of it? to use vigorous efforts to have it cleared away? and to return to the simplicity of worship, practised in Apostolic times, and by Apostolic men, according to the commands of our Lord Jesus Christ him-self? Hislop.

THE USE OF UNINSPIRED HYMNS IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

Our readers are aware that the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales deal with the subject of public worship on Congregationalist and not on Presbyterian principles. Thus it leaves each congregation to decide for itself whether, in celebrating the praises of God, it will use instrumental, or confine itself to vocal music and whether it will use uninspired hymns, or confine itself to the inspired psalms. It appears that in Parramatta advantage has rec-ently been taken of this congregationalist liberty, and a hymn-book and certain innovations introduced. At meeting of the Presbytery of the Hawkesbury, held at Windsor on the 4th instant, "the first business taken up was a memorial signed by twenty-five membes of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Parramatta, setting forth that a strange hymn-book and certain other *innovations* had lately been introduced into the services of their church, protesting against the innovations, and praying that they might be prohibited. Along with the memorial there was also read a copy of a correspondence that had taken place with the kirk session, shewing that this lower court had been applied to first on behalf of the memorialists, but without avail. After hearing Mr. Rattray in support of the memorial, and the Rev. Mr. Laughton in reply, the Presbytery decided that the best and most fitting course was to refer the memorial to the highest court, the *General Assembly,* to meet on the 13th October, where it would be sure to be dealt with as its importance and significance to all the Presbyterian Churches of the colony deserve."

It is not a little instructive to observe that, as in this case, those who compromise the truth for the sake of what they call union, will not forego unscriptural innovations for the sake of it; as if they not only failed to value the truth, and would therefore readily surrender it; but even hated it, and would therefore gladly make no small sacrifice to relieve themselves from some of its restraints, and effect their escape from conformity to some of its requirements.

The negative cause of the preference given to uninspired hymns, when they are preferred, is correctly indicated in the following

extract from a preface by the Rev. Dr. Cooke of Belfast, to "The True Psalmody," a valuable little treatise of which we wish some enterprising bookseller would import a hundred or two hundred copies. "My earliest recollection," says a Dr. Cooke, "of family and public psalmody is that of the exclusive use of the English version of the biblical psalms, authorised by the Reformed Church of Scotland. In our Presbyterian Churches, so far as my knowledge extends, others were unknown. When I entered the ministry, in 1807, the Scottish selection of paraphrases and hymns had come into partial use; and influenced by the feeling in their favor, I was gradually led to adopt them. The principle of their use once adopted, the way to others was opened to an unlimited extent; for, if these paraphrases and hymns be good for public worship, it follows that others may be as good, or better. Accordingly, at one time of my ministry, I dedicated both time and pains to selecting, from all accessible sources, an additional volume, with an essay, embodying a defence of its use in private or in public worship. I need scarcely add, that I believed my arguments – which were partly original, and partly derivative – to be unanswerable.

"I shall now detail, and as briefly as may be, the circumst-ances that first led me to doubt, and finally to reject my former conclusions.

"Having been appointed to a short missionary tour, I left my home in good health, but was taken suddenly ill, and; during a month, was unable to return; and it was when 'wearisome nights were appointed to me, and tossings to and fro until the dawning of the day,' that, in frequent solitude, I was thrown, almost entirely, on the resources of memory. But with that faculty God had sufficiently endowed me; and the psalms committed in school-boy days, and paraphrases and hymns of riper years, presented ready subjects of meditation. And it was then, that, all unexpectedly, yet irresistibly, it was impressed upon me, by experience and feeling, that the most celebrated hymns of uninspired men were, like Job's friends, 'miserable comforters,' when compared with the experience of Christ, in the days of humiliation, of which the Book of Psalms is the true prophetic picture." . . . . "I cannot fail to pity those who can find, as they assert, so little of Christ in the inspired psalmody of the Bible, that they must seek and employ an uninspired psalmody as exhibiting him more fully. Our Lord himself found himself in the psalms – (Luke 24: 44, 45) – and thereby 'opened his disciples understanding, that they might understand the

Scriptures.' Sure-ly what was the clearest light to *their* eyes, should be light to *ours*. And truly, I believe, there is one view of Christ – and that not the least important to the tired and troubled believer – that can be discovered only in the Book of Psalms – I mean his inward life. No eyewitness of the outward man – though an inspired evangelist – could penetrate the heart. But the Spirit who 'searcheth the deep things of God,' has, in the psalms, laid open the inmost thoughts, sorrows, and conflicts of our Lord. The Evangelists faithfully and intelligently depict the sinless Man; the psalms alone lay open the heart of 'the Man of Sorrows.' The most pious productions of uninspired men are a shallow stream – the psalms an unfathomable and shoreless ocean.

"In conclusion, I beg to record, that two things confirmed my decision in favor of the exclusive use of inspired psalmody in public worship. First, the biblical psalms being inspired by the Holy Ghost, (2 Tim. 3: 16; 1 Peter 1: 21), in using them, there can be no error. Secondly, though in uninspired sacred poetry I had discovered many beauties and other excellencies, I never had discovered any compilations which I could pronounce free from serious doctrinal errors . . . . If a doctrinal error be, at all times, dangerous, how much more when it is stereotyped in the devotions of the sanctuary."

414

The following summary of the history of psalmody, which we derive from the above named treatise, merits the earnest consideration both of the advocates and the opponents of the use of uninspired hymns, whether in Parramatta or elsewhere

1. The "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs" of the Bible passed over to the New Testament Church. 2. There is not a shadow of historical evidence that any her hymns were sung in apostolic times in the worship of God. 3. Some heretics did, at an early period, make and use hymns; but these earliest of human composures have disappeared, leaving behind them only the fact that they once existed; or, at most, a few waifs which cannot be recognised or allotted to time and space. 4. The first known orthodox hymn writer lived at the close of the second century, and there is no evidence that the single hymn which he composed was ever sung in God's worship. 6. Opposition was made at a later period to the introduction of human compositions, while the psalms of the Bible were held in the highest estimation, and were sung both in the east and in the west. 6. During the middle ages, the Waldenses sang the psalms; hymns were made by monks, and sung in the popish communion. 7. At the Reformation the psalms exclusively were used in worship in the 'strictly Calvinistic churches.' The Lutheran churches, which retained some of the trappings of Popery, retaining also the use of hymns. 8. The practice of Calvinistic churches was based upon the principle, that the Bible is the only rule in worship. 9. The Church of England was then almost exclusively a psalm singing Church. 10. No hymn book was found in the Western Reformed Churches until something more than a century ago. Hence, 11. The Scripture psalms were ever sung in God's worship in the purest days and parts of the Church in the Apostles' days, among the Waldenses, and in the most scriptural of the Reformed Churches." The writer adds, and this summary fully justifies him in doing so, "Whatever assistance the cause of hymn singing may derive from the occasional use of hymns in times, either ancient or modern, when religion had begun to decline, or from their use among the followers of Antichrist, we cheerfully allow it; but we do claim, that in using exclusively the Bible psalms, we follow the footsteps of the flock."

Correspondence.

MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

To the Editor of "The Testimony."

Sir, – The following brief report of the annual meeting of Rev. A. J. Campbell's congregation in Geelong might be not a little instructive to the good people of Melrose, amongst whom Mr. Campbell once professed to hold the position, principles, and testimony of the Free Church – if by any chance they should happen to see the report. I copy as follows from the Geelong *Advertiser* of August 1st. I would send the clipping, but there is a melancholy duty to be performed in preserving the evidence of backsliding and unfaithfulness which such documents afford.

ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH.

"The annual congregational meeting of St. George's Church was held last Thursday evening, Rev. A. J. Campbell in the chair. There was a considerable attendance, and some important business transacted.

The financial statement was adopted. It was highly satisfactory, and showed that the debt on the church had been reduced during the last year from £700 to £260 sterling.

The subject of the introduction of the English Presbyterian hymn book was then brought forward by the chairman, and a spirited, though friendly discussion, ensued, in which various leading members of the congregation took part. On the question being put to the meeting, it was carried in the affirmative by an overwhelming majority.

The chairman then brought before the meeting the subject of the annual bazaar for the Benevolent society, and stated that to some of the congregation it appeared a very costly and objectionable way of raising money for that society, and proposed – That instead of furnishing a stall, as usual, at the next bazaar, the congregation should subscribe a sum equal to the amount usually raised by such stall. This

was carried unanimously.

A member of the congregation then brought forward the use of the harmonium during the services, and very liberally offered to present the church with an instrument for such a purpose. This matter, however, was left over for consideration at next general meeting.

The proceedings were closed with a vote of thanks to the conductor of the psalmody for his gratuitous services, and after the doxology and benediction the meeting separated."

The fashions of this world change. The bazaar fashion is on the wane, and, unfortunately, other equally bad or worse fashions are taking its place. It is very instructive to discover that in these circumstances the annual stall at a bazaar is found to be expensive and objectionable! But is the costly attraction of a bazaar stall to be given up for nothing? The brief report supplies an answer. The hymn book is already admitted, and the harmonium is on the road.

Here is another item illustrative of moderatism in Victoria, and associated in subject with the foregoing. There is a small tract published in Geelong called "The Monthly Letter," edited by Rev. A. J. Campbell. It is small in size, and very small in various other respects. In the number for June there is an article headed "The Gaol. A Harmonium wanted. This is a communication from the "Church of England chaplain of the hospital and gaol." I quote the paragraph along with the editorial remark subjoined within brackets: –

"There were fourteen men (yesterday) at a Bible class in the gaol, and the majority of them seemed attentive; some of them are very desirous to have psalmody at the Sunday service, which, unfortunately, cannot be managed at present; but if you can really mend things that are out of joint in the establishment, I will tell you what you can do, sir; let an harmonium be provided at once; there is always some one there capable of 'discoursing sweet music.' Who knows what good it might do? It must not be forgotten that there are frequently 'innocent men,' so called, in prison. Then there are numerous attendants and chaplain; and I think the harmonium idea is not a bad one, all things . duly considered, and I do hope, for the sake of the unfortunate prisoners, that you will quickly improve upon it

[There ought to be no difficulty in carrying out our good friend's suggestion. But he must take it in hand himself, or, if the incumbent of Christ's Church, who takes a deep interest in the gaol, would hold a meeting, musical or otherwise, in his school-room, I am sure the necessary sum would be raised. – ED.]

In dealing with so ponderous a subject as the gaol, there is something comical about the fantastic difficulty of our "good friend" the chaplain, the labouring mountain produces its result, and a harmonium is wanted! Again, a laudable desire for psalmody is evinced by some of inmates of the gaol – but it seems there can no psalmody without an harmonium. I thought the harmonium generally banished the psalmody. In any case, why did not Mr. Campbell instruct his "good friend" at this point, and intimate as politely as possible, that if there is some one capable of "discoursing sweet music" there was some possibility of reaching the psalmody in the meantime – while the all important harmonium was getting tuned? Even the "innocent men," so called, might profit by this.

As to Mr. Campbell, I am reminded of the remark of Dr. Begg, quoted in your last number of *The Testimony,* that the change in the utterances of quondam Free Churchmen is enough to make one forget one's identity. I cannot say, indeed, that any follies and inconsistencies on the part of Mr. Campbell are calculated to have this effect, but they have the effect of making one question the identity of the present Presbyterian minister of St. George's, Geelong, and former Free Church minister of Melrose, Scotland. Mr. Campbell had the character of belonging to what was called the infant school theology. If there was a puling want of manliness and maturity, it was charitably supposed the lack was made up by a large amount of spirituality. To suspect these amiable creatures of any leanings to worldliness was to overturn the very foundation of their claim to generous regard and Christian affection. If there was a palpable want of vigorous theology, there was any amount of "pious small 415
talk." The amount of real religion and godliness in Scotland afforded shelter for a small school of these people. No such shelter in Victoria screened Mr. Campbell from the more direct action of the world and worldly men in the churches. He has steadily given way before the pressure. The extracts quoted exhibit him to us on the inclined plane sliding downwards very perceptibly. As to the "pious small talk," the "Monthly Letter" is valuable as a record in that matter. Mr. Campbell was kind enough to issue a predecessor of a somewhat similar character some years called "Friendly Words." In the matter of "small talk" and "nice stories," some of them very "nice" they are very characteristic of Mr. Campbell.

Since writing the foregoing the Home papers have come to hand with the reports of the General Assembly. You will observe, that the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes put in an appearance and gave an account of the Australian colonies.

As to the blessings which Unionism has conferred on New South Wales, I have no doubt you are infinitely better qualified to give a verdict than Mr. Dykes. Regarding his account of Presbyterianism in Victoria I feel disposed to make an observation. As to the Union, it must be admitted that his review is somewhat in a business style – but the business is rather that of an insurance company than of a church – number of ministers doubled in eight years, average salary £300 a year. But it is in connexion with the "dissidents" that the sentiments of the house and the wit of the speaker come out in fullest manifestation. In the course of a few sentences, referring to those who would not go into the Union, we have laughter, renewed laughter, loud laughter, roars of laughter. In fact, in one aspect of the case, the Assembly of 1868 is second only to that of 1861 for the ovation which it has given to the witnesses for the Testimony of the Disruption Church of 1843. Indeed, quite naturally Mr. Dykes refers to the Assembly of 1861, at which the late Principal Cunningham was the chief orator in denouncing the Free Church witnesses of Victoria. The learned principal had retired in disgust from the deceit and dishonesty which he found so prevalent in the management of Church affairs, and kept aloof from public business. But schemers have many irons to put in the fire: a handsome present of £6900 brought Dr. Cunningham back to the Church Courts. The one signal event of his life, after his return to the Church courts, was his attack on the Victorian witnesses for the Testimony of the Free Church. The battle was over the "Melbourne affair," as he contemptuously called it. The Rev. Mr. Miller was then the Free Church Deputy in Scotland, and he often described the scene after returning to the colony. All who have heard Dr. Cunningham in animated debate, know with what tremendous vigor he used to speak. He had a powerful voice, and on this occasion the brawny arms of the strong man swung about, thrashing the air like appendages of a steam engine. The learned Principal had lost an eye – an event which entitled him to sympathy; but, on the present occasion, the want of the eye, as a matter of fact, added its own terrible feature to the scene. The other eye glared as if the owner were under the spell of demoniacal possession The facial contortions were terrific to look at. It was on this occasion that he uttered the memorable sentiment – itself sufficient to immortalize the speech – the sentiment regarding the obstinate witnesses, that the sooner they died out the better. This was the last will and Testimony of Dr. Cunningham towards those whose crime was unaltered adherence to the principles of 1843; for before the end of the year Dr. Cunningham himself had departed this life. This was no doubt a great oration for the Testimony in behalf of Christ as Ruler among the nations, and that ovation, in connexion with the truths and principles concerned, remains as a fact, though every witness should subsequently apostatise from his faithfulness.

But Mr. Dykes has honored the Testimony referred to with another ovation. It is to be found in the laughter, the loud laughter, the renewed laughter, the roars of laughter, from the present majority in the Free Church of Scotland. Dr. Robert Buchanan may well have been greatly tickled at such obstinate consistency in mere Australian witnesses. See what he himself can point to – his declaration during the old Voluntary Controversy – that Voluntaryism, in divorcing Church and State, was the special work of Satan. This was while he was in the Established Church. But now he is out of the Established Church, and the sagacious

ecclesiastic has discovered that union with the Voluntaries is the most important duty in the way of building up the kingdom of Christ. See, too, what occasion for merriment Dr. Candlish must have had against those who will not strike their flag to Voluntaries. Some years ago he pronounced a woe to the Free Church when she should deviate towards Voluntarism. But men do not seem to have believed in Dr. Candlish or his woes, for the current has set in strongly in the woe warned direction, and that current is carrying Dr. Candlish and all his woes along with it, so now the prudent leader of the Free Church has most conveniently discovered that the union movement is the work of the Holy Ghost! What roars of laughter such divines must indulge in when they bear that any witnesses in the Australian Colonies should be squeamish in such matters. Mr. Dykes very considerately points out that such scrupulosity must damage their comfort!

But possibly the edge of Mr. Dykes' wit was sharpened by recollections which closely concerned himself. While he was drawing his £800 a year in Victoria, his conformity to the world went the length of patronizing Sabbath trains. Certain witnesses perform the unpalatable service of bearing testimony publicly against this conduct. His specific reference to "two gentlemen," shows that he has not forgotten them. After all, the ovations above referred to are but a small instalment of what is to come. The theatre of rejoicing will be much larger than the Free Church of Scotland, but, "two witnesses" still figure in the predicted events. When the witnesses are slain, "they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another, because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth."

I am, &c.,

PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, Victoria.

August 9, 1868.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

The Presbytery of Maitland met at the Presbyterian School House, East Maitland, on Friday, the 30th ultimo. There were present – Rev. James McCulloch, Rev. W. S. Donald, and Messrs. Hugh McDonald and Samuel Porter, Elders. The minutes of last meeting having been read and approved of, the Presbytery proceeded to the ordination of the Rev. Duncan McInnes. The Rev. Mr. Donald, according to

appointment of Presbytery, conducted public worship, preaching from Col. 1: 29. "Whereunto I also labor; striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily," an appropriate and impressive sermon on the work and encouragements of the Gospel minister. At the conclusion of the services a narrative of the proceedings in reference to the call to Mr. McInnes and the steps preparatory to his ordination, was given. Thereafter, the questions ordered by the Synod to be put to probationers previous to their ordination, having been put to Mr. McInnes and satisfactorily answered, he was by solemn prayer, and the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, set apart to the office of the holy ministry, and admitted to the pastoral charge of the congregation at Rockymouth, Clarence River.

Mr. McInnes then received the right hand of fellowship from the brethren present.

The Moderator then ascended the pulpit, and delivered suitable addresses to the newly ordained minister and the people present, founding his remarks on 1 Tim. 4: 16, "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

Mr. McInnes, having subscribed the formula, took his seat as a member of Presbytery.

Mr. Donald was appointed to supply services at Clarence Town and Seaham on Sabbath the 9th August. The Presbytery adjourned, to meet on Tuesday, the 4th August.

It is cause of much satisfaction that the numerous congregation at Rockymouth is now to be fully supplied with ministrations. We are happy, also, to add, that the Rev. Alexander McIntyre is at present in Sydney, on his way to supply ministrations to the congregation at Grafton.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 36 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, SEPTEMBER, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 36 SEPTEMBER. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Believers dead to the Law … … … …	417
The Attitude which Protestants ought to maintain towards the Church of Rome … … … … …	418
The Psalms … … … … …	419
The Church's Duty and the source of its Safety in the midst of present and approaching Dangers … … …	420
Correspondence – Mr. Dykes on Colonial Unions … …	424
Moderatism in Victoria … … … …	426
Is the Church of Rome the Catholic Church? … …	427

BELIEVERS DEAD TO THE LAW.

I through the law am dead unto the law, that I might live unto God. – Gal. 2: 19.

These words are closely connected with the preceding and the following context. It is not necessary for us, however, to trace the connection in which they stand, for they are in no way dependent on it for their meaning; and the importance and application of the truth which they convey are by no means confined to the immediate purpose which it is here stated to serve.

The Apostle takes his own as a specimen case; and what he asserts of himself he virtually asserts of all believers. When he says "I through the law am dead" (or, rather, died) "unto the law, that I might live unto God," he virtually asserts of all believers what he thus asserts of himself.

While the statement of our text has this extended application, it presents a fact of fundamental importance in the history and economy of the Christian life. This fact comprehends three elements, which we shall now consider successively: the simple fact itself, the instrumental cause, and the design, of the death of believers to the law. They died to the law, through the law, that they might live unto God.

We have first to consider the fact that believers have died, and are therefore dead, to the law. That we may understand the precise contents of this fact – what it comprehends – we must remember that all men in their natural state, and prior to the exercise by them of saving faith in Christ, are guilty, and therefore under the curse of the law. By this curse, such is its fearful efficacy, they are smitten with spiritual death, and driven into a state of banishment from God; while, beyond the limits of their sojourn here, it assigns to them, as the final form and full measure of their punishment, eternal death. The curse having this operation, it is evident that it shuts out from those who are under it all that pertains to spiritual life, all that qualifies for holy activity and holy enjoyment.

From this deplorable state, as clearly follows from the very nature of it, none can deliver themselves. The curse allots to all who are under it eternal death, and, of course, therefore, none of them can exhaust it for themselves. None of them can gain for themselves the position of persons in whose case the punishment denounced by the law had been fully borne. If they could gain and actually gained this position for themselves, they would then be dead to the law, their relation to it would be that of persons in whose case the death denounced by it had been in its whole extent undergone, and against whom therefore, it could prefer no further demand with respect to the suffering of punishment.

Now, what sinners could not do for themselves Christ has done for all who have believed or will believe on him. He has borne for them the punishment which the law has attached to sin – he died for them. And when sinners believe in Christ, they become interested in what he has thus done; his bearing the curse of the law, his atoning death, becomes available for them. They come thus to be in the position of persons in whose case the death denounced by the law was fully suffered. They die to the law. The death of Christ has satisfied the demands of the law as regards the enduring of punishment; and, they being interested in his death so that it is of avail for them, they have died to the law: its demands as to the suffering of death as the punishment of sin have been fully satisfied in their case

If the demands of the law as to the possession of perfect righteousness were not at the same time satisfied, exemption from liability to punishment could not be obtained. Those who do not possess a perfect righteousness are guilty in not possessing it. The non-possession of it involves guilt. But Christ has provided a perfect righteousness for his people, and this righteousness is unto all and upon all that believe on him. Thus all who believe in Christ are in the position of persons on whose behalf the death denounced as the punishment of sin has been suffered and exhausted, so that in their case the demands of the law with respect to punishment have been fully satisfied; and, at the one time, in the position of persons who possess a perfect righteousness, and in whose case the demands of the law with respect to the possession of such a righteousness are also fully satisfied. Their being in the former position is expressed, and their being in the latter implied, when they are said to have died

to the law.

Those who have died to the law have died to it through the law. Of their death to it it is itself the instrumental cause. In or418
der that sinners may die to the law, they must become interested in the death of Christ, and in order that they may become interested in the death of Christ, they must feel their need of an interest in it. Now, in bringing them in this respect to a due sense of their state, the Holy Spirit, by whom all that pertains to the application of redemption is effected, makes use of the law. By means of the law he discovers to them, and causes them to feel, that they are guilty. He reveals to them the contrast which their lives and the state of their hearts present to what the law requires, and their consequent exposure to the wrath of God and to eternal death. He further convinces them that they can do nothing that will in the least entitle them to deliverance from this sad condition; that they cannot, even for the time being, for the very briefest period, act a dutiful part; that, while they cannot cease from acting, the state of their hearts and their attitude towards God are such, that their activity through-out is that of rebels. He thus brings them to recognise that, while it is necessary for them to be in the position of persons in whose case the demands of the law with respect to the punishment of sin and with respect to righteousness have been satisfied, they cannot satisfy for themselves its demands with respect to either.

The Spirit further discovers to them the righteousness wrought out and the atonement made by Christ, and enables them to discern that these are, in every respect and most fully, such as will abundantly satisfy all the demands of the law, in the case of all who may be interested in them; that they comprehend all that the law requires or could require. "The righteousness of God without the law is" thus "manifested" to them, "being witnessed by the the law and the prophets." – Rom. 3: 21.

When, finally, the Spirit conducts those, to whom he has discovered their need of salvation, and the suitableness and sufficiency of the salvation provided and offered, to the exercise of faith in Christ, and thus to an interest in his death and in all that he has done for sinners, the law, so to speak, declares itself satisfied. Seeing they are now interested in the atonement made by Christ, the law declares that its demands with respect to punishment are fully met in their case; and, seeing that they are now interested in Christ's righteousness, it declares that its demands with respect to righteousness are also fully met in their case. In other words, it declares that they died by becoming interested in the death of Christ, and are, therefore, no longer liable to death as the wages of sin; and that the righteousness of Christ being unto them and upon them they are entitled to life.

Thus through the law, convincing of sin, and, both when, the atonement is presented to be received and after it has been received, bearing testimony to its sufficiency, those who believe in Christ die to the law.

And they die to it that they may live unto God, – that they may be in circumstances to live, and may actually live, to him.

Those who are under the guilt, are under the dominion of sin; they are spiritually dead. They are, therefore, incapable of the proper activity of spiritual life, that is, of all true obedience. But, when sinners believe in Christ, and, becoming interested in his atoning death and in his perfect righteousness, receive the pardon of sin and are made accepted in the Beloved, spiritual life is imparted to them, the Holy Spirit, as the author of this life, being put within them. They are thus brought into a capacity to live to God.

And they actually live to him. Those live to God whose lives are directed to his glory. The lives of all such are regulated by his will, but it is not exactly with reference to this fact that they are said to live to him. Their living to him consists in this: – recognising that they are his, they study to dispose of themselves for him, – they glorify him in their bodies and in their spirits, – wheth-

er they eat or drink or whatsoever they do they do all to his glory. Now believers live thus, and therefore live to God; not, indeed, perfectly, for, while the will is present with them, how to perform fully and exclusively that which is good they find not; but it is their aim to live to him perfectly, and in the main they do live to him.

While they have been restored to spiritual life and the Holy Spirit dwells in them, they are brought under the influence of powerful motives to live to God. The character of God, with all the clearness with which it is revealed in the Gospel, is revealed to them as exercised and displayed in his gracious dealings with themselves. Thus the revelation of it, with which they are favoured, is eminently fitted to awaken on their part the affections with which they ought to regard him, and, particularly ardent love to him and it is therefore fitted to move and impel them to render to him the devoted service which is the proper expression of such love.

The fact that his dealings with them have been so merciful and gracious, and so beneficial in their effects, that they have afforded a conspicuous and glorious display of his character as the God of salvation, lays them under a strong obligation to cherish the warmest gratitude, and, under the influence of gratitude associated with love, to live to him.

All should institute the inquiry with respect to themselves, whether they have been constrained by the ministration of the law to flee from the wrath to come; whether they have been awakened to an adequate and influential sense of their urgent need of an interest in Christ.

All should inquire further whether they have believed in Christ, so that they have become interested in his death, and have died to the law, being, with the full sanction of the law, and, as it were, at its own instance, relieved fully and for ever from the curse which it formerly pronounced upon them. All, who would obtain a satisfactory answer to this inquiry, must ascertain whether they live to God. This is the only decisive evidence, as it will be an unfailing consequence of their having died to the law.

How desirable the position of those who have died to the law, to whom, therefore, there is no condemnation, and who will never come into condemnation; who are no longer under the law but now under grace; in whose case the law has been divested of its condemning power, to whom spiritual life has been restored, and who, being united to Christ and the Spirit dwelling in them, are enabled to live and do live to God.

THE ATTITUDE WHICH PROTESTANTS OUGHT TO MAINTAIN TOWARDS THE CHURCH OF ROME,

This is the point really at issue in the discussion to which the rather singular phenomenon of the presence of three ministers of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, – Dr. Lang, Dr. Steel, and Mr. Milne, at Archdeacon McEncroe's funeral, while it does not appear that the ministry of any other Protestant denomination was represented in the procession, has given rise; and it is a point of which the importance cannot easily be exaggerated. The doctrine of some is substantially, – and it has been even vehemently enunciated in the little discussion to which we have referred, – that Protestants should show the same favor and countenance to the Church of Rome and its

agents – as they show to other Protestant churches than their own, and to the agents of such churches. This ignoring of the difference between protestantism and popery is represented as an essential means of maintaining peace and harmony in a community composed, as this community is, of protestants and papists. To this doctrine 419

however, we cannot, for our part, subscribe. We must hold, for we cannot on any ground consistent with the obligations and discharge of duty do otherwise, that the attitude of a christian and a patriot towards the Church of Rome and its agents ought to be determined by the estimate, which his Bible teaches him to form, of the bearing of popery on the eternal interests of men; and the estimate which the uniform and emphatic testimony of history and observation, in concurrence with his Bible, teaches him to form of its bearing on their temporal interests. The question with which he has to deal is not whether one may be a member of the Church of Rome and yet a good man, but how popery and the labours of its teachers affect the interests of men as individuals and as members of society, their interests here and hereafter. And on this point no one, who derives his views from the word of God and the evidence of facts, can come to but one conclusion, the conclusion, namely, that, as regards civilised and professedly christian communities, there is no known human agency that is capable of doing and that actually does so much mischief to man, throughout the entire range of his interests, as the agency of the Church of Rome. It is the nature and the aim of pop-ery to destroy the mental liberty of individuals, and the civil and religious liberty of communities. In its dread of the liberty of thought and action which human beings, awakened to a sense of their direct personal responsibility to God, will claim and exercise, it withholds the Scriptures from the people, wholly where it can, and everywhere as far as it can. It corrupts the Gospel of the grace of God; it substitutes for it another gospel, which is not another, and the full acceptance of which cannot fail to be attended with eternal ruin. At the same time it is highly dishonouring to the Saviour. It treats his atonement and mediation as insufficient, professing to supplement them by what it calls the offering of the mass and the intercession of the Virgin Mary and others.

Such are the character and operation of popery; and it is the office and official work of the popish priest to disseminate its doctrines and extend its influence, and thus to secure, as fully as he can, that its proper effects shall be produced, and shall alone be produced, over the whole extent of his field of labour. He is, therefore, in proportion to the malignity of the system which he applies, and of which he is the agent, a minister of evil. Is he, then, to be honoured? Is it consistent with enlightened Christian concern for the welfare of men in time and in eternity and for the glory of God that he should be honoured? We deliberately and emphatically answer, no.

As to the avoidance of all that is irritating and calculated to disturb the peace of society, the duty of such avoidance depends wholly upon circumstances. If men are engaged in an evil work, and popish priests are engaged in a work intensely evil, we are not for the sake of peace to allow them to prosecute it without exposure or opposition, effecting all the mischief which the success of their operations will involve.

THE PSALMS,

AND SOME OF THEIR METRICAL VER$IONS; IN PARTICULAR, THE ONE "ALLOWED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND, AND APPOINTED (IN 1649) TO BE SUNG IN CONGREGATIONS AND FAMILIES."

The following paper on the Psalms and the English versions of them we abridge from the *Watchword*: –

While the name of "psalms" may be given to all sacred poetry intended to be, or capable of being, sung in the praise of God, it is generally given to the poetry of David and his brother bards, which forms one of the books of the Bible, and is called the "Book of Psalms." These psalms constituted the chief, if not the only Psalter of the ancient Jewish Church. They constitute the only Psalter or Psalm book of some of the Churches of Christ, and the chief one of all. This they do now, and this they have done for eight-

een hundred years; and this they will continue to do, we may venture to say, till the end of time.

It is on this wonderful book, and some of its metrical versions – a book which has been well said "to embody the universal language of religious emotions" – the Psalter or Psalm book of the Church in all ages and in all lands, and which is one day destined to the Psalter or Psalm book of the world – that we purpose making a few observations.

1. *Its Name, and the Place its Name indicates it to hold in the Worship and Praise of God.*

It is called "The Psalms." Thus it is by our Lord. In His last. words to His disciples He said: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me," (Luke 24: 44). In two other places it is called "the Book of Psalms," (Luke 20: 42, and Acts 1: 20). Names these which designate it not only as a distinct book of the Bible, but declare it to be the only book in it entitled to the name; and that while other pieces may rank along with it, they were never intended to take precedence of it, nor to exclude it

The Church of Scotland, in her best and purest times, has always shown a preference, pure and simple, for the Psalms of David. They were her songs in the days of her youth, when she came up out of the land of Egypt; they were her cradle hymns, which were sung to, and by her, in the days of her childhood; they were the strains her martyrs sang on the scaffold and at the stake, which the Covenanters sang when wandering on the mountains and moors, in the clefts of the rocks, in dens and caves of the earth; when on the edge of battle; with which they expressed heir trust, and comforted their hearts in the hour of defeat, and their gratitude and joy in their hour of victory.

2. *Its Spiritual Excellence.*

In every age the Book of Psalms has been extolled, not only for its poetic beauty, but higher than this, its spiritual excellence. The Fathers were unanimous and unbounded in its commendation. Athanasius styles it an "Epitome of the Scriptures;" Basil, "A compendium of theology;" Luther, "A Bible in little;" and Melancthon, "The most elegant writing in the world." "The Psalms," says another, are a cluster of jewels, made up of the gold of doctrine, the pearls of comfort, the gems of prayer, a field of promises, a paradise of fruits, a sea wherein tempest tossed souls find treasures of consolation, a heavenly school wherein God himself is the Great Teacher. They are the flowers of Scripture, a mirror of grace, wherein is reflected Christ the Son of God – a most accurate anatomy of a heavenly soul delineating its affections, and temptations, its highest joys, and its deepest sorrows" Such was the estimation in which the Psalms were held by the earliest Christians: They were accustomed to learn them by heart, that by means of them they might enliven their social hours, soften the cares of life, and soothe its sorrows. They read and sang them, not only in the churches, but in their families at meals, and at night on retiring to rest. They were to them what they were to the psalmist himself, and what it would be well if they were more than they are to us, – "Our song's in the house of our pilgrimage,"

3. *Its Metrical Versions*.

"In every Protestant country," says Dr. McCrie, "a Metrical

Version of the Psalms appeared at a very early period. The French version, begun by Clement Maret, and completed by Beza, contributed much to the spread of the Reformation in France. The Psalms were sung by Francis I, and Henry II, and by their courtiers. The Papists flocked for a time to the assemblies of the Protestants to listen to their psalmody. A number of the Psalms were translated into metre in Scotland, some time 420
even before the Reformation, for George Wishart sang one of them in the house of Ormiston on the night in which he was apprehended. Five years before the Reformation was completed, they were sung in the churches. The Psalms which were sung at this time were translations, it is probable from the French, and were the productions of the brothers John and Robert Wedderburne, sons of a merchant in Dundee. They were never completed: and the first complete version adopted and used in the Reformed Church of Scotland was that of Sternhold and Hopkins, which version continues to be used in some of the country parishes of England to the present day. Though commonly ascribed to them, it was not wholly composed by them. Sternhold composed the first fifty one, Hopkins the next fifty eight, and the remaining forty one were composed by the English Protestants who had fled to Geneva, during the reign, and to escape the persecutions of Mary the Bloody. The first Scottish edition of this version was printed in Edinburgh in 1564."

Having been in use for upwards of half a century, an attempt was made in 1632, by Charles I to supersede it by that of his father, King James, or rather the version which bears his name, for it is now well known that only thirty one of the Psalms were his composition; the rest were the work of the Earl of Stirling.

Thirty five years afterwards, Charles I attempted to introduce his father's version, but the Assembly resisted the attempt.

Thus the old version continued in use till 1649, when it was superseded by the present one, and which was adopted on the ground of its being more "plain, smooth, and agreeable to the text, than any used heretofore." The author of our present version, was Francis Rose or Rouse. This Mr. Francis, of whom, as the chief author of what is commonly called the Scotch Version, it becomes us, as Scotchmen, to know more than we do, was born at Halton, in Cornwall, in 1579, and studied at Oxford. He joined the Parliament party against the king, and was often a member of Cromwell's council. Parliament being desirous of superseding the old version, employed Rouse to prepare another, which was published in 1641. This, at least, is the opinion of some, though its preparation and publication, according to others, originated with himself. Be this as it may, that the Parliament had an active, if not originating, hand in its publication and adoption is evident from the following extract from a minute of the Westminster Assembly: – "Whereas the Honorable House of Commons, by an order bearing date, Nov. 20, 1643, have recommended the Psalms published by Mr. Rouse to the consideration of the Assembly of Divines, – the Assembly has caused them to be carefully perused, and as they are now altered and amended, do approve them, and humbly conceive they may be useful and profitable to the Church, if they be permitted to be publicly sung." Besides being revised by the Westminster Assembly, they were for five years in the hands of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by whose orders they were at last published, and adopted as the Psalter of the Scottish Church, which, without amendment or alteration, it has continued to be to the present day. Not having seen this version as it came originally from the hands of Rouse we are unable to say what changes it underwent in the hands of the two Assemblies, and whether these changes were for the better or worse. Having seen, however, and compared a few of the Psalms as composed by him, and altered by others, we are enabled to say that in these instances the alterations were an improvement, and that it was probably so in the case of many more, if not all. Though scant justice has been done to the memory of Rouse, the real author, we are, perhaps, little aware of what we owe to such men as Adamson, McKail, Hutch-ison, and Trail, and other members of the committee or committees appointed by the General Assembly to revise his version, and out of whose refining fires it came in its present form. Indeed,

if we can believe Barton, the pet Psalmist of the Cromwellian Puritans, they had a greater hand in it than is generally supposed, for he says, "the Scotch have lately put forth a Psalm Book, *most* what composed out of *mine* and Mr. Rouse's."

On Nov. 23, 1649, Rouse's version was at length sanctioned by the Commission, with authority of the General Assembly, and every other discharged from being used in families or churches.

The present version has many excellencies, and especially adheres closely to the Hebrew text. It is not a little singular, that in most cases where emendators and others have given us *their* amended versions, these are not *improvements*. Whether it was owing to this or not, we know not; it is however, a fact, that no less an authority than Sir Walter Scott, on being consulted about an *amended* version, did *not approve* of the attempt, and on his advice it was for the time abandoned. Boswell, the friend and biographer of Johnson, has given a still more decided opinion on this subject. "After looking," he says, "at various Metrical Versions of the Psalms, I am well satisfied that the version used in Scotland is, upon the whole, the best, and that it is in vain to think of having a better. It has in general a simplicity and *unction* of sacred poetry, and in many parts its translation is admirable." This witness is true. The number of psalms is "one hundred and fifty," and we believe that no fewer than one hundred and fifty have been found who have translated them into English verse, in whole or in part, and after comparing Rouse's with most of them, we give him the preference. We do not except "certain M.S. versions which have been laid before the committee" of the Free Church on psalmody, of which attempts, we are sorry to say, we cannot speak with much commendation; and even though they are designed only as supplemental, we should think the committee will pause ere they give them *their* approbation, and the Church ere it gives its *sanction* –with all the rage there is abroad for change and innovation, which even the Free Church has not quite escaped. In such a matter all undue haste should be carefully avoided.

THE CHURCH'S DUTY AND THE SOURCE OF ITS SAFETY IN THE MIDST OF PRESENT AND APPROACHING DANGERS.

We make the following extracts from the opening address of the Moderator of the last General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland – the Rev. Mr. Nixon, of Montrose.

"Still the principal causes of danger to the Church are not so much the physical violence as the false ideas and opinions by which it is assailed just as the chief character in which its great adversary is now to be looked for, is that of the father of lies. In these perilous times of the last days evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse. And amidst the abominations of the earth, of which she is the principal parent and patron, and up till the very hour when she is overwhelmed by the judgments of God, the mother of harlots shall be found wielding the power of rulers and of ruled for her own wicked ends, intoxicating mankind with the wine of her fornications, making herself drunk, where she can, with the literal blood of the martyrs of Jesus Christ, and, where she cannot do that,

making herself drunk with the more precious blood of men's murdered rights, privileges, and hopes, and glorifying herself and saying, I sit as a queen, and shall see no sorrow, as she occupies her infamous throne in the midst of the nations that lie prostrate under her feet. To proclaim that the Church of Christ is past the worst of her trials is probably to deceive her and throw her off her guard. Her history is more likely to be assimilated to that of her Divine Head when on earth. As His heaviest suffer421
ings were those which immediately preceded His glorious resurrection, so her darkest season is likely to be that which ushers in the light and glory of her millennial day. In the position providentially assigned to us in connection with this approaching crisis, we cannot stand fast except we have Christ on our side, fulfilling His promise – 'Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.' And we cannot have His promise farther than we know and obey His Word. 'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and he that 'loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him.' So that the manifestations of His presence, and our success in serving Him depend on the extent to which His Word dwells in us richly in all wisdom and in all spiritual understanding. His Word furnishes the banner under which we are to fight, the armour which we are to wear, the weapons with which we are to conquer, the instructions which we are to obey, and the promises that cheer us on to victory. No Church has more thoroughly understood, appreciated, and acted on this fact than ours. When reformed from Popery she drew her doctrinal principles, her ordinances of worship, and her form of Government, from the pure Word of God, in distinction from and opposition to those human grounds on which other Churches more or less based their faith and practice. Into our creed and order we have all along allowed nothing to enter for which we are not ready to plead the express instructions or manifest warrant of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the soundness of our doctrine, the scriptural character of our mode of worship, and the beauty and fruitful virtue of our government. The time is rapidly approaching when, amidst the surge of human pride and human passion there shall sensibly and emphatically remain no refuge except the Word of Christ, and Christ whose Word it is. But nothing else is needed, and nothing else should be required by the Church and by Christian men. Let us, and those who are coming after us, only take that Word for our rule, and its Author for our strength, and let us carry out the provisions of that Word in all their length and breadth, in their simplicity and fulness, and we shall overcome all our Redeemer's enemies, and our own, by the blood of the Lamb and by the Word of His testimony. . . . By all means let us take advantage of the language that is current, and of the highest and purest forms of modern culture, as mediums of spreading the truths in question. But let us take care that those glorious truths themselves which the Bible reveals, and which our standards formulate, are maintained, taught, and spread, in all their fulness, purity, and force. (Applause.) Let us maintain and spread them thus, because they are found, and as they are found, in God's own Word. And let none of us part with a jot or tittle of them so long as it cannot be proved to be without warrant in that Word, so long as, in opposition to all gainsayers, we are able and ready to prove from that Word what we believe, and to say in truth, Thus and thus saith the Lord. It were an easy matter to show, from our past history, what lofty elevation, what inflexible consistency, what invincible firmness, what commanding power, attached to all the witness-bearing of our forefathers, from the single fact that they had a constant reverential regard to the Word of Christ, and were thus kept in life giving fellowship with Himself . . . . . As witnesses of God on the earth, it is most important towards the fulfilment of the work assigned to us, that we thus bear in mind, and seek to realise in fact, the practical results of all our testimony, and of every part of it, in the maintenance of the divine glory, the furtherance of the true life of the Church, and the extension of Christ's kingdom in the world. Especially considering the present state and prospects of the Church and the world, it seems to be more emphatically now, than ever, our calling and duty to seek to have our own minds, and the minds of our people, furnished and familiarised with the teachings of the Word of Christ,

and their hearts and our own filled with his enlightening, sanctifying, and strengthening grace, so that we may be prepared more earnestly and effectually than ever to understand, maintain, and advance whatever is for his honour and the true interests of men, in the midst of the conflicts that are waging, and that are destined to become more and more multiplied, fierce, and perilous in these last days. For it requires no prophet's foresight to see that there is before us a season and series of conflicts between light and darkness, between good and evil, in which every conceivable error and almost every conceivable iniquity shall have, in turn, its patrons and promoters, until everywhere over the face of Christendom, and in as yet unparalleled forms of evil, the enemy cometh in like a flood. Unmistakeable symptoms are already to be witnessed of such a state of things. While the Church ought to be the salt of the earth, there are large portions of it that have lost their savour, and are fit only to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. Romanism and Ritualism are captivating daily increasing numbers with doctrines and ceremonies which, in the name of religion, gratify the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life. (Hear, hear.) Rationalism is fostering that silly pride of intellect that exhibits itself in ignorant, conceited contempt of the divinest truths and the most overwhelming realities. Formalism is superseding principle after principle revealed in scripture for the regulation of the Church, by arrangements of man's devising. It is supplanting every ordinance of a pure, simple, spiritual, scriptural worship, by human flesh pleasing inventions; and it is practically perverting and putting out of sight the doctrines of grace as unfashionable, and substituting for them such opinions as are more suitable to the current tastes and maxims of the age. There is abroad everywhere a spirit of rebellion against established authority, against subjection to all law human and divine. (Hear, hear.) The inspiration of the Bible is opposed, yea, its common honesty is being questioned, yea, the very existence of the Deity is beginning to be boldly denied. And there is not a bond of divine or even of common morality that is not being fatally loosened in the minds of men. The literature that is spreading among, and devoured by, millions of the people daily, is charged with the spirit and many of the forms of these prevailing evils. Popular lectures are spreading them in the name of a boasting, though shallow and false philosophy. Unsanctified prosperity is rearing thousands upon thousands in a selfishness and a sensuality that, under such popular literary and scientific influence, ren-der them easily changed into confident, though stupid scoffers, walking after their own lusts. The general education pleaded for will leave the minds of the rising generation without any antidote to those prevailing influences and tendencies. And, not as a matter of expediency, or as the least of two evils, in the disordered state of society, but as a matter of absolute perpetual obligation, such as bear rule among men, in regard to the laws which they frame and execute, are to know no difference, and to make none, between the religion of Christ and the religion of Antichrist, but to treat them exactly with the same favour, or

rather the same indifference. These and many such evils are abroad among us, hemming in true religion, depressing its interest and power, penetrating into our churches and families, seducing fatally the young, destined probably ere long to poison the very sources of instruction and of training for our children, and preparing many, it is too likely, for open apostasy when a day of trial comes. (Applause.) If such evils as these, or others of equal magnitude are to be apprehended, it becomes us to act as those who are alive to their position, their prospects, and their duty, and prepared earnestly to contend or the faith once delivered to the saints. (Applause.) As we would 422
have Christ with us, we must teach men everywhere to observe all things whatsoever he has commanded us. (Applause.) By manifestation of the truth, we must commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God, and do so whether it proves the savour of life unto life, or of death unto death. We must declare the whole counsel of God, neither adding to it so as to incur the plagues which it threatens, nor taking from it so as to incur the exclusion of our names from the Book of Life. Every sentiment which we hold or reject should be held or rejected, according as it abides or cannot abide the touchstone of the Word. Thus, for instance, we hold that a number of congregations are properly formed into a Church, because that was the case with the Church in Jerusalem, and the Church at Ephesus. We do not lodge the form of government in the hands of the members, because it is said, 'Obey them that have the rule over you.' We place the initiatory seal of the covenant on the children of believers, because the promise of the covenant is to them as well as to their parents. We must maintain the propriety and necessity of a standing ministry, so long as we read of the pastors and teachers given by Christ for the edifying of his body, the Church. We cannot believe that the dispensation of the sacraments is the chief means of grace, while we hear Paul saying that he was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel. We cannot countenance the taking up of this chief work of the ministry by any at the bidding of their own conceit, so long as we respect the information that even Timothy set himself to it through the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery; still less can we countenance the immodest assumption of the work by females, while we regard the prohibition laid on women in this matter in the Word of God. We cannot submit to diocesan bishops, so long as we can have such bishops as those of the Church of Philippi; or such guides and rulers as were at once the bishops and elders of the Church of Ephesus. We cannot have anything to do with such Established Churches as exist, so long as we duly, remember that we have but one Master, even Christ, and that, while rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, we are to render to God the things that are God's. (Applause.) As little can we have to do with the doctrine of those who would have rulers either to acknowledge or to ignore Christ and Antichrist alike, so long as we remember what is involved in his having all power in heaven and on earth. With each and all of the characteristic doctrines and practices of the Papacy we must keep up an unceasing and deadly war, so long as we remember the marks of Satanic wickedness, and the sentence of doom pronounced against that system in the unerring, unchangeable, everlasting Word. So, in like manner, in dealing with these who introduce erroneous doctrines, of whatsoever nature, into the Church, anent the state of sin and misery into which mankind have fallen, or the way of salvation revealed in the gospel, our only course is to go ourselves and bring them to the law and to the testimony, assured that, if they speak not according to them, there is no light in them. Even when we have to vindicate the divine authority of the sacred writings themselves, the simple, suitable statement of the truth which they reveal will so exhibit their self evidencing power as often most effectually to confound and silence all gainsayers. Yea, when obliged to contend with the greatest deistical or atheistical pretenders to science, the best way to confound them, and to scatter others from their side, often is just to hold forth the Scripture character of God and of Christ, till they are unable to stand in the presence of its manifested glory. (App- lause.) There is no end or limit to the power which the Word thus puts into the hands of those who use it faithfully. Only let them use it as the word of him who calls himself 'the Word of God,' and in that character is come forth 'to smite the nations.' Let them, in his name and with his attending presence, go forth everywhere, crying, 'O Earth, Earth, Earth, hear the Word of the

Lord!' The Word, so used, will prove a two-edged sword from his mouth, to pierce and lay prostrate before him, or to cause to perish from his presence, all to whom it comes. It will prove a fire to consume whatever refuses to be purified by it, a hammer to break the hardest rock in pieces, a flail with which the worm Jacob shall thrash the mountains, a sword in the hands of the saints, giving them power to bind kings themselves with chains, and nobles with fetters of iron. For he whose word it is, and who is himself 'THE WORD of GOD,' 'hath received a name which is above every name, that at his name every knee should bow, and that every tongue should confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' To Christ, therefore, the divine head of every man, we must go ourselves and try to bring every sinner for salvation, and yield and seek to secure unreserved love and obedience. To Christ, the living and life giving Head of the Church, we must look to rule her faith, and worship, and discipline; to fill her with his light, and life, and peace; and so to become a wall of fire around her, and the glory in the midst of her. And we must equally own and honor Christ as Governor among the nations, and address to those concerned his message, 'Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings, be ye instructed ye judges of the earth; serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling; kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, if once his wrath be kindled but a little. The kingdom and nation that will not serve her (*i.e.*, the Church) shall perish: yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. The kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him.' These and similar declarations of Scripture conspicuously confront the rulers and ruled of earth at this moment, proclaiming their fate in their corporate character for time, as well as their fate, individually, for eternity. What these declarations mean will of course be sought out and testified by every faithful witness for Christ. Their whole meaning it is not our business here to attempt to state, for that is a subject within the region of debate, which it is neither my province nor my desire at present to enter. But I suppose I shall have the sympathy of all among us whose opinions and feelings are worthy of respect, if I state the following inferences from such declarations as inferences that will be generally admitted. First, Neutrality in the cause of Christ on the part of rulers and nations as such, as well as on the part of any other of the sons of men, in the use of any resources committed to their trust, must always be regarded and dealt with by him as a refusal of allegiance to his throne, and bring down upon them his displeasure. (Applause.) Secondly, All positive support or encouragement given to any kind of idolatry or anti-christian worship insults the person and specially provokes the anger of God the Saviour, who will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to graven images. Thirdly, To give any such support or encouragement to Popery, which is emphatically the Antichrist, the formal, direct, and most malignant enemy of

Christ on earth, is to become involved in the deadliest war that has ever been waged with Christ in this world, and in an altogether peculiar manner inevitably brings down on those who engage in it the wrath of the Lamb. (Applause.) Fourthly, If, either on the ground of their being alike channels of good, or on the ground that apart from their moral character, they are both great political powers, national rulers as such dare to place Popery on a level with the Gospel, and to deal with the priests and inventions of Popery exactly in the same way as with the ministers and ordinances of the Gospel – they put Baal on a level with Jehovah, offer the most intolerable of all insults to the only true God and Saviour, and bring on the land which they misgovern sure if not swift destruction. 423
(Applause.) Fifthly, Looking at the prevalence of Popery, of infidelity, of practical atheism, and of the divisions and strifes of evangelical Churches in the land, enlightened, faithful, Christian rulers (if we have such) would, in present circumstances, serve Christ and the nation, as well as the Church, most effectually, – first, by refusing all aid to the false religion; secondly, by recognizing and owning Gospel truth wherever it is found in the land; third, by encouraging the friends of the Gospel to maintain and support it by their own exertions – (applause) – and, fourth, by aiding in its extension and support only in cases which private Christian enterprise was failing to reach. (App- lause.) In some such way as this, probably, must we labour to clear for ourselves, and to occupy, the ground on which it is our duty, and will prove our safety, to stand in the coming battle of the great day of God Almighty, when rulers and powers, civil and ecclesiastical, shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for he is Lord of lords and King of kings. In the view of these conflicts it is of unspeakable importance that, as a Church, we draw closer and closer to Christ himself; cultivate more vital union to and communion with him; be filled with his truth and grace; and bear faithful testimony concerning him before all men; – and that whether they hear or whether they forbear. His Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, and his witness for the truth upon the earth. She can be so only so far as she has in her the same mind that is in himself. She must not separate herself from his side. To whomsoever he is sending his messages, she must repeat them in her testimony. She must not break her links with the past, the present, or the future, farther than he has broken his. Of all Churches on earth, it specially becomes the Presbyterian Church of Scotland to be jealous of narrowing the ground on which she stands for the honour of her Lord. For, reviving the primitive faith of the country, which the Papacy long overbore, our Reformers, drawing the doctrine, worship, and government of the Church directly from the Divine Word alone, gave her such a full, comprehensive, and scriptural platform, that the carrying of it out would bring the land, or any land, wholly, over to Jesus. Its very partial realisation, and that in spite of continual attempts on the part of our civil rulers to corrupt and weaken it, has raised Scotland morally above every land on earth. Its universal, full realisation, would turn the kingdoms of the world into the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ. Be it ever far from us to imagine that our Reformers laboured for mistaken views of the truth, and that their joy in suffering for what they deemed the cause of Christ was a delusive joy. Let us be and continue followers of them, so far as they were followers of Christ. Like them, let us resolve to be found on the Lord's side, and at his side, in his whole relations to earth and time, and linked in our teaching, claims, and destiny, to the whole length and breadth of the reign which he has promised, and will not fail to establish over all nations, so that his saints may enter with him into the dominion of the whole earth."

Referring to the subject of Union, Mr. Nixon remarked: – "I cannot help thinking that the principles of our Church, rightly understood in their nature and bearings, present broad enough ground, or, at all events, the central portion of the ground, on which to rally and band together the Evangelical Protestantism of the empire – (applause) – so as with the help of God to baffle the designs and break the power of these implacable foes of our country, and render it more than ever the home of truth and freedom, a kingdom of servants unto God. (Applause). The doctrine of our Church respecting the duty of rulers to the cause of Christ, rightly interpreted and applied, is the only doctrine that can properly and effectively meet the emergencies that are arising with reference to this matter. (Hear, hear.) It is the only

doctrine that can accomplish the true and thorough reformation of Churches and nations, and at the same time place and preserve them in their proper position toward Christ and toward each other. (Applause.) It forbids and would at once and for ever, cut of all State aid to false religion. Rather than have the true and false in religion supported together, as the lesser *evil* to a land, though still an evil to it, our doctrine prefers that, so far as concerns material aid to Churches, they be left to sustain themselves. (Applause). At the same time, our doctrine would never allow rulers or ruled to fancy that they do not need the Gospel as the mainstay of all truly and lastingly healthful government, or that, as the condition of the Divine blessing upon it, Christ does not require their homage, their heartfelt practical homage, nationally as well as in all other ways, to himself, his truth, and his cause. And as a repetition of Christ's own commandment to rulers, our doctrine summons them, with all their resources, which are his gifts, to acknowledge his truth, his Church, and his rule, and to further his kingdom in the world. Now it can, I think, be easily and conclusively proved that this doctrine of our Church, so understood, is in thorough accordance with common sense, with the general judgment of all ages, with the deepest instincts of our mental nature, with the lessons of history, of observation, and of experience, and with the manifest dictates of the Word of God. Properly applied our doctrine would command the respect of all men. It would overthrow false Churches. It would put an end to the false position of true Churches. It would open the hearts and hands of the followers of Christ to stand by, provide for, and uphold any Church that acts upon it. It would preserve Churches and nations from the sin of putting Christ and Antichrist avowedly on a level, whether by doing equally much or equally little for both – conduct which, in either way is a disowning of Christ, and will be so dealt with by him. And, fin-ally, this doctrine of ours, as a principle of the divine government, would operate so as to end in the destruction of all Churches and communities of men who will not have Christ alone by his truth to reign in and over them, and in leading the nations that survive to offer their homage at his feet, so as to be blessed in him, and call him blessed, and to fill the earth with his glory. (Applause.) We have no faith in any other principle as capable of accomplishing these ends. If rulers let true religion alone on the ground that it refuses support at their hands, they withhold from Christ the national homage due, and they deprive their government of its chief stay, and of the use of its principal means of promoting the nation's well being. If rulers treat religion of every kind as a mere engine of State policy, to be used or thrown aside as expediency may seem to dictate, a land so governed will speedily become so demoralised as to perish in its corruption.

But if rulers refuse their countenance to error, and give their countenance to truth wherever found, inculcate liberality as the main dependence of the Church, and, supplement it only so far as the peace of the Church permits and its necessities require – (hear, hear) – such rulers would be just, ruling in the fear of God; and, with reference to the land which they governed, 'as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.' Till statesmen come to be somewhat of this character, the less we are required to look to them for the maintenance and advancement of religion, the better. (Applause.) Not that we are to abstain from proclaiming their duty. (Hear, hear.) Not that the land can truly and permanently prosper, except they perform their duty. Not that we are to leave Christian duty undone, rather than have 424
their assistance in doing it, even when that assistance is offered on proper conditions. But, alas! the bulk of all classes of statesmen, even when they do a thing towards religion, which is in itself right and proper, are yet animated in the act with principles so unsound, and, besides the one right end, have so many other and ulterior ends in view which are mischievous, that our Church and ministers would act most wisely in letting these potsherds of the earth strive with each other – (laughter) – in simply holding forth before them the grand principle of Christ's gospel and government to which Churches and nations must both submit before the earth has rest, and in the meantime welcoming any result of their movements which may tend to good, and striving with our whole energies and resources to advance the power and prevalence of these principles, which shall yet make all men in all positions to bow at the name of Jesus, or crush them under his feet. I cannot shut from my thoughts the perplexities with which we are involved with reference to our duty to Christ, to his Word, and to his Church, in regard to one of the subjects before us. But it is not the first time that we have been in perplexity. . . . . And if we are uprightly seeking to know the way of duty, and waiting on the Lord for guidance, he will direct our steps. Let us resolve that, so far as we can, with prayerful inquiry and deliberation, ascertain his will, we shall neither advance without his presence nor remain behind it. Let us have no other desire than that he may reign, reign in us and over us, reign in our courts and congregations, in our Church and land, and reign over the earth. Let us resolve to be in that position in which we may serve Him most freely and most fully, in which we can obey the entire instruction of his Word, and testify whatever concerns his honour, and do most to advance his kingdom and man's salvation; and our ears shall hear a word behind us saying, 'This is the way, walk ye in it, when we turn to the right hand, and when we turn to the left' (Applause.) We are compassed about with a cloud of unseen witnesses, who have rapidly gone up from our own ranks, and whose voices speak to us from the eternal world, calling us to faith, and patience, and brotherly love, and heavenly hope, and sobriety of judgment, and holy faithfulness and zeal in the work which our hands find to do.

If we are not wanting to God's glory, he will not be wanting to our joy. – Brooks.

MR. DYKES ON COLONIAL UNION*S*.

[In submitting to our readers the just and seasonable remarks of our correspondent, we deem it proper to contradict the statement of Mr. Dykes, made, of course, from hearsay, and not from personal observation, that, "so far as the history of this union (that in this colony) goes, its fruits have been signally good." Its fruits have been so far from bearing such a character that many, who were favourable to it, and expected from it, in at least some good measure, such advantages as they were assured it would yield, now confess that they have been sadly disappointed. The Church which resulted from it is, as a matter of course, numerically stronger than any of the Presbyterian Churches that formerly existed in the colony; but increase of numbers, when secured, as in this case, by unfaithfulness to the truth and by compromise of principle, is not a "good" or even creditable result. And yet, with the exception of this result, there is nothing whatever among the products of the union that can be referred to as "good fruit," while there is not a little of a decidedly opposite character. With far more knowledge of the colony than Mr. Dykes possesses, and with probably a deeper interest in its welfare, we are constrained to regard its Presbyterianism as in a worse condition now than it was in prior to the union; and, if we are not greatly mistaken in our interpretation of symptoms by no

means obscure, it will inevitably sink, within the range of the union, into a condition still more unsatisfactory. The union, in the estimation of at least some of those who took part in effecting it, was only a first instalment of change and modification; and it is difficult to say what aspect the Union Church will pre-sent by the time the balance is cleared off. We may be pretty sure, however, that, little as it now resembles the true Church of Scotland, it will then resemble it still less. What those gentlemen desiderate is, as they themselves express it, "An Australian Church for Australia," that is, if the language has any meaning, a church organised, not after the Scripture model, and therefore not after the model of the reformed Church of Scotland, but according to a "plan and specifications" prepared specially for these colonies. It might be thought a serious objection to this method of Church organisation that it is wholly different from that adopted by the Apostles, whose plan and practice it clearly was to erect, not, for example, a Galatian Church in Galatia and a Judean Church in Judea, but in every territory, into which they introduced the Gospel, a Church conformed exactly to the pattern shewn them by Christ. It is not, however, felt to be so by those, who have this matter in hand.

Mr. Dykes, by-the-bye, seems to think – and we shall not controvert the opinion – that in one respect, at least, Australia has too "Australian" a Church, a Church which has derived too many of its ministers from a process somewhat similar to that which inflicted on these colonies their early population – from a sort of transportation. "It has been," he says, "the habit of the colonies to suffer not so much from the want of men as from the kind of men you send forth. There has been more injury done, or at least as much, from men going out who ought not to have done so, as by withholding them."

The fruits of the union "good," forsooth! How could good fruits be produced by a union which has taught those who concurred in it that men may violate principles which they profess to bold, and violate them not in one instance and under urgent circumstances only (which were bad enough) but systematically and always, entering into a compact which imposes an obligation to violate them; voluntaries, for example, agreeing that some of the ministers associated with them shall receive State aid, and even taking direct personal part in providing for their Church a theological institution to be partly erected and partially endowed by the Government? Is this a mode of proceeding that is in accordance with the mind of Christ, and on which his blessing may be expected? Mr. Dykes may believe it is: we cannot.]

To the Editor of "The Testimony."

Sir – In the report of a speech delivered by the Rev. Mr. Coutts, at the annual meeting of the Presbyterian Congregation

in Hunter Street, Newcastle, I observed that that gentleman referred to the reception given by the late General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland to the statements of the Rev. Mr. Dykes, respecting the Presbyterian unions that have been effected in New South Wales and Victoria.

I was rather astonished that Mr. Coutts attached so much importance to the Testimony of the Free Church Assembly. According to the views once held (and, we presume, still held) by him, the Free Church is a schismatic body, and so occupies a sinful position. For, of course, this view must be held, by every intelligent and consistent admirer of the principles and position of the Established Church of Scotland. It is also cause of astonishment that the testimony of the late Free Church Assembly, in the matter referred to by Mr. Coutts, should be thus appealed to. I have no doubt some of your readers will remember that a testimony of a very different kind was given forth by the Free Assembly of 1845, when it received with roars of 425 laughter the "milk and water" resolutions (as they were called) of the Synod of Australia. These resolutions were to the effect that the Synod was willing to hold fellowship with and receive ministerial supplies from the Established and Free Church alike – in other words, to act towards them as on the same footing. But the last part of the basis on which the union in this colony was consummated and the resolutions appended to it are identical, as to their object, with the "milk and water" resolutions of 1844, that object being to place the two Churches – the Free and the Established – on the same level. Two of these resolutions are as follows: "That, previously to the consummation of the union, the Synod of Australia shall dissolve its connection with the Established Church of Scotland, and omit from its designation the terms expressive of that connection": "That the Synod of Eastern Australia shall, previously to the consummation of the union, emit a declaration to the effect that they have no ecclesiastical connection with the Free Church of Scotland." In an able pamphlet, published shortly before the consummation of the union, the writer, after giving a correct history of these resolutions, says in regard to the second: –

"It is very true that the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia has no connection with the Free Church; but, while it is a fact, it is a well known fact, that it has no connection with it, a fact which it is not necessary to declare for the purpose of making it known. Why, then, declare it? To serve the purpose I have indicated, and that purpose alone, – the purpose of placing the Free Church of Scotland on the same footing, on which the dissolution by the Synod of Australia of the connection of the Church under its spiritual superintendence with the Established Church of Scotland would place the Established Church of Scotland, and of thus contributing to place those Scottish Churches, the Established and the Free, on the same footing, in every respect in relation to the proposed United Colonial Church."

The following resolution provides that, in the matter of procuring ministers, nothing should be done to frustrate the design or disturb the effect of this levelling and equalising process: –

"That no official application for the supply of Ministers be made from the United Church to any of the Churches in the United Kingdom.

If the proposed United Church is not to honour the Established Church of Scotland by applying to it for ministers, neither is it to honour the Free Church with such an application. It must on no account and in no respect indicate the slightest preference for the one as compared with the other. It must be scrupulously careful to treat both exactly alike.

The resolutions that have now been reviewed are *negative* in their operation. What they provide is, in the first place, that if one of the negotiating Churches must withdraw from its connection with the Established Church of Scotland, the other must at the same time proclaim that it has *no* connection with the Free Church of Scotland; and, in the second place, that *no* application shall be made for ministers to the Free any more than to the Established Church of Scotland. Of this *negative* compromise the last article of the basis furnishes the *positive* complement. 'This Church,' it says, referring to the proposed United Church, 'shall receive ministers and probationers from other Presbyterian Churches applying for admission, on their affording satisfactory evidence of their qualifications and eligibility, and subscribing the formula.' Here it is, first of all, laid down that the United Church 'shall receive ministers and probationers from other Presbyterian Churches' without distinction. It will receive them from the Established Church as well as from the Free Church of Scotland, and from the former as gladly as from the latter."

The object proposed in the "milk and water" resolutions of 1844, being thus reproduced in the resolutions and the basis on

which the union was consummated, what a strange spectacle presents itself as to the connection of Free Church Assemblies with these matters. In 1845, the Assembly receives with shouts of derisive laughter resolutions placing the Colonial Church in the same relation to the Free and Established Churches; and in the Assembly of 1868 the account of a union whose formation involved the very same compromise, is received with applause; and whilst the Assembly now-a-days virtually retracts the testimony it formerly bore as to colonial faithfulness and unfaithfulness, there is no avowal of such retraction. Surely some explanation is required when Assemblies in 1866 and 1868 approve of a compromising course, which was condemned by an Assembly of the same Church in 1845.

In this connexion it is instructive to mark the different periods at which testimonies were given forth in regard to colonial matters in the Free Church. The testimony given forth in 1845 was in the days of her first love, when she was cleaving fast to her principles. The latter testimonies are given forth in times when not a few of her own ministers and elders evidently think that she has entered upon a retrograde course as to the maintenance of her distinctive principles.

I will now proceed to notice some of the statements made by Mr. Dykes in his speech before the Assembly. One of these statements is as follows: – "It (the union) has been effected simply by falling back on these (the Westminster standards) which are common to all the portions into which Presbytery has fallen, and by suffering those differences, which have emerged in the course of history, to remain in abeyance, in so far as they are differences not recognised by the Presbyterian standards of Westminster." We demur to the representation that the union in this colony was effected simply by falling back on the Westminster standards. There were, as we have shown, resolutions accompanying the basis, which, along with the concluding part of the basis itself, involve compromise by placing, and that designedly, faithful and unfaithful Churches on a level. As to falling back on the Westminster standards, it was well known that many of those who subscribed the basis held widely different views, and that, too, on a vitally important point. Surely those on the one hand who declared their continued approval of the principles and position of the Established Church of Scotland, and those on the other hand and who asserted their approval of the principles and position of the Free Church of Scotland, must hold widely different views of the doctrine of Christ's headship over the Church. If

that be a slight difference, how can the contendings and position of the Free Church be justified? The Colonial Committee of the Free Church must, in better times, have thought this to be too important a point to be kept in abeyance. The late convener (the Rev. Dr. Bonar) of that committee wrote many years ago to Tasmania that, in order to the Free Church approving of a Presbyterian Union, it would need to have some assurance that parties entering it did not approve of the Church as at present established in Scotland, or words to that effect. Now, at the time the union was effected in this colony, the Free Church had no such assurance as the Colonial Committee deemed necessary in 1852. On the contrary, those in this colony connected with the Established Church declared most explicitly their undiminished approval of that Church, and would allow of no arrangement which had the appearance of reflecting unfavourably upon it.

Mr. Dykes in his speech took special notice of the cordial reception given to him by the Assembly of the United Church in New South Wales. But he might also have stated that, if a minister of some standing should appear as a representative from the Established Church – a church which is regarded by 426
Mr. Dykes and those who applauded his statements as an Erastian Church – he would receive just as hearty a welcome as Mr. Dykes received from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. If this addition had been made by him he would thus more faithfully have said what was "due not only to the Churches" in these colonies, "but also to the principles they represent." These principles would not lead the Union Churches to give a more cordial reception to a minister coming from the Free Church, than they would give to one coming from the Establishment. Speaking of his reception, Mr. Dykes did not inform the Free Assembly that the minister who, as Moderator, conveyed the thanks of the Union Assembly to him, wrote a pamphlet shortly before the consummation of the union, in which he charges the Free Church with Popish assumptions, and characterises the disruption as an outburst of fanaticism, and the conduct of the Free Church leaders as something worse. Mr. Dykes lauds the members of the Assembly he attended in New South Wales for their avoiding, "with a kindly and gracious jealousy, any subject, or the expression of any opinion, which was thought to have the slightest danger of irritating or stirring up old animosities." He also alludes to previous divisions among Presbyterians in this colony. Now the speaker could not be ignorant that one of these divisions consisted in the separation of those who formed the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia in 1846, and who at the time were highly lauded by the Free Church. Any allusion to that division by any of the ministers of the Union would, no doubt, have irritated, and would have been contrary to the spirit of the compact to which they had agreed. There have been times, however, in the history of the Free Church, when the laudation of such extreme caution in referring to a matter, which in the judgment of that Church involves faithfulness to Christ on one side, and unfaithfulness on the other, would have met with very little sympathy in a Free Church General Assembly. I only add that, if Mr. Dykes's view as to keeping silence on important points of difference were to be carried out, Unions on a very extensive scale indeed might be easily effected and maintained. But would that be loyalty to the truth?

Yours, &c, Presbyter

15th September, 1868.

MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

To the Editor of "The Testimony."

Sir, – Another act in the drama for suppressing the Free Presbyterian Church in this colony has taken place. The sum of £380 drawn for some time back by a couple of Unionists so long as they dishonourably retained the name of the church mentioned, is now, on the sole authority of their friend the Treasurer of the colony, to be transferred to the account of the Presbyterian Church. You may remember, that during last year there was the instructive conjunction of two Bills before Parliament, in which the Unionists were specially interested. The Attorney-General of the time brought in an Education Bill, which was vigorously supported by the Presbyterians. But it turned out that the Presbyterians had a "little Bill" of their own to get pushed through Parliament, and it was put into the hands of the Attorney-General. The Education Bill was founded on some mistakes as to statistics, and was withdrawn. The Free Church Spoliation Bill, however, briefly called the "Synod of Victoria Bill," contained mistakes all through and had to be entirely remodelled, yet its passage through Parliament was secured by the Attorney-General: This made over a large number of Free Church properties to the Union, but there remained the question regarding the annual sum drawn as stipend and building grant. You will notice that according to the 53rd clause of the Constitution Act of this colony the sum of £50,000 is to be distributed to the different denominations

according to their numerical strength as determined by the last census. To interfere with any clause in the Constitution Act requires that the Bill shall have an absolute majority in its favour when passing through both Houses. The Bill was not treated according to these conditions; indeed it was even degraded from being regarded as a public Bill at all. It was pronounced by the Speaker to be a private Bill, and standing orders were suspended in order to remit the fees due in behalf of private Bills. The Unionists had influence enough in Parliament to secure all this. In these circumstances, then, the properties had been transferred to the Union, but not the State grant of money. How was this to be accomplished? Of course there are such things as taking the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown; also trial of the case before the Supreme Court, to ascertain how the law of the matter really stands. According to these methods, Free Church money might have been left with Free Church people; but there was a much shorter method, by which Free Church money – even the small sum of £380 per annum – might become a sweet morsel to the Unionists. I will endeavour briefly to explain this matter a little further. As already indicated, the basis of distribution is the numerical strength of each denomination according to the last census. At the last census there was such a confusion of Presbyterian designations that, after a prolonged correspondence on the subject, the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown was taken, and the number of ministers supported by each nomination was accepted as the nearest adjustment in the circumstances. This arrangement was obviously in place of the determination according to the actual number of adherents. But when the Unionists arrived at the zenith of their strength, Mr. Hetherington applied for a re-distribution of the State aid. This the Treas-urer of the period resisted, stating that as an increase of adherents between one census and another made no difference in the amount to be drawn, so the increase of ministers did not entitle the body to a re-distribution of the State grant. The former Treasurer belonged to the Church of England; the present Treasurer is a Presbyterian – a Unionist, and only a few days ago received the usual silver trowel for laying the foundation stone of a Union church. The matter was very summarily dealt with by him. It was put to him, Could the Treasurer take mon-ey from the account of one denomination, the Free Church, and put it to the account of another denomination. He ans- wered in the

affirmative without hesitation. He was referred to auditor of the public accounts, and at once announced that he declined interference at that point – he acted independently of commissioners of audit. Such is the advantage on the part of the Unionists in having Blastus, the king's chamberlain, as a friend at court. According to this, if I should join the Church of England, it would depend simply on the goodwill of the Trea-surer for the time whether or not I could take with me a portion of the grant allotted to the Free Presbyterian Church. Of course no Treasurer would venture to assume this arbitrary power where a large denomination might to be the victim. Had the Free Church been powerful in numbers and political influence, there is not the least reason to believe that the £380 would have been taken out of the Free Church account at the Treasury, and put to the credit of her denomination. In our case, unfortunately, the transfer could be "safely" made, as the Attorney-General said when handing over about a dozen Free Church properties to the Unionists, at the instance of those two very eminent free Church ministers, Messrs. McVean and Meiklejohn. The matter was determined at a meeting held at the Treasury on the 2nd September. Representatives of the opposite sides were invited to be present. No reporters were at the interview, which lasted little more than a quarter of an hour. 427

When we came out, the lobbies were crowded with deputations awaiting an audience, and long reports of their interviews appeared in the newspapers of the following day. I had occasion before to draw attention to the fact that while the Free Church Suppression Bill was passing through Parliament prolonged evidence was taken – but not published.

Short as the interview was there were little characteristic incidents which may be noticed. At one point Mr. Hetherington used, in regard to Mr. Paul, who was present, the endearing expression "our brother." This was too much for me. I do not mean that I had recourse to my pocket handkerchief. In a prolonged drama incidents will occur that excite the risible faculties as well as the emotions of satisfaction, indignation, &c., &c. My indignation has been roused often enough when I have seen the pious pretences of Unionists, and the systematic double-dealing and untruthfulness by which Union negotiations have always been carried on. In the present case I was neither indignant nor melted with tender emotions towards "Brother Hetherington." I had no doubt the treasurer set down the pretence at its correct figure, while a smirk – I may as well confess it – might possibly have been traceable on my countenance, my eyes turned towards Mr. Meiklejohn, who was present along with Messrs. Hetherington and McVean. He appeared not a little disconcerted, and did not know which way to look. Supposing "brother Hetherlngton" should have arisen and rushed impetuously into Mr. Paul's embraces, would it have been expected of Mr. Meiklejohn to do the same to me? yet I am far from asserting that there was really nothing in the brotherly regards of Mr. Hetherington. Quite the contrary. Polypheme had some regard for Ulysses when he told him he would devour him last. I have seen a clever sketch representing two sailors adrift on a block of ice – sea monsters are sailing all round them. The skill of the artist has contrived to throw a most ludicrous indication of most sincere regard on the part of the devouring monsters towards the tough individuals on the ice. As the ravenous monsters grinned with delight, their very teeth seemed to water for the prey. Their tenderly affectionate regards were too deeply rooted in self-interest to be doubted for a moment.

Mr. Meiklejohn volunteered one announcement: "We claim to be the Free Presbyterian Church." This gentleman came in such a hurry from New Zealand, that he left questions to be settled by his New Zealand friends which he ought to have seen settled himself: With all his haste he came after the split between the two parties had taken place in Victoria. Being in motion himself he cast in his lot with Mr. McVean, who was also in motion, being on his passage between the Free Church and the Union. Of course Mr. Meiklejohn's Free Church character requires to be pointed out in such circumstances, else it might not be seen or even suspected.

Mr. McVean made numerous attempts to speak. "If the Treasurer – for one moment – would just allow me – I could, &c." This was pretty nearly the sum total of several attempts. At last, how-ever, he broke through, and was proceeding to discourse upon the Bill, the consent of parties, the equitable division – but sundry emphatic negatives from Mr. Paul could not be set aside. Mr. McVean subsided, after giving an instructive proof that the old weakness is no way cured by joining the Union. Mr. McVean's love of truth is as strong as ever. – I am, &c.,

PETER McPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, September 9th, 1868.

IS THE CHURCH OF ROME THE CATHOLIC CHURCH?

The Church of Rome arrogates to itself the character and the title of "the Catholic Church," and thus unchurches and classes as "heretics" all denominations of Christians not comprehended with- in its pale. Of course, the catholic or universal church, properly so called, is the entire and only church of Christ; and, therefore, none

but the members of it are members of the Church of Christ, or, in other words, Christians. Is the Church of Rome, then, the entire and only Church of Christ? If it is, it is properly called and ought to be called the Catholic Church, – a necessary consequence, of course, being that protestants are not christians. But protestants, by occupying the position of protestants, declare not only that the Church of Rome is not the entire and only Church of Christ, but, further, that it is so corrupt, that it is difficult, to say the least, to regard it as a branch of his Church, and impossible to hold communion with it. Accordingly, when they call it the *Catholic* Church, they stultify themselves; they contradict or retract this declaration, and, to be consistent should abandon the position which implies it, by giving in their adherence to their Catholic Church, or by avowing themselves here- tics if not heathens.

Protestants very generally seem to feel the inconsistency, into which they thus fall in styling the Church of Rome the Catholic Church. And, to compound the matter, they adopt an expedient which they too hastily conclude will, on the one hand, save their consistency and their claim to rank as christians, and, on the other, satisfy their popish neighbours. They prefix *Roman* to *Catholic,* and speak of the Roman Catholic Church. But this amend-ed nomenclature only adds a new objection to those it seeks to remove; for what is catholic, that is, universal, cannot be Roman, and therefore particular.

But, though the Church of Rome were the Catholic Church, it would still be improper to call its members Catholics. The entire Church of Christ, as comprehending all his people, is properly called catholic or universal, but from the very ground on which thus it is properly so called, it is evident that its members cannot be spoken of as catholic or universal. If *Catholic* were a term expressive of character it might be applied to individual members as well as to the aggregate of members viewed as a whole. Thus the true Church of Christ is holy and each member of it is holy. But *Catholic* is expressive not of character, but of extent, for it denotes the *whole* viewed as comprehending all the constituent parts, as, for example, the whole Church viewed as comprehending all the members who compose it. It is, therefore, altogether inapplicable, in the case which we have now under consideration, to a member of the Church. There is much the same impropriety in calling a

member of it a *Catholic,* as there would be in calling a single citizen *the Nation.*

What name, then, are we to give to this Church and to its members? As for the church, why not call it the Church of Rome, as we call the Church of England the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland the Church of Scotland; or, as there is some impropriety in applying a name derived from a particular territory to a body beyond that territory, why not can it the Popish or Papal Church, as being governed by the Pope, on the same principle on which we call a Church governed by bishops an Episcopal Church, and a Church governed by presbyters a Presbyterian Church? and, then, calling the Church the popish or papal Church, we should call the members of it papists, as we call the members of Episcopal Churches Episcopalians, and those of Presbyterian Churches Presbyterians.

But papists themselves do not like this name. But why not? Are they ashamed of the pope, that they dislike to be called after him? Or are they displeased that we do not assist their Church in its arrogant and impudent attempt to monopolise the christian name, and quietly accept for ourselves the position and appellation of heretics which it assigns to us? This latter, we have no doubt, is the real cause of offence, but it is such a cause as protestants, if they are only true to themselves, cannot remove.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 37 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, OCTOBER, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 37 OCTOBER. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

PAGE.
Faith … … … … … … 429
The Free Church, Union Negotiations, and the Establishment Principle 431
"Work in the Wynds," and "The Psalms of David" … … 432
Mr. Dykes' Speech on the Australian Churches … … 433
Publicans and the Public … … … … 434
Moderatism in Victoria … … … … 435
Disposition to compromise the Truth manifested in Union Negotiations in Scotland … … … … … 437
Popery and Ritualism… … … … … 438
Irish Church Commission … … … … 438
The Structure of Psalm 133 … … … … 439
Romish Impositions … … … … … 439
Ecclesiastical Intelligence … … … … 439

FAITH.

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" – John 3: 30.

There are three topics suggested by these words to which we propose to direct attention – the nature of faith – the warrant to believe, – and the motives to believe.

It may seem unnecessary to institute any inquiry into the nature of faith, inasmuch as we know, from acquaintance with the acts of our own minds, what it is to believe. But, when we reflect that, as is evident from the Scriptures, there

is a species of faith that is not saving, we shall perceive that such an inquiry is not unnecessary. Simon Magus believed after a sort, (Acts 8: 13,) and yet he was "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." – (23.) And we read that on a certain occasion many believed in Christ's name, to whom notwithstanding, he did not commit himself (John 2: 23, 24.) He was thus practically pronounced their faith worthless. And he declares "not every one that says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter in heaven," (Matt. 7: 21,) though all who recognise him as "Lord" must have some kind of faith.

The nature of the faith, that ought to be exercised in any given case, will depend upon the nature of its object. Some objects of faith are related only to the understanding. If a person of unquestionable veracity informed me that travelling, say, in a part of this island not previously explored, he discovered a mountain of a certain appearance and height; regarding his testimony as sufficient evidence in such a case, I would believe him. Here my belief or faith would be no more than the assent of my understanding, – the admission of my understanding of the sufficiency of the evidence, and, consequently, of the truth of the statement. There would be nothing for me to admire or to appreciate; I should be only informed, that, at a certain time and in a certain locality, a mountain in no way remarkable was discovered. But if my informant related to me the circumstances of a recent shipwreck, attended with a great loss of life, and described in vivid terms the fears, the unavailing efforts, and the protracted sufferings which preceded the disastrous and melancholy issue; – in this case; as in the former, my understanding would admit the sufficiency of the evidence and the truth of the statement; I should believe in this sense. But in the object of faith now presented to me there would be not a tittle that addressed itself to my heart, – that called for sympathy and for sorrow at my hands; and accordingly if my heart remained unaffected my faith would be inadequate – it would not be commensurate with its object. The object of faith in the former case would address itself to my understanding only, and therefore the due recognition of it by the understanding would in that case be an adequate faith; but now the object of faith presented to me would address itself to my heart as well as to my understanding, and therefore the recognition of it by the understanding only would not be an adequate faith.

If a faithful servant rushed into your presence with the alarming intelligence that your house was on fire, and that in a few minutes more it would be impossible for you to effect your escape, and you coolly replied that you believed him, but remained composed and sat still; would he not conclude, notwithstanding your assurance to the contrary, that you did not believe him? And why would he draw this conclusion? Because he could not but perceive that the faith which you professed to exercise was wholly inadequate; – that it fell far short of being commensurate with the object of faith presented to you. That object being such that it addressed itself powerfully to the heart, without the recognition of it by the heart there could not be an adequate recognition of it.

It is not enough, however, in order that faith may be adequate, that its object, when it is such as addresses itself to the heart as well as to the understanding, be recognised by the heart as well as to the understanding. It is necessary further that it be *suitably* recognised by the heart. If you are informed that somewhat has befallen a neighbour which is greatly to his advantage, and you believe the intelligence, but regard the occurrence with regret; – there is here a recognition by the heart of an object of faith which addresses itself to the heart, but there is not a suitable recognition of it by the heart. It is regarded with regret, whereas it should be reg-arded with joy. The faith of devils comprehends a recognition of its object by the heart; – "they believe and tremble;" – but 430
the recognition is not a suitable recognition, there is nothing in it, for example, of the adoring love with which the character of God should be regarded.

Thus faith may be described as the adequate recognition of its object, – the recognition of it, according to its character, by the heart as well as by the understanding, when it is of such a nature that it addresses itself to the heart.

From the remarks that have now been made, it may be perceived that the inadequacy of faith is of two kinds. One form of inadequate faith presents itself to us, when the object of faith addresses itself to the heart as well as to the understanding, but is recognised only by the understanding; and another, when the object of faith presents itself to the heart and is recognised by the heart, but not suitably. The former kind of inadequacy arises from the disruption of the heart from the understanding which sin has wrought. But for this disruption and the consequent schism in our nature, every object presented to us would meet with an adequate recognition, – a just recognition of the whole of its character and of the whole of its claims. And the latter kind of inadequacy arises from the corruption of the heart, in consequence of which it puts bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.

From the view now presented of the nature of faith in general, you will perceive that saving faith is just an adequate recognition of its object. What then constitutes such a recognition? The object of saving faith is Christ, the Saviour of sinners. – Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world – Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved – He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. Christ, as the object of saving faith, is presented to us in the light of the Gospel testimony and offer. The Gospel testimony describes Christ's person, his offices, and his benefits. In his person he as unspeakably glorious as the Son of God, and with his divine glory are associated the mild graces of his humanity. He is thus the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely. His offices originated in his Father's love and in his own. The Father so loved the world that he gave him to assume and to execute his mediatorial offices, and he himself so loved it that he wholly concurred with the Father in this arrangement, and in due time finished the work which was given him to do. And his offices, instituted by divine wisdom, are co-extensive with our wants varied and multiplied as these are. We are ignorant, and he is a prophet and teaches his people. But we are blind, not merely without knowledge; but spiritually incapable of receiving it; and he, in the exercise of his prophetic office, enlightens the eyes of the understanding; he not only presents the light of the truth, but also imparts to the soul the power of spiritual vision. We are guilty, and he, as the high priest of his people has made atonement for sin, and cancels its guilt. We labour under many wants, and are exposed to many evils, and he ever liveth

to make intercession for his people, and to procure for them, and dispense to them, all the blessings that they need. We are naturally of a rebellious spirit; and he, in the day of his power and by the efficacy of his grace, makes his people willing to submit to his authority. We are surrounded by enemies, who are too powerful for us, but he makes his people more than conquerors. In short, he works in his people all the good pleasure of his goodness and perfects that which concerns them. And his benefits are inestimably precious, – peace and acceptance with God, renewal after his image, restoration to communion with him, and ultimately the full and eternal enjoyment of him, – in a word all that is desirable for us and would be advantageous to us. And those benefits derive no small enhancement from our natural position, as guilty, condemned sinners liable to eternal misery.

And Christ, as executing those offices and bestowing those benefits, is offered to us, – he is offered to us that he may execute his offices in, our case, bestow his benefits on us, and thus be our Saviour.

Such is the object of saving faith, – the object of which it forms the adequate and due recognition. Accordingly in the exercise of saving faith, which the understanding assents to the truth of the Gospel testimony and offer there is besides the suitable recognition by the heart of all that both present; – the excellency of Christ's person, the grace, the suitableness, and the efficacious execution of his offices, and the preciousness and fulness of his benefits, are met with the proper affections and the proper choice, – are dealt with suitably by the whole soul, – not by the understanding only, but also by the heart. Realise the circumstances under which faith is exercised and the office it fulfils. You feel that you are guilty and ready to perish, – all who exercise saving faith do, – and while you feel that you are in this state the call is addressed to you, "Behold the Lamb of God, – believe on him and you shall be saved." You direct your attention to the Saviour thus presented and offered to you, and you see that he is himself glorious, that the salvation which he bestows is glorious, – and that he bestows it in the exercise of loving kindness and with mighty power; and, now, what is necessary and what constitutes saving faith is, that your whole soul be suitably exercised with respect to what is thus before you, – that you admire, prize, choose, confide. That you merely assent to the truth of the Gospel message respecting Christ and his salvation is, by no means, the whole of what the occasion demands; it demands, besides the exercise of certain affections and a certain determination and choice. If you tell a mother that her son, who for several tempestuous days, that to her seemed interminable, was exposed at sea to the dangers of a terrible storm, is now safe on shore, will her faith in the intelligence be a mere assent of the understanding? Will not her heart have a large share in the exercise of it? From the nature of its object it will be an ardent affectionate faith. And so also, from the nature of its object, is saving faith. If a widowed mother were anxiously revolving in her mind how she might be able to make provision for herself and her destitute family, and, while as yet she could think of no method of accomplishing her object, a benevolent kinsman sent word to her, that, if she confided in him and would be directed by him, he would undertake to see herself and her family provided for in a manner that would be altogether satisfactory to her; and, if, reflecting upon his character, his resources, and the terms of his offer, she perceived that his proposal was honorable to himself and highly desirable for her, and cordially accepted it; this would be an exercise of faith, and you will easily perceive that it would comprise not only the acknowledgment of the understanding that his character, his resources, and his offer were such as they appeared to be, but also the satisfaction of her heart with all that her understanding would thus acknowledge, and its acceptance of the proposal made to her.

The case, with which we deal in the exercise of saving faith, is very similar to the one we have now supposed. To sinners ready to perish a message from heaven is addressed, that, if they confide in Christ and will be directed by him, he will save them; and, when, contemplating Christ's person, his character, his offices, his resources, and his benefits, surveying the method of salvation, and weighing the terms of the Gospel offer, their understanding and their hearts are satisfied, and they accordingly: accept Christ as their only Saviour, and his benefits as all their salvation, – they exercise saving faith.

But while an exercise of saying faith is thus analogous to the exercise of faith which our supposed case illustrates, it differs from it. The object of saving is distinguished by spiritual excellencies, and, accordingly, saving faith includes in it the heart's

appreciation of those excellencies, and its satisfaction with them; whereas, in the case which we have supposed, the excellencies to be recognised by faith are excellencies within the sphere of sense, and of the present life.

There are, it appears, then, three modifications of faith by which it adapts itself to its object. When its object addresses itself to the understanding only, faith is the recognition of it by the understanding. When its object, being distinguished only by other than spiritual qualities, addresses itself to the heart as well as to the understanding, faith is the recognition of it according to its qualities, by the heart as well as the understanding; and, when its object, being distinguished by spiritual qualities, addresses itself to the understanding and the heart, faith is the recognition of it, according to its spiritual qualities, by the understanding and the heart.

Thus saving faith, being elevated by its object, is the highest modification of faith. And from its nature, you will perceive the necessity of divine grace to enable us to exercise it. If it were a mere assent of the understanding we are capable of such assent in our natural state and in our own strength. But as it implies a just appreciation of spiritual things and a due acknowledgment of their claims the natural man is incapable of it; for he "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." That we may exercise saving faith it is necessary that we be enabled by divine grace to recognise aright the character and claims of Christ and of his salvation, and to proceed aright with respect to them. It is objected to the view now presented that it makes faith too complicated. In describing the nature of faith what we have to do is to exhibit it in its true character, whether it may appear simple or complicated. It is to be observed, however, that the operations of the human soul, though they appear to our ordinary consciousness as being each of them one simple operation, will appear more complicated in any description of them that we can offer. And, besides, those operations are usually complicated, and certainly faith is – composed of elements contributed by different powers of the soul.

We shall now indicate some of the properties of the faith whose nature we have endeavoured to describe. And, in the first place, it is not an ignorant confidence in Christ. It originates in knowledge of himself of his benefits; for without this knowledge there could be no such acknowledgment of the claims of the Sav-iour and of his salvation as we have seen constitutes true faith. But the faith of most is not thus enlightened. They know but little of Christ and his benefits, and they do not desire such knowledge. They are satisfied with knowing from report, that Christ is the Saviour of sinners, and

that he delivers from misery, and bestows happiness; and they trust that he will deal thus with them. This is not the true faith.

The true faith being intelligent, is also earnest. It is the response of the heart as well as of the understanding to the claims of Christ and of his salvation, – it is "the escape of the soul from a state of guilt and condemnation to a state of acceptance," – it is the soul's reception of a glorious Saviour and salvation whose glory it discerns and appreciates. Thus, from its very nature, it must be earnest. But how languid is the faith with which most are satisfied? It is not, like true faith, the dealing of the soul, in circumstances of extreme urgency, with the most momentous realities and interests.

True faith is, from its nature, operative. Being an acknowledgment of Christ's claims, it is naturally and necessarily followed by obedience to him. It implies a just appreciation of Christ's excellence, and it therefore involves and awakens love to him; and those that love him will keep his commandments. Faith implies also a just appreciation of spiritual blessings, and will therefore give rise to diligent endeavours to obtain them.

THE FREE CHURCH UNION NEGOTIATIONS, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT PRINCIPLE.

It is one of the worst features of union negotiations, at least as they have been hitherto conducted, and, certainly, it is a very objectionable feature, that they degenerate into a crusade directed to the dislodgment of a portion of truth from the public testimony of the Church, though not from the creed of individuals, the portion chosen for attack being that by the holding of which the soundest of the negotiating bodies is distinguished from such of them as are less sound. In the conduct of the union negotiations in Scotland this process is now applied to the doctrine of a civil establishment of religion, which is held by the Free Church and the Reformed Presbyterian Church, but rejected by the United Presbyterian Church. This doctrine always formed a part of the public testimony of the Established Church of Scotland, as, indeed, the fact of its establishment proclaimed. And the Free Church, claiming to be the true Church of Scotland, has always professed to bear the entire testimony of that Church, and therefore to hold this doctrine as an integral and prominent part of it. And, besides has repeatedly, by express deliverances and declarations, guarded itself against any suspicion that it did not hold it, which might arise from the fact of its not occupying the position of an established Church, assuring the people of Scotland, with much reiteration and earnestness, in every way in which such assurance could be conveyed, of its high appreciation and unwavering maintenance of it. Now, however. many Free Churchmen, we fear we must say, a large majority of Free Church ministers, and, in that, majority not a few of the very men under whose leadership the profess- ions of adherence to it, to which we have referred, were so often and so emphatically made, contend that it has no right to a place in the Church's testimony. They will not say that the Established Church of Scotland did wrong, or that the Free Church has done wrong, in assigning to it such a place; but they deny that such a place can be claimed for it in the contemplated Union Church. But, if it had a right to occupy a place in the testimony of the Church, in the instances to which we have referred; how can it lose its right to occupy a place in it? It may be true that, if a place be claimed for it in the testimony of the projected Church, that Church cannot be formed; this, however, may only prove that that Church cannot be formed without a compromise of truth, and ought not, therefore, in present circumstances, to be formed at all. To dislodge a truth from its proper place and thus abridge and mutilate the testimony of the Church, to secure an alleged practical advantage, is clearly to sell the truth and to do evil that good may come.

If the ground were openly taken, that the doctrine in question ought never to have occupied a place in the testimony of the Church, it would be consistent to maintain that it has no right to a place in that of the projected Union Church. But Free Church Unionists do not take this ground; they could scarcely venture to take it. The taking of it would too plainly proclaim that they no longer represented the historical Church of Scotland. The ground they take is that the doctrine of the civil establishment of religion is not expressly taught in the standards of the Free Church, and that, though it may be inferred from what is taught in them, no mere inference from the teaching of a Church's standards is entitled to a place in its testimony. The language of the Confession of Faith on this subject is, "he (the civil magistrate) hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that the of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline 432
prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed" (chap. 23: sec. 3.) After some expository remarks on the language of this passage, Principal Cunningham states the meaning of it in the following terms: "the words do not necessarily, or naturally mean [as Erastians allege] more than that the civil magistrate is entitled and bound to aim at, and to seek to effect, the different objects here specified, which are all comprehended under the general heads, of the welfare of religion, and the purity and prosperity of the Church of Christ. This is just the principle of establishments, which we believe to be not only true but important." (Discussions, p. 223.) Thus, according to Dr. Cunningham, the Confession of Faith teaches the doctrine of the civil establishment of religion; and we fully concur with him in holding that it does so. It teaches that "the Civil Magistrate is to take order," or to use means to secure, that "all the ordinances of God be duly settled, administered, and observed;" and, if he discharge this duty, he will, by discharging it, establish religion and, in certain circumstances, endow the Church.

But, though the doctrine in question were not directly taught in the Westminster Confession, still, seeing it "may be deduced, by good and necessary consequence," from what is thus taught in it, none, we apprehend, who receive that Confession, can consistently reject it. Dr. Candlish, falling into a strange mistake as to the ground, on which a logically valid deduction from a known and received truth must itself be received, contends that while, from the fact that the Holy Spirit, under whose inspiration the Scriptures were written, knew every doctrine that could be deduced from their express teaching, we are bound to receive every doctrine that may be deduced from it, "by good and necessary consequence," yet, inasmuch as the Westminster divines possessed no such knowledge, those, who receive the standards which they composed, are not bound to receive such doctrines as "by good and necessary consequence may be deduced" from the express teaching of those standards. But it is not on the ground that the teacher or teachers, who enunciated or communicated a truth, knew the further truths that might be deduced from it, that we receive those truths when they are deduced, but on the ground that they are logically and validly deduced. From the constitution of our minds, and the laws to which their operations are subjected, we recognise, and cannot but recognise, that what is rightly deduced from what is true is itself true. We cannot, therefore, reject a valid deduction from a doctrine, and, yet honestly with the conviction that we are logically consistent and justified in doing so, retain the doctrine itself. If we cannot or will not receive the doctrine deduced, and mean to be honest and to preserve the consciousness of being

so, we must go back on the doctrine from which it is deduced, and reject that doctrine also. We presume that Dr. Candlish's convictions will not permit him, in the case under consideration, to adopt the latter alternative, and declare himself a decided voluntary; but, if they will not, they will as little permit him; – whatever he may do by breaking loose from the logical restraint they impose, – to adopt the former. The contention that man may hold a certain truth, and yet remain at liberty to reject a doctrine logically deduced, and which he sees to be logically deduced from it, is so utterly unreasonable, that it is only in the advocacy of a bad cause that so acute a thinker as Dr. Candlish could have been driven to the wretched shift of resorting to it.

"WORK IN THE WYNDS," AND "THE PSALMS OF DAVID."

To the Editor of "The Testimony."

Sir, – I do not know whether many of the readers of The Testimony have seen and perused "Work in the Wynds," by the Rev. D. Maccoll, Glasgow. It is a book which contains deeply interesting and very instructive information. It gives an account of

the great and good work which has been accomplished in some of the most debased parts of Glasgow, – the Wynds and the Bridgegate, – by home mission agencies, at whose head Mr. Maccoll has laboured with great success, first, as a missionary, and afterwards as the settled pastor of organised congregations. Vast numbers of the lapsed classes have, in connection with his labours, not only been restored to Church going habits and respectability of character, but in many cases seem to have been brought to the saving knowledge of the truth.

When, in 1858-9, various places were visited with a season of awakening and revival, Mr. Maccoll's field of labour shared largely in the precious blessing. It is not our intention, at this time, to say more in regard to the labours of that devoted and energetic minister in the Wynds and elsewhere, or of the revival which took place in connection with these labours.

Our object at present in referring to these is, to bring before your readers, who may not have seen Mr. Maccoll's book, the testimony which he bears to the superiority of the Psalms of David over hymns of human composition, in promoting revival work. We refer to this as the testimony of one who is evidently a man of considerable judgment and experience, – one whose self denying and zealous labours were crowned with no ordinary success, and one who had abundant opportunities of observing what means were most conducive to the furtherance of the Lord's work in the souls of men. After showing, in one or two particulars, that the revival in the Wynds, effected no revolution in their methods of work, he proceeds, "We did not need new songs. What psalms we had read, and studied, and sung, in five years, having nearly finished the Psalter when the revival commenced, we found best fitted for all kinds of sing-ing during these wondrous nights. Before every prayer we had a few verses suited for confession, or faith, or hope, or thanksgiving, read and briefly explained, and the prayer naturally rooted itself in them, and gave branches for many bird like petitions to find rest and food, ere they took wing heavenward. Our most useful addresses to the anxious were from the Psalms. We led them there into green pastures, and they lay down beside still waters. Once or twice in these early days we tried a hymn, but found it would not stand exposition. It did not seem to have the deep soil of the Psalms, which could be turned over and over again, and be all the richer for the digging. We had not quite finished the Psalter when the revival began. We were about to begin the closing Hallelujah Psalms, and the revival helped us easily into them. Hymns were used elsewhere by those who attended our meetings, and hymns have, to some extent, been used since, but much of the stability and rooted strength of the work, I attribute, among other subordinate causes, to the continuous and intelligent use of the Psalms through all the exciting work of the first years. I remember, when one of my elders proposed in the session, two years after the work commenced, that we should introduce hymns for the sake of those of weaker capacity, – "No," said another, "let us bring them up to the Psalms."

We believe that there is much truth and much force in Mr. Macoll's remarks as to the peculiar depth and richness of the Psalms, as well as their adaptation to meet the various cases of exercised souls. In comparing these divine songs with songs of mere human composition, one is led to exclaim, as David did regarding the sword of Goliath, "There is none like that, give it me." To those who would be inclined, like one of the Wynd elders, to introduce hymns for those of weaker capacity, we

would commend the appropriate and pithy answer of the other elder referred to, "let us bring them up to the Psalms."

Yours, &c., &c.,

PRESBYTER.

16th October, 1868.

MR. DYKES' SPEECH ON THE AUSTRALIAN CHURCHES.

(*To the Editor of "The Testimony."*)

Sir, – Having been by circumstances prevented from saying all that we wished to say regarding this speech in our former communication, we now return to the subject. We deem this all the more necessary, as we notice, since the last issue of The Testimony, that the portion of Mr. Dykes' speech, on which we have been animadverting; has been published in the *Free Church Monthly Record,* – a publication read by some in this colony.

The first part of the speech referred to, which we would notice at present, is that in which he refers to the ministers of our church who stood aloof from the union as consummated in New South Wales, and is as follows: – "I am sorry to say that five respected and avowed brethren of that church, ministers of this Free Church of Scotland, have seen it to be their duty to hold aloof from the union as consummated in New South Wales. As to their scruples, I am sure that there is not one of us but will regard them with respect, but at the same time I cannot refrain from expressing my regret at it, because I am sure that this scrupulous standing aloof will, to a very large extent, damage their own comfort, and will also damage their usefulness." As to the manner in which Mr. Dykes alluded to us there is nothing to be complained of, – very different from the unbeseeming way in which he referred to the protesting brethren in Victoria, in a passage which does not appear in the *Monthly Record.* At the same time, his statement is, in some parts, unintelligible, and in others contains an incorrect representation of matters of fact. In speaking of our ministers, he says, "five respected and avowed brethren of *that* church," &c. The church to which he refers immediately before is the Union Church of Victoria, and a little before that he alludes to the Union Church of New South Wales. How the five ministers who stood aloof from the union as consummated in this colony can be called "avowed brethren" either of the Union Church in Victoria or that of New South Wales is rather mysterious. Again, he speaks of these five as "ministers of this Free Church of Scotland." In that he is mistaken, as one of the five is a minister of the pre-disruption Church of Scotland. Mr. Dykes evidently holds up as a cause of regret and

astonishment the circumstance that those belonging to the Free Church of Scotland should stand aloof from the lately consummated union. But had one of the five brethren referred to been present in the Free Assembly and obtained an opportunity of speaking, he could have shown that of all those who were negotiating for union, Free Churchmen were just the very parties who might be expected to stand aloof, as matters were finally settled. For some of the resolutions, which partly constituted the foundation of the union, placed the Free and Established Churches of Scotland on a level, and thus compromised the testimony of Free Churchmen. And we hesitate not to affirm that the time once was, when, in the Free Church Assembly, no one would have ventured to speak of such standing aloof as matter of astonishment and regret. Mr. Dykes further says, "as to their scruples, I am sure there is not one of us but will regard them with respect." This is rather strange. If the union be all that he describes it, in regard to principle and otherwise, we are entitled to very little respect and highly deserving of condemnation. He adds, "at the same time I cannot refrain from expressing my regret at it, because I am quite sure that this scrupulous standing aloof will, to a very large extent, damage their own comfort, and will also damage their use-

fulness." Had we the opportunity of reaching his ear we could inform him that he may keep himself very easy on that score, and we presume that we are better judges in the case than he can be. For some two or three weeks in this colony, and having no intercourse with the five brethren referred to, how can he be so sure of what he states regarding damage to their comfort and usefulness? Before pronouncing so confidently in such a case, wise men would like to get information on both sides of the question. But this we fear is a specimen of the way in which the Church at home is imposed on by unwarrantable statements.

We believe that these brethren are satisfied that the claims of Christ's truth impose on them the obligation to occupy their present position, and therefore their comfort of mind at least is in no way damaged, but it would have been very considerably damaged had they entered the union. As to other comforts we do not know that many of the union ministers can boast of much superiority in that respect. Then again, as to usefulness, the ministers of our Church have their hands full of labor, yea, more than they can well overtake.

On this point we would add that those who left the Establishment in 1843 were charged with a *scrupulous* separation, and in some cases a worse name was given to it; and, no doubt, it was said that they greatly damaged their comfort and in some senses this was true. Many of them suffered as to bodily comfort. They were without that influence which their position as parish ministers gave them, and their spheres of usefulness were not so extensive as before. But all things considered they had much more comfort and usefulness than they could have had by acting otherwise than they did at the disruption.

So I doubt not the ministers of our church feel in relation to their present position as standing aloof from the lately consummated union. In speaking of what Mr. Dykes calls the signally good fruit of the union in this colony, he mentions the raising of £10,000 to bring out ten additional ministers from Scotland and Ireland. This is an extraordinary statement and bears incorrectness on the very face of it. What Church in Australia would ever dream of bringing out ten ministers at the expense of £10,000, and yet the same statement occurs in both the Daily Review and the Monthly Record. Of course the correct figure is £1000. But what is there very wonderful in the Union Church raising that sum? Our own Church some sixteen years ago, when not at all so numerous as it was for some years before 1864, gathered, we believe, some £1400 for bringing ministers out from the Free Church of Scotland. On another occasion the Presbytery of Maitland collected as much as was sufficient for bringing out three ministers, and ministers were brought at other times at the expense of the Church or of congregations. That a church so very much more numerous; and under the enthusiasm of unionism, collected £1000 for the purpose referred to, was no very great feat surely. A second "signally good" fruit mentioned by Mr. Dykes, as yielded by the first couple of years of the Church's history, is proceeding to found a Presbyterian College in connection with the University of Sydney, at a cost of £10,000. He did right to say *proceeding* to do this, when speaking of the first couple of years. As to this affair of a Presbyterian College we venture to say that had the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia not been pestered and unfitted for almost every good work by distracting agitations and divisions about union, and that too when there was little or no encouragement for union negotiations, a College on a much more satisfactory foundation than that referred to Mr. Dykes *could*, and, we believe, also *would* have been founded. The third signally good fruit of the union is the starting of "a literary organ." This however did not come 434 from the first couple of years of the Union Church history. The periodical referred to was started (if our memory does not entirely deceive us) in the course of the third year of that history. But what is there so signally good in the starting of that periodical. In our own Church, with greatly reduced numbers, there has been started and there is still continued "a literary organ," and that too, within a twelve month of the reduction of its numbers, which, in point of ability and principle, will, – to say nothing more, – stand a very fair comparison with the other periodical referred to. From all this I think it has been shown that Mr Dykes should not have been so confident as to assert, "I venture to say that nothing like this would have been done had they remained in their former condition of separation." If his information in regard to this and other matters had been much fuller, he would not have been so ready to venture assertions, when speaking before the Assembly of Australian matters, and very probably the same remark applies to what he says about Victoria. "To all those labours it has buckled itself since it became a Union Church, and but for the strength given by that Union I do not think it could have undertaken them at all." In speaking of Victoria, and referring to the fact, that for the present generation the Union is one rather of conjunction than of fusion, he thinks that in some respects this is an advantage. "I think a Church, embracing many who have been reared under various conditions, and whose general tone and manner in looking at questions have not been exactly framed on the same model, offers a fairer specimen of that sacred society founded on Pentecost," &c. Let all this be applied to the case in hand, a Church composed of Free Churchmen, Erastians, and Voluntaries. What a splendid specimen of "that society founded on Pentecost!"

Yours, &c.,
PRESBYTER.

16th October, 1868.

PUBLICANS AND THE PUBLIC.

We trust there are exceptions, though they cannot be numerous or strongly marked; but, taking publicans as a class and judging from the bearing and the effects of their occupation, they are among the worst enemies of their species. They are not influenced, indeed, by feelings of enmity against their neighbours, any more than their neighbours are influenced by feelings of enmity against them; but, then, they act the part of enemies towards their neighbours, and do the work of enemies

among them. In most cases they originated the process by which our drunkards were made drunkards, and, as regards many of them, utterly and hopelessly ruined; and in all the remaining cases or nearly in all they contributed greatly to its baneful success. And by the same process by which they supplied us with our drunkards, and to the extent to which they have supplied us with them, they produced all the great and varied evils which result from drunkenness. And who can estimate those evils, as they affect drunkards themselves, in the form of disease, dilapidation of character, loss of reputation, poverty, and that guilt before God of which these are some of the penal consequences; and as they affect their families and relatives, and even the community at large? The evils which publicans inflict upon the community are very serious. They withdraw by the attraction of their *taps* a large amount of time from productive employment, they impair the physical strength and still more the moral character of those whose time they thus alienate and waste, and, according to the degree in which they effect this deterioration, render them less valuable or a positive burden to society, and, not only so, but centres of evil influence and contamination. A forcible illustration has just come under our notice. A drunkard whom we happen to know, and whom we repeatedly endeavoured, but hith- erto without success, to restore to habits of sobriety, was recently

passing through one of his periodical seasons of excess. After some time his transactions with the publican rendered him so violent, that the occasional visits to his family, with which he interrupted those transactions; were attended with extreme danger to his wife and children. Under these circumstances, after other methods were repeatedly tried with him to no purpose, the proper treatment for incorrigible drunkards was reluctantly adopted in his case. He was "given in charge," – bound over to keep the peace for six months, – and, failing to find the necessary sureties put in jail, where he is now kept at the public expense. The wife of this man has been calling upon us since we began to write to solicit our assistance to prevent injudicious friends, who proposed to do so, from procuring his premature liberation, and thus doing an injury both to himself and to his family. Here we have a case in which the publicans have inflicted upon society, in addition to the evils already specified, the expense of jail accommodation and board for their customer and victim. The wretched man himself they have reduced to a wreck in body and in mind – they have ruined him. And what misery and shame they have caused to his family? How revoltingly they have perverted the most sacred and tender of our earthly relations, those of husband and wife, and of parents and children? When we survey all the mischief thus done to the drunkard himself, to his family and to the State, and remember that similar mischief is wrought by the same mischief makers in hundreds and hundreds of instances, and in some cases even greater mischief, is there not abundant and melancholy ground for classing them, as we did at the outset, with the worst enemies of the species?

In enumerating the evils with the production of which our publicans are chargeable, the large amount of funds diverted from their legitimate applications and most perniciously misapplied, under the influence of their operations, should not be overlooked. The large sum, which is annually worse than thrown away for intoxicating beverages in the United Kingdom, would pay the national debt in some twelve or fourteen years, and thus permanently relieve the country of all the taxation that the existence of that debt renders necessary. And in this colony the amount wasted in the manner indicated is not at all proportionally less. If it were wisely and dutifully emp- loyed the comfort of very many families would be greatly increased, a sufficient provision would in thousands of additional cases be made for seasons of sickness and for old age, and at the same time a large surplus would remain for the various purposes to which relative affection, Christian philanthropy, and public spirit would dictate the application of it. This source alone would yield, without infringing on family claims, sufficient funds to supply the entire country with the ministrations of religion and the benefits of education.

Some may be disposed to think, and the publican himself endeavours to think, that he is not to be blamed for all the varied mischief of which he is thus the author. But why is he not to be blamed for it? Does he not choose his occupation, enter upon it, and prosecute it, with the full knowledge that drunkenness and the brood of evils with which this prolific vice ever surrounds itself will be sure to result? Does he not make his arrangements and form his plans with the deliberate view of securing that drunkenness, be it attended with what evils it may, will result, or, in other words, that he shall have good customers who will empty their own pockets and fill his? And, if he finds that the neighbourhood or portion of the public on which he operates, is proof against the temptations with which he assails it, and does not yield him good customers, will he not be disappointed? The reader's own observation and the nature of the case will supply the answer to these questions. And in what a horrible attitude does the answer to them present the public- 435
an? We shall not allow ourselves to characterise it in the terms which offer themselves to us as the appropriate terms for the purpose. We will only say that we wonder the human conscience can be so grievously corrupted and seared that it does not render it impossible to sustain it.

How surprising and deplorable that the government of a country, and particularly of a country which enjoys the light of Christianity, should license operations so powerfully demoralising, impoverishing, and otherwise pernicious? It increases its revenue by this course, but at the same time and more than in proportion it increases its expenditure. And how infatuated to license for the sake of revenue a powerful opposition to the design of its own existence!

MODERATISM IN VICTORIA. – LIEUTENANT HENDERSON.

[The facts brought under the notice of the reader in the following letter from the Rev. Peter McPherson, of Meredith, Victoria, and the state of things of which they form illustrations, cannot be too deeply deplored. In times, however, in which everything will be tolerated but faithfulness, some will be disposed to present, on behalf of each of those facts, the petition, which the Rev. (?) Volunteer Lieutenant, to shew, we suppose, his freedom from the straitness of Protestant orthodoxy, presented on behalf of General Jackson, *requiescat in pace.* We cannot, however, concur in this petition. Such sayings and doings ought to be exposed.]

To the Editor of "*The Testimony*."

Sir, – In a Ballarat paper which I received the other day, there is an account of a banquet to a captain of the Ballarat Rangers, a rifle corps of volunteers. Lieutenant Henderson presided on the occasion, and proposed, as a toast, the guest of the evening. Contrasting the active duties of the volunteers with the noisy doings in Parliament, he employed the following elegant illustration, as showing the state of things amongst our legislators: –

"all cry and na'oo,
As the De'il said when he clippit the sou."

This was received with "great laughter and cheering." You may wonder why I introduce such a matter as this; so I must state, with-out farther mystery, that Lieutenant Henderson, of

the Ballarat Rifles, is the popular Presbyterian minister of the great goldfield metropolis of Victoria. At the close of the same banquet, Lieutenant Henderson announced his belief that he had now "lived down" the opposition which greeted his first assumption of military duties. It occurred to me that there was something more instructive in the announcement than Mr. Henderson was aware of. We have been familiarized lately with the distinction between "levelling up" and "levelling down" in the Irish Church question. Either way a kind of equilibrium may be produced. Let us take a general review of Mr. Henderson's appearances for some years past, with an eye to discover what connexion they are calculated to have with the question of living "up" or "down."

Amongst other honors conferred upon Mr. Henderson is that of president of a gymnastic society. Here is part of a speech which he delivered at one of the meetings of the Club: "They had received at the hands of the great God a gift, and it was their duty, as men, to protect and maintain it in every way. They were there as men to make themselves as perfect as possible in developing their muscles, so as to enable them to perform their daily work, and and by performing their work to not go beyond their strength. He looked upon gymnastics as a means of moral culture, and any man who followed it kept the devil at arm's length, and also placed himself out of temptation." Mr. Henderson is a stalwart divine, not much, if anything, short of six feet; and with sentiments to correspond with his physique, we are led to expect a tolerably decided illustration of muscular Christianity. Besides being president of the

Gymnastic Club, he was, or is one of the numerous vice-presidents of the Short Hours Association. A writer in the Ballarat papers, taking up the subject, gives the following glimpse into the sort of arrangements patronised by Mr. Henderson and a number of other ministers in connexion with the association named. After expressing himself as painfully surprised at the advertisements which were appearing in the papers, the writer says – "But that others, or any other Christian should permit any committee of which they are members to pass any motion that is not in harmony with the Word of God, without putting their veto on it, or, if unheeded, tendering their resignations (so as to avoid the appearance of identifying themselves with that work), is truly a sad thing, whether that work be a benefit in the theatre for the Asylum, a lottery for the Hospital, or profane song and ball for the Short Hours Society." The question as to whether Mr. Henderson has been "living up" to a mark, or "living down" to one becomes pretty apparent from such materials as those now adduced. Doubtless it may be said that I am picking evidence on one side. Then let me pick some evidence on the other side. What sort of impression is produced in one's mind when it is discovered that this same Mr. Henderson moves, with all sol-emnity, in a Church Court that steps be taken for inculcating the duty of family worship and of training up children in the ways of godliness? No doubt it is useful to have this record in the *Union Magazine* as evidence of the godly zeal and pious watchfulness of Union ministers. But which goes to the wall in such a case, the catechising or the profane song? If Mr. Henderson patronizes both, what is the result? Is it fair play between religion and profanity? From a case like this one can get some insight into the terrible anomaly, that ministers in Scotland are pointing to the success of the Union movement in Victoria, while godly men on the spot are mourning over the prospect of vital godliness disappearing from the country. Take Mr. Henderson's zeal for the godly upbringing of youth in connexion with the following piece of edifying matter given by him at a religious tea meeting, if, indeed, it be proper to call these meetings religious. It is a brief dialogue between a minister and a second called Sandy: –

"Minister – 'Do you think that God made the devil good?'

"Sandy 'said that he was nae great thing, but still he micht be a guid de'il.'"

On another occasion Sandy was asked how many commandments there were; and, after scratching his head and pondering awhile, he said 'a hundred.' Meeting with a companion, Sandy told him what had occurred, and that he had been asked how many were the commandments. 'Why,' replied his friend, `that's easy enough – there's ten.' 'That would niver do,' said Sandy, ' I tell'd him that there was a hundred, and he wasna pleased."

I must acknowledge the quotations are numerous, but they form the body of evidence in the case, and enable the reader to come to conclusions independently of mine.

But there is the very important question of the Sabbath, in connexion with which we have to examine the "living down" process. At the time of Easter in 1861 and 1862 there were volunteer encampments held near the Werribee River, between Geelong and Melbourne. These encampments lasted for some days. No doubt the arrangement for these military displays and exercises could have been made so as to take place only on weekdays. But there is the point. Time, is valuable. No doubt six days out of the seven have been given for secular purposes, but men are ever laying hands on the seventh also. The Divine command is constantly pushed aside by human arrangements. The reviews are made to include the Sabbath. Some of the volunteers are already in camp on the Lord's holy day, and trains bring additional numbers on that day. A night attack at 1 a.m. ushers in 436

the first hours of the Lord's day. The invasion of the sacred hours of the Sabbath suits a worldly populace as well as a worldly government. But, with a military chaplain, of course we shall have Divine service. The Reverend Lieutenant Henderson, in combined military and clerical dress, is pronounced a remarkably fine study. His pulpit consists of two drums At the volunteer encampment held near Sunbury, in 1867, service is held at night. The Reverend Lieutenant Henderson is mounted on a "Lorry." Large fires are blazing, and the scene is described as eminently picturesque. At one of the Werribee encampments he is reported in the papers to have administered the Sacrament in his tent after the open air service. The secular press is delighted with him. But, unfortunately, the secular press is too deeply implicated in Sabbath desecration to give a verdict free of serious drawback. In one of the papers, one of the encampment sermons of Lieutenant Henderson was given, for the most part, *in extenso*. The text was – "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Did it not occur to Lieutenant Henderson that the whole affair was a case of giving unto Caesar the blessed hours of the Sabbath in connexion with a demonstration which could have been held on the secular days of the week? One of Mr. Henderson's famous subjects of lecture is "Stonewall Jackson," and I observe in a notice of it he is represented as a "man who would fight battles, march his men, or do anything which he considered his duty, even on the Lord's day, although showing through every action of his life that he was a thorough Christian and a firm believer in a just and all-wise Creator. *Requiescat in pace*." This is one word for General Jackson, and two for Lieutenant Henderson. But it will not serve Mr. Henderson. There is some difference between the exigencies of actual warfare and mere sham-fighting. There are not many people now-a-days who believe, like the Jews of old, that, if attacked by an enemy on the Sabbath day, there is nothing for it but to be quietly massacred. One can understand that defence of life, of family, or city on the Sabbath day, if attacked by the spoiler, comes under the head of necessity and

mercy both. But what kind of necessity and mercy are in the question in getting up a sham-fight whose arrangements shall include the sacred hours of the Sabbath? However, a minister of religion who has broad views of Sabbath obligation is sure to enlist the sympathies of the press and a worldly community, Perhaps the most popular men in Christendom for some years past have been Dr. Norman McLeod (whose lax news of the Sabbath so much grieved good men a few years ago) and Dr. Thomas Guthrie, editor of the *Sunday Magazine.* Who is that gentleman flying past in a cab on the Sabbath day? Is that a minister? Yes: it is the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, lately junior pastor of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, colleague to Dr. Candlish. Who is that on the Sabbath day taking his seat in a coach for a long journey apparently? Is that another minister? It is not another; it is our former friend, the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes. And who is that again on the Sabbath day stepping into a train and out of a train? That is again the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, who regularly preached for a long period in the Church of Dr. Cairns, of Melbourne, the great Sabbatarian who has denounced Sabbath trains so vehemently. Yes, Mr. Dykes has broad views, and is on the high road to promotion. He is liberal to the world, and the world is liberal to him. Lieutenant Henderson is on the same track.

But my illustrations of "living down" are not yet exhausted. Take the following report of a banquet at which Lieutenant Henderson figured as follows, responding to the toast, "Success to the Volunteer Movement" –

"The toast was drunk, and followed by the refrain 'for we are jolly good fellows,' and much laughter. The Rev. Mr. Henderson responded to the toast. He was a volunteer, and intended to say something, but he had quite forgotten it after the demonstration of enthusiasm with which the toast was drunk. He had great delight in the volunteer movement. He was quite sure they all felt as much pleasure in it, and were anxious to re-enter the corps and do their duty. (Cheers.) Captain Campbell was a plain spoken individual, as they all knew, and had noticed some shortcomings in the members of the corps, but he thought that, upon the whole, they were 'jolly good fellows,' and worthy to drink their own healths in bumpers (Much laughter.) He hoped that they would all join under the new regulations; that there would be a sufficiency of men; that there would be no arrears in consequence of absence from drill; and that the clerk of petty sessions would have nothing in the shape of a summons for any of them in consequence. (Laughter.) They had been told to take pride in this movement, and he did take pride in it, and being in with such a set of jolly good fellows as the Ballarat corps. In doing so he did no honor to the volunteer force; but he did honor to himself by the part he had taken in it. He could repeat that it was his intention to remain with them until his son was able to step into his shoes, and as the boy referred to was only lately put into breeches, he was pretty sure to be with them at any time during the next ten years. (Cheers.) They were 'in' for another three years; and although he hoped there may not be a very great deal of fighting during that time, he hoped that, if they were called upon to do serious work, for the country, they would do it with their might. There was plenty of courage amongst his comrades the volunteers; and he only wished that men of his profession in this colony and elsewhere had shown as much interest as he had been allowed to do. Plenty of clergymen said that it was a grand thing to be a member of a rifle corps, and so forth; but it was useless to advise a number of people to do that which they did not do themselves. (Cheers and laughter.) Now, it would be just as good a thing for the person who gave the advice to join the rifles as it would be for any of them. He knew that in some parts of the world clergymen had taken an active part in this movement. He knew of a bishop of the Episcopal Church of the United States who was made a general. (Laughter.) He had a long grey beard; and this venerable individual, when leading a charge, referred to his own appearance, and called out 'Now, my lads, follow your granny.' (Loud laughter.) He did not say to them to follow him; but he hoped always to be able to go with them. (Loud cheers.)" – *Ballarat Evening Post*, Sept. 24; 1863

As these references to banquets multiply one is met with the question whether Mr. Henderson does not attend more of them than is for edification. I see an account of one at which thirteen toasts – the classic dozen are recorded. This, too, is exclusive of the "usual loyal and patriotic toasts," which appear to be given into the bargain, and not counted. I see another at which Mr. Henderson responds to the toast of "the learned professions," which came seventh in order. You will also notice something very like *double entendre* in the long extract quoted above, where Mr. Henderson ascribes his forgetfulness of what he intended to say to the enthusiasm with which the toast was drunk. What has come before us is sufficient to prepare us for that spurious liberality which consists in always being ready to say a great deal to the discredit of one's own religious beliefs, a significant proof how lightly and loosely one sits to these beliefs, be they good, bad, or indifferent. You no doubt observed above the *Requiescat in pace* in reference to Stonewall Jackson, the usual popish phrase for the dead to be seen so constantly in the Roman Catholic portion of cemeteries represented by the initial letters of the words, R.I.P. At a Church of England soiree it was 437
only to be expected that Episcopacy had much to recommend it. Both Prelatists and Presbyterians were wrong 200 years ago. A modified episcopacy such as obtains here might have been accepted by those who objected to the prelacy of former days. A permanent Moderatorship had advantages. Then as to the Lit-urgy. Mr. Henderson could use a liturgy himself – a statement, by the way, which I have not the slightest intention of questioning. On the other hand, without the Liturgy, a "good many very bad prayers were offered up." Platitudes and commonplaces like those from really pious men are a ground of charge of feebleness in ministers; but side by side with conformity to the world, they are the broad and liberal views of men of superior minds. Yet these broad and liberal views work out some very curious results. Mr. Henderson is under solemn declaration that he accepts of the Presbyterian system of doctrine, worship, and Church government as agreeable to the Word of God. But a spurious liberalism, the shame in which many ecclesiastics glory, requires that in such a case he shall express marvellous respect for other systems of belief and worship, and throw no little contempt on his own. Mr. Henderson writes an article in the *Union Magazine* on the efficacy of the Sacraments. The initials W. H. and the contents of the article leave no doubt as to the authorship. Now according to the spurious and shallow liberalism referred to, it would be out of all character if Mr. Henderson, a Presbyterian minister, should become the mere exponent of Westminster, of Presbyterian theology on such a subject. Accordingly, his article was such that an outcry was raised at once against it, as savouring of baptismal regeneration. Of course the silly people did not take a correct estimate of Mr. Henderson's standpoint, and the imperious demands of a liberal and enlightened age. The article in question having the initials "W. H." (William Henderson) attached to it, the Rev. W. Hamilton wrote to the *Union Magazine,* requesting that the name of the author might be given, lest people should suppose that he was the writer of

the unsatisfactory article – the initials of his name being the same as those at the foot of the article. Here was a fair start for a sacramentarian controversy, but, the editor prudently put his thumb on it. Friendly on the part of the editor. And who was he? The Rev. J. Oswald Dykes. "A fellow feeling make us wondrous kind."

We have had a glance at Mr. Henderson in theology, – what shape will he assume in philosophy? During the course of last year, a namesake of his, Rev. A. M. Henderson, an Independent, delivered a lecture in Ballarat on the Philosophy of Creation In the course of it he took occasion to deal with the theories propounded by Darwin and others. Rev. W. Henderson, our hero proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer but in doing so put in a "mild protest" on behalf of the Darwinian theory of the origin of species. He said he did not see that the theory, held or rejected, had any thing to do with a man's Christianity or theology. He had learned much from the theory – beautiful, but insufficient as it was, Darwin had taught him that God, in creating the world, worked according to order and by law; that he had not work spasmodically, creating a bit now and a bit then, dropping asleep over his work every now and then, and waking up every now and then to create another little bit. He denied that Darwin's work was atheistical and referred to a passage in his writings in which a Creator is distinctly recognised. Such is an abbreviated account of Mr. Henderson's remarks, as reported in the Ballarat papers. It is clear Mr. Henderson is himself in philosophy as well as in divinity. He is supposed to occupy the ground of the believer as against the infidel, therefore the infidel shall have all sorts of chivalrous consideration from the gallant volunteer. In reply to Mr. Henderson's remarks, the lecturer quoted a passage from Darwin, distinctly setting aside the idea of a Creator as superfluous. He disowned, as irreverent and unbecoming a minister of the Gospel, the term "spasmodic," as applied to the actings of God. Such is briefly the account from the newspapers.

(*To be Concluded in our next*.)

DISPOSITION TO COMPROMISE THE TRUTH MANIFESTED IN UNION NEGOTIATIONS IN SCOTLAND.

We make the following extract from the Report on Public Questions laid before the original Secession Synod at it last meeting: –

"With respect to the present Union movement among several of the non-Established Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, the Synod need hardly express its concurrence in much of what is said about the desirableness of union in itself. The divided state of the Church is a judgment with which she has been visited for her sins, and a scandal to religion. At the same time, however desirable the healing of our divisions may be, this object is to be sought only in the way of a faithful testimony being maintained for the whole of revealed truth. It is deeply to be lamented, however, that many, even of those who profess adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, seem, prepared, for the sake of union, to surrender or compromise some its most important such the doctrine of the atonement as held by Calvinists, and laid down in the Confession – viz., that Christ died for the elect alone, in opposition to the doctrine of a universal atonement. The attempt which has been made to adjust the difference on this important subject, in the way of the parties expressing their assent to the mere words of the Confession, while there is every reason too apprehend, that these words are understood by them in different senses, we cannot but regard as not only trifling with the sacred interests of divine truth, but as unworthy of the character and position of the professed servants of Jesus Christ.

Another important article of truth under discussion, and which appears in danger of being compromised for the sake of union, is the doctrine of the connection between Church and State, or the duty of nations and their rulers with respect to religion. This has been called the 'question of the day,' and on account of special importance at the present crisis, we deem it proper briefly to express our views in reference to it.

And here, let it be observed, that the question is not whether the Bible is a rule of duty to the civil magistrate in his public and official, as well as in his private capacity. This, all seem to allow. It appears, from the articles of agreement bet-ween the negotiating parties, that those representing the United Presbyterian Church acknowledge what was denied by the advocates of Voluntaryism in former days – that civil magistrates, acting in their public capacity as magistrates, are under obligation to submit themselves to Christ, and to regulate their conduct by his Word; and that Church and State, though distinct, owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres, may be signally subservient to each other's welfare. These are important admissions, at which we truly rejoice, involving as they do a renunciation of the atheistic principle, that civil rulers, as such, have nothing to do with religion. Notwithstanding these admissions, it is evident from their distinctive articles, that they still deny that it is competent to the civil magistrate to give legislative sanction to any creed in the way of setting up a civil establishment of religion, and that it is within his province to provide for the expense of the ministrations of religion out of the national resources. That Jesus Christ, as sole King and Head of the Church, has enjoined upon his people to provide for the maintaining and extending it by their freewill offerings – that this being the ordinance of it excludes State aid for these pur- 438
poses and that adherence to it is the true safeguard of the Church's independence. We maintain, on the other hand, that the civil rulers of every country, where the light of Christianity shines, are bound to acknowledge, and make a national profession of it, by giving it their legislative sanction – a principle which seems to us to be denied in one of the above quoted distinctive articles of the U. P. Church, which we hold to be taught in Scripture, which has been uniformly held and acted upon by the Church of Scotland, and which the Free Church distinctly owned at the Disruption. We further hold, that, among other ways of helping the Church, civil rulers may and ought to grant her pecuniary aid. We do not say that they are required or warranted in all cases to endow the Church, or to take upon themselves in any case the whole duty of providing for the temporal support of her ministers. This duty belongs partly and primarily to the Church herself, to her own members and people, but not exclusively. What we assert is, that the duty in question is obligatory on both Church and State; that while the Christian people are bound to give of their worldly means for the support and spread of the gospel, not less are nations in their national capacity bound to do so, by dedicating a portion of their public funds to the Church's service, and to the service of her King. This is one way of honoring the Lord with their substance, and of being workers together with himself and his Church, in advancing the interests of his kingdom and glory. It may be added, that, in the present negotiations, all parties are overlooking the basis of union which was adopted at the second reforming period, which included the whole of the Westminster standards, and to which the Churches in the three kingdoms so solemnly bound themselves to adhere. It is much to be regretted that so many things in religion, which form essential parts in the system of revealed truth, and which are acknowledged as such in our Reformation standards, are now made light of, or left open questions – matters about which Christians may lawfully agree to

differ – in direct opposition to the terms of the commission given by Jesus to his apostles and and their successors, "Go and teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

In connection with the above extract we give the following letter, addressed by the Rev. A. Moody Stuart to the members of the Free Church Assembly: –

(*Private Circular to Members of Assembly*.)

43 Queen Street, 1st June, 1868.

HONOURED FATHERS AND BRETHREN, – I address you in this form, because relative duties of a painful kind prevent me from waiting in the Assembly today.

I humbly entreat you to grant me half-an-hour tomorrow on the Union question; or if this cannot be granted to one member, to prolong the Assembly for another day. My reason for desiring this is the critical state of the Church, and my grounds for asking it are, that I attempted in vain to speak on Thursday: that the whole question was revolutionised that day by the principle of *establishments* being made the open question in the leading speeches, instead of the matter of *endowments,* and that being slow to take that in, I voted under mistake; that a still more alarming novelty was the denial of establishments in the Standards; and that my esteemed friends, Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Candlish, ought to have secured time for discussing changes so startling. I appeal to their sense of justice to secure it to me still, for I shall else have no opportunity of answering them for three years to come.

I write out of the depths of a broken heart, bleeding for my well beloved Church, all the more beloved in her danger, ready to faint at the prospect of a conflict with beloved brethren, and longing far rather to flee away and be for ever at rest.

I am, Fathers and Brethren, yours most respectfully in the Lord,

A. MOODY STUART.

POPERY AND RITUALISM

This soul ruining system [popery] once so solemnly abjured by Britain, is not only still gaining ground among us, but has of late been making more rapid progress than it ever hitherto has done since the Reformation. It is receiving much countenance and support from many of our statesmen and public rulers. New and dangerous concessions to its claims are boldly advocated – as, for example, the proposal which has been made to endow the Roman Catholic Church, and to charter a Popish University; nor are any means left untried, on the part of Romanists themselves, in and out of Parliament, for overthrowing the Protestant religion, and regaining for their own system that ascendancy which it possessed in former ages. And we have no hesitation in expressing our solemn conviction, that, to whatever causes the present distracted state of Ireland may be traced, it is owing chiefly to the prevalence of the Romish system, and that so long as Popery continues to prevail in that country, peace and pros-perity will not be enjoyed.

Another dark feature in the character of present times is the prevalence of ritualistic and popish practices among Protestants. It is well known, that a large and increasing section of the Anglican clergy are much more nearly allied, in their sentiments and feelings and modes of religious worship, to Popery than to Protestantism – indeed that they are Papists in all but the name. A similar remark applies to a large proportion of the clergy and members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. How lamentable is it to think that a Church so distinguished for its orthodoxy and zeal in defence of Protestant truth as the Church of England was at the period of the Reformation, should have fallen so low as to tolerate such errors and superstitious practices as transubstantiation, auricular confession, priestly absolution, prayers for the dead, &c.! And it is much to be deplored, that the attempts made by certain parties in our prelatic establishments, to check the progress of these evils have proved of so little avail. Nor is it among Episcopalians only, that this ritualistic spirit prevails, It has begun to manifest itself even among Presbyterians in various forms, such as the use of instrumental music in the public worship of God, the singing of anthems, kneeling at the Lord's Supper, the superstitious ceremonies sometimes observed at the laying of the foundation of ecclesiastical buildings, and other practices hitherto disallowed and condemned among Presbyterians" – *Report on Public Questions in Original Secession Magazine.*

IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION.

The report of the Established Church (Ireland) Commissioners has been laid on the tables of both Houses of Parliament. The London correspondent of the *Dublin Express* gives the following as the material points of the report: – "The Commissioners recommend a re-arrangement and a reduction in the number of dioceses and of the incomes of the bishops, except in the case of Cork. They propose to reduce the number of sees to eight, by distributing the united dioceses of Cashel, Kilmore, Meath, and Killalee amongst the adjoining sees. There was a difference of opinion as to whether there should be two Archbishops, or whether Armagh alone should be retained. They propose that the Lord Primate shall have a clear income of £6000 a year; the diocesan of Dublin, if an Archbishop £5000, if only a Bishop, £4500; and all the rest £3000, with £500 extra for those who have to attend in the House of Lords. They would abolish all the cathedral establishments except those attached to the eight sees which are retained. The salaries of the eight deans they would fix at £1000 a year each, except St, Patrick's, to whom they would allow £1200. The cathedrals of the merged sees they would con439

vert into parish churches. They would reduce the number of archdeacons to not more than two for each diocese, and allow them to be chosen from any living, to be paid £100 a year for their services, and to be removable upon the appointment of a new bishop. It is said that considerable encouragement will be given to tenants under church leases to purchase the perpetuity, a lower scale being recommended. It is recommended that unconverted church leaseholds be vested in the Commissioners. Holders of lands subject to tithe rent will be enabled to redeem them. Incumbents are to be relieved of the management of the glebe lands, except a limited portion necessary for their own use. The increased duties imposed upon the Ecclesiastical Commissioners will necessarily involve a reconstruction of that body, and it is said that recommendations to that effect, and to include a larger proportion of the lay element, are embodied in the report. There are also some suggestions for a readjustment of the church revenues amongst the incumbents, to be effected by the suspension of livings which are practically sinecures, and by imposing an increased tax upon livings where the income is large and the church population small. It is understood that the clergy will be exempted from the payment of visitation fees."

THE STRUCTURE OF PSALM 133.

Behold, –

A. How good and } it is for brethren to dwell
B. How pleasant } together in unity.

B. It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, *even* Aaron's beard: that went down to the skirts of his garments.

A. As the dew of Hermon, *and as the dew* that descended

upon the mountains of Zion: for there the Lord commanded the blessing, *even* life *for* evermore.

Here we have in A. the *profitableness* of unity among brethren, illustrated in *A*. by the fertilizing influence of "the dew;" and in B. its *pleasantness,* illustrated in *B.* by the delightful perfume of the sacred oil, with which the high priest was anointed. It need not be observed that attention to this arrangement is necessary, not only to a full perception of the beauty of the Psalm, but even to correct understanding of its meaning.

He that is most tender of God's honour shall find by experience that God is most mindful of his comfort. – *Brooks.*

ROMISH IMPOSITIONS.

Holy Water commenced … … …	A.D. 120
Penance, in … … … … …	157
Monkery, in … … … … …	328
The Mass in Latin … … … …	390
Extreme Unction … … … …	550
Purgatory }	
Invocation Saints and Virgin } … …	593
Papal usurpation confirmed by the weakness of the Emperor Phocas … … … …	607
Kissing the Pope's toe, and adoring him … …	709
Image worship, adoration of the Cross &c. …	715
Canonization … … … … …	993
Baptism of Bells … … … …	1000
Transubstantiation … … … …	1000
Celibacy of the Priesthood … … …	1015
Indulgences … … … … …	1194
Dispensations … … … … …	1205
Inquisition … … … … …	1210
Auricular Confession … … … …	1214
Elevation of the Host … … … …	1222

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE,
TINONEE CHURCH, MANNING RIVER.

At a meeting of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, on the Manning River, convened at Tinonee, on Tuesday last, for receiving from the Manse Building Committee an amount of the moneys which passed through their hands as a committee, the following resolutions were moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to: –

1. That the thanks of the Congregation be tendered to the Manse Building Committee for the efficient manner in which they have executed the trust committed to them as a Committee.

2. That arrangements be made for wiping off the debt still remaining on the Tinonee Free Church.

3. That it is *due* to the congregation to state that the debt on the Tinonee Free Church would have been paid years ago, but for the fact that Mr. Alexander McMillan failed to give an account of the moneys he received and expended, as treasurer to the Tinonee Free Church Building Committee.

(Signed) ALEXANDER LOBBAN,
Tinonee, Oct. 6, 1868: Chairman.

SUSTENTATION FUND AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS. – We would take the liberty of urging on the Deacons' Courts and Committees of Management, in the different congregations of the Church, the importance of having the contributions to the Sustentation Fund, and the special collections appointed by the Synod for the current half year, in the hands of the Treasurer William Buyers; Esq., 69 New Pitt Street, Sydney, by the beginning of November.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 38 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, NOVEMBER, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Testimony.

No. 38 NOVEMBER. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Faith … … … … … … 441
Annual Meeting of the Synod of Eastern Australia … … 442
Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria … … … 445
Canon Law … … … … … … 445
Moderatism in Victoria … … … … 446
Presbytery of Maitland … … … … 448
Correspondence … … … … … 449

Apprehended Defection on the part of the Free Church … … 451
Lecture on Purgatory … … … … … 451

FAITH.

(*Concluded from page* 431.)

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." – John 3: 36.

WARRANT TO BELIEVE.

We now inquire what warrant we have to believe. When you consider the nature of faith, – that it is the due acknowledgment of the claims of Christ and of his salvation, – you must perceive that we not only have full warrant but are under obligation to believe. To believe on Christ is to give to him the reception to which he is entitled, and it must always be our duty to give to him that reception. Accordingly, it is expressly stated that this is the commandment of God that we believe on him whom he has sent. (1 John 9: 23, John 6: 29.) And, when we have a command, it of course follows that we have a warrant to believe.

The error to be carefully guarded against is, that our warrant to believe depends upon our own exercises or qualities, – that we are authorised to believe if we are penitent or have spiritual desires, but not otherwise. We shall not be *disposed* to believe unless we are penitent and have spiritual desires, but we are *warranted* and *authorised* to believe on the single ground, that, from the nature of the case and from the call and command of God, it is our duty to believe.

MOTIVES TO BELIEVE.

We proceed now to urge the motives to believe. These, at least so far as we shall at present insist upon them, are presented in these statements, – it is reasonable to believe, – it is our duty to believe, – it will be unspeakably to our advantage to believe.

To urge the motives to believe is just to persuade men to believe; and, while we are urging them, therefore, the proper attitude for you is, that of persons weighing carefully the motives urged, stirring up their souls to comply with them, and desiring earnestly that the Spirit may effectually incline them to the determination and choice which constitute compliance with them. Assume, then, this attitude.

The first motive which we urge is, that it is reasonable to believe. Being rational creatures, if we do not act a rational part, we contradict our nature, and degrade ourselves from the rank to which it exalts us. We should highly value the noble distinction of reason, and should ever carefully guard against depriving ourselves of the dignity which it confers. If we do not act reasonably, we sink into a lower position than irrational creatures are capable of occupying. The position of irrational creatures is comparatively low on the scale of God's works, because they afford a more limited display of his perfections and are adapted to less exalted ends than higher orders of creatures; it is not as being distinguished by anything morally offensive that they occupy it. But it is on this ground that rational creatures who act unreasonably occupy their low position. *They* are distinguished by what is morally offensive.

It is reasonable to believe as regards the acknowledgment by the understanding of the truth of the Gospel. But we take it for granted that you exercise this kind of faith. And what we now call upon you to consider, is, that it is reasonable to believe in the sense of giving a due reception to the Saviour and to the salvation presented and offered to you in the Gospel.

Saving faith implies a high appreciation of its object; and is it not reasonable to have a high appreciation of Christ, who is infinitely glorious in his person and in his character, and in whom, as the Saviour, every excellency is found that could recommend him in that capacity? He is the Son of God, the Father's equal, – he is also the Son of Man, a partaker of human nature in its highest excellence, the faithful maintainer of the principles, and the honour of the divine government, and the compassionate and mighty deliverer of sinners, – he exercises divine love, wisdom, and power in effecting their deliverance, – and he enriches them with all the benefits of which they are capable, exalting them to glory, honour, and immortality And, all this and much more being true of him, is it not reasonable to hold him in corresponding, that is, in the highest, estimation?

Saving faith also implies the cordial reception of Christ as our Saviour. And is it not reasonable that persons in so deplorable and helpless a condition should gladly accept such a deliverer, a deliverer whose love disposes, and whose power, wisdom, and resources enable him to perfect that which

concerneth them? Those who exercise saving faith make choice of what really confers and constitutes blessedness; and is it not reasonable that we should make this choice, and not rest in what cannot satisfy and will soon cease?

442

And, when we say that it is reasonable to believe, we mean that this is the only course that is reasonable. We are so circumstanced that we cannot but give some treatment to Christ; and the only treatment that it is reasonable to give to him is, to honour and receive him as is done in believing. It is only by believing in Christ that we shall attain to blessedness, and intentionally, as becomes our rational nature, glorify God; and it is clear we do not act reasonably, if we do not seek those ends, and seek them in the only way in which they are attainable.

We are commanded to give to Christ the reception which is given to him in believing; and, when our Sovereign commands, the reasonable course for us is to obey. But here a second motive to believe presents itself to our notice, – that it is our duty to believe. The Scriptures expressly present this motive, – "this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ," (1 John 3: 23) and it must be our duty to believe as it is the commandment of God that we do so. When men are called upon to believe on Christ, it is not a mere invitation that is addressed to them. The invitation of our Sovereign has the force and bears the character of a command.

From the nature of the case, it cannot but be our duty to believe. Is it not our duty to honour the Son of God? Is it not our duty to value and receive the unspeakably precious salvation, which God has provided and offers, and which we so urgently need? Is it not our duty to receive benefits, which will not only raise us from degradation and misery to blessedness and glory, but also bring us into a capacity to love and serve God? If it were not our duty to believe, unbelief would not be sinful. And if our unbelief is not sinful, neither was that of the Jews. But their unbelief was treated by God as being sinful; in punishment of it they were visited with fearful judgments, extinguished as a nation, and dispersed over the whole earth. It may be said that the Jews crucified Christ, and that it was on this account that they were dealt with in the manner referred to. Very true; but in crucifying Christ they only gave expression and effect to their unbelief; and, if their unbelief itself had not been sinful, it would not have been sinful to have acted in accordance with it.

The Scriptures uniformly represent unbelief as sinful. Christ, promising the Comforter to his followers, declares with respect to him, "he will convince the world of sin . . . . because they believe not on me." (John 13: 8, 9.) And, addressing the unbelieving Jews, he ascribes their unbelief to their inexcusable indisposition to believe "ye will not" – "ye are not willing to come unto me that ye might have life;" and he then assigns as the reason why they would not come to him, that they had not the love of God in them, and that they received honour one of another, and sought not the honour which cometh from God only; and he concludes with an intimation, that, inasmuch as, wilfully, from corrupt motives, and in the face of abundant evidence, they continued in unbelief, they should be visited with condemnation. "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father, there is one that accuseth you, even Moses." (John 5: 36-47.)

It is to be observed that the duty of believing occupies such a place among our duties, that, while we do not perform it, we perform aright no other duty whatever.

Some would persuade themselves that it is not their duty to believe, because they cannot believe. If it were the case that they could not believe though they would, this reasoning would be plausible; but, when the state of the case is, that they cannot believe, simply because they will not, the duty of believing clearly remains unaffected. A wicked undutiful son cannot honour his father and his mother, because, from the badness of his heart, he

will not honour them, but regards them with dislike and aversion; but, notwithstanding this inability, is it not his duty to honour them? Now this case, though certainly an extreme one in the conduct of men towards each other, represents correctly the position of the unconverted with respect to spiritual things. Christ himself testifies of such, "they have both seen and hated both me and my Father." (John 15: 24.)

A third motive is, that it will be unspeakably to your advantage to believe. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. (John 3: 36.) The unbelieving are thus, according to the testimony of Scripture, under the wrath of God. While they are here, it abides on them in a manner suitable to the character of the present state, and takes effect but to a limited extent; but, when they go hence, abiding on them still, it will no longer, the period of retribution having arrived, be restrained in its operation. They will have their portion in everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. (Matt. 25: 41, 46.) How fearful is this wrath! How deplorable the condition of those on whom it abides! And what an unspeakable advantage to be delivered from it! This advantage is attached to faith.

And those who believe, while the wrath of God no longer abides on them, have everlasting life, which is the Scripture expression for consummated blessedness, and all the circumstances under which it is realised. They are made accepted in the beloved, – they are enrolled among the sons of God, – they are renewed after his image, – they have communion with him, – and those privileges, attainments, and experiences shall all, in due time, be heightened to the perfection of the heavenly state And, in the meantime, all things shall work together to secure this result. Such are the inestimable advantages attached to faith.

CONCLUDING APPEAL.

Will you then believe? This, you may think, is not the question in this case, but whether the blessings of salvation shall be granted to you. On this latter point there is no ground for doubt. The blessings of salvation are offered to you, – they are pressed upon your acceptance. That you may possess, nothing is necessary but that you receive them, – that you believe. The question, therefore, which you are concerned to answer is the one which we have put, – will you believe? Christ is presented and offered to you; will you give to him the reception which he claims and to which he is entitled, and, which you must give to him that you may be saved? Will you give it to him now, for it is with respect to the present only that we are authorised to treat with you? You must now decide either way; you cannot escape from either receiving or rejecting him. Which then will you do? Will you not receive him? Is it not due to him, do you not owe it to yourselves that you receive him? Will you not receive him then? Are there any who will reject him? Has not peace with God, – has not renewal after his image, – has not communion with him, – has not heaven any attractions for you? If they have, believe and they shall all be yours.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
SYNOD OF EASTERN AUSTRALIA.

The Synod of Eastern Australia met in St. George's Church, Sydney, on Tuesday, the 3rd instant, at half-past 7 p.m. The retiring Moderator, having been prevented from arriving in time to preach the opening sermon, the Rev. William McIntyre delivered an address based upon Acts 1: 8. "But ye shall receive 449
power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The address was to the following effect: – These words were addressed by the risen Saviour to the Apostles whom he had chosen. We are not to suppose, however, that they do not at all apply to the non-official members of the Church. If we except such acts as are strictly official, and what is strictly official in the manner of performing other acts, there is nothing which it is the duty of office-bearers to do that it is not the duty of non-official members to do, so far as it may be practicable for them to do it. It is the duty of office-bearers to proclaim and apply the truth, this is their great duty; but it is the duty of non-official members also to proclaim and apply it as they may be able, and may have opportunity. And even what non-official members cannot do themselves it is their duty to do by the agency of proper office-bearers, using all legitimate means to procure this agency, and doing their utmost to maintain it. It devolves upon all the members of the Church to see to it that the Church's work is done, and to contribute in their respective places, and according to their respective means and opportunities, to the doing of it.

Office-bearers, however, are under peculiar obligations. Certain duties, as regards the performance of them, though not as regards the making of provision for performing them, are committed to them exclusively; and, as regards the duties, or at least some of the duties, that devolve on them and on non-official members in common, they alone are authorised and commissioned to perform them as the organs of the Church. And while they thus occupy the highest and most distinctive province of the Church's activity, the performance by the non-official members of their respective duties, and the fitness of the Church in respect of character and effort to serve the great purposes of its existence, greatly depend on their zeal and faithfulness.

The office-bearers of the Church have their appointment from Christ, and, as such office-bearers, they are subject to his exclusive authority. The words before us were addressed by Christ to "the Apostles whom he had chosen;" and though he does not now choose and appoint office-bearers by his own direct personal agency as he chose and appointed them, he still no less really, as administering the covenant of grace, chooses and appoints all duly authorised office-bearers.

And, as the office-bearers of the Church have their appointment and their commission from Christ, they are under law to him, in the whole exercise of their office. Those whom Christ calls to office in his Church he qualifies for its duties, and he does so not only in the more ordinary administration of Providence, but also and further by the supernatural agency of the Spirit, visiting them with the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and imparting to them suitable spiritual gifts for their respective spheres of labour and departments of usefulness.

All the members of his Church and, in a very special manner, its office-bearers, by whose agency it is that to a great extent it performs its functions as an organised body, Christ has constituted "witnesses" unto him. To all of them he says, as he said to the Apostles, "Ye are witnesses unto me . . . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth." The whole of the Church's work, viewed under one of its aspects, consists in bearing testimony, full and faithful testimony, for Christ. The testimony which it is thus the Church's duty to bear for Christ, in all its utterances, and in its whole character and history but especially by the agency of its office-bearers, respects his person, his offices, his execution of them, and the benefits which he has procured and dispenses. And, that this department of its testimony may be intelligible and regarded, it must bear a clear and earnest testimony with res-

pect to man's natural state, and his great and urgent need of the salvation revealed and offered in the Gospel. The testimony with which the Church is entrusted respects further Christ's claims, and the homage to which he is entitled, both as Head of the Church and as Prince of the kings of the earth. The homage which he claims, and to which he is entitled, as Head of the Church, includes exclusive obedience to him, and undeviating adherence to his arrangements and instructions, in all that pertains to the constitution and government of his Church, and the dispensation and maintenance of its ordinances; and the homage which he claims, and to which he is entitled, as the Prince of the kings of the earth, includes obedience to him on the part of civil communities and their rulers, and the promotion by them of his cause in every way competent to them, as by giving civil sanction to the truth, and by the application of the public funds. Voluntaryism, denying as it does that it is the duty of civil rulers, or of civil communities as such, to promote the cause of Christ, under any circumstances, in either of the ways specified, is so far, and therefore to a grievous extent, a rejection of the claims of Christ; and Erastianism, conceding, as it does to civil rulers, a right of authoritative interference with the internal administration of the affairs of the Church, which Christ has not conferred on them, and denying, as it also does, that Christ, by requiring that the internal administration of the affairs of the Church shall be conducted by its own office-bearers alone in accordance with the laws which he has given to it, has forbidden the exercise of such interference by civil rulers, and submission to it on the part of the Church, is so far in another direction, and also to a grievous extent, a rejection of the claims of Christ. But a compromise, to the effect that the Saviour's claims, so far as Voluntaryism and Erastianism involve a rejection of them, shall not be asserted or denied, that no testimony shall be borne with respect to them, – and it is by such a compromise that the Unions effected in these colonies have been reached, – is not only a more extended, but, at the same time, a more treacherous, because a concerted rejection of his claims; it is a deliberate rejection of them for a consideration and a purpose.

Unionists are accustomed to contend that it is not necessary, in this part of the world, to bear the testimony which has been thus suppressed; that is, that it is not necessary, in this part of the world, to bear a full testimony to Christ's headship. This testimony they would have us regard as a mere Scottish testimony. No testimony, however, is less capable of territorial limitation. Christ's headship lies at the foundation of the Church's existence, and is the source of its efficiency. It is therefore not only incumbent upon the Church but also necessary for it, at all times, and in all places and circumstances, to assign and faithfully preserve to the doctrine of the headship its proper place and prominence. A Church that dislodges this doctrine from its testimony, and puts it under a bushel, cannot warrantly expect that Christ, in the exercise of this headship will honour and help it. His dealings with it will be far more likely to verify the declaration – "If we deny him, He also will deny us." 2 Timothy, 2: 12.

At the close of this address, the Moderator – who had in the meantime arrived – constituted the Synod. The following members were in attendance: – Allan McIntyre, (Moderator), William McIntyre, James McCulloch, Colin R. Greig, William S. Donald, Duncan McInnes, ministers; and Peter Stewart,

Samuel Porter, and Malcolm Gillies, elders. The roll having been made up, the Rev. W. S. Donald was unanimously chosen Moderator; and routine arrangements for conducting the business of the Court having been made, the Synod adjourned.

On Wednesday, the Synod met at 10 o'clock, and was constituted, when the Rev. W. McIntyre, as Convener of the Com- 444
mittee on Mr. John A. Stuart's studies, gave in the following report; – "During the past twelve months Mr. Stuart prosecuted his studies with great assiduity, and made satisfactory progress. During the earlier part of the year he studied logic, using 'Whately's. Logic' as a text book, and moral philosophy, using 'Wayland's Moral Science' as a text book; and, during the latter part of it, Greek and Church History. During the whole period he studied systematic and polemical theology, the text book used being 'Hodge's Outlines.' He also wrote and submitted for examination a considerable number of discourses on texts given to him." Mr. McIntyre, in conclusion, recommended that Mr. Stuart should be taken on trials for license. This report was adopted, and it was unanimously resolved, that Mr. Stuart's trials, of which a sermon on Ephesians 2: 8, and a lecture on John 15: 1-8, which he had been directed to prepare, should form a part, should be proceeded with in the evening. The Rev. W. McIntyre gave in the following report on behalf of the committee on procuring ministers and on Church extension: – "The committee fears that the expectation of a supply of labourers from Scotland, which, as stated in former reports, it was lead to entertain, must for the present be abandoned. If, however, the Union now contemplated shall be formed in Scotland, a large portion of the Free Church will unquestionably refuse to enter into it, and forming then the Free Church, restored to its pristine character, will unquestionably deal with this Church far otherwise than the Free Church now deals with it. But we must not be diverted, by this prospect or by any other, from distinctly and practically recognising that no Church, that does not train its own ministers, can be satisfactorily supplied with labourers. Though our expectation of a supply from Scotland has been disappointed, we have cause to be thankful for a valuable accession to our number of labourers in course of the past year. A minister, who laboured for years with great acceptance as a minister of the Free Church in Scotland, formally connected himself with our Church in course of the past year, after calm and mature consideration. The committee refers to your esteemed Moderator, the Rev. William S. Donald. A considerable time ago Mr. John McLeod, a student of theology in connection with the Union Church in Victoria, feeling that his objections to the position of that Church would not permit him to labour in connection with it, expressed a desire to be received as a student by this Church. The convener of the committee, having satisfied himself that Mr. McLeod, was a promising student, encouraged him to come to Sydney to prosecute his studies. This he accordingly did; and, from the time of his arrival studied along with Mr. Stuart with great diligence and with satisfactory results. Another promising young man, who has made considerable progress in preparatory studies, has offered himself as a student." The Synod adopted this report, and resolved to take Mr. McLeod on trials for license.

The attention of the Synod having been directed anew to the difficulty encountered by congregations in procuring sites from the Government, a committee was appointed to procure for this Church a recognition of its rights in this direction.

In the evening Mr. Stuart was taken on trials, and examined in Greek, theology, and Church history; and, after engaging in prayer, read a sermon on the text formerly specified – Ephesians 2: 8. The Synod then engaged in devotional exercises, conducted by the Moderator and the Rev. Allan McIntyre.

The Synod met on Thursday forenoon, when Mr. McLeod was taken on trials, and underwent an examination similar to that already described as undergone by Mr. Stuart. In the evening the Synod resumed the trials of Mr. Stuart and Mr. McLeod, when the former read a popular lecture on John 15: 1-8, and the latter a sermon on Ephesians 2: 10, and a lecture on John 19: 1-7.

On Friday forenoon the Synod resumed the trials of Mr. Stu-

art and Mr. McLeod, and examined them on inspiration. The Synod then, taking a conjunct view of their trials, regarded them as satisfactory, and resolved to license Mr. Stuart and Mr. McLeod at a future diet.

A committee to correspond with sister Churches was appointed.

In the evening Mr. Stuart and Mr. McLeod, having satisfactorily answered the questions put to probationers, and having signed the formula, were licensed to preach the Gospel and to exercise their gifts as probationers for the Holy Ministry, and were addressed in appropriate and impressive terms by the Moderator.

On the suggestion of the Treasurer, the Synod directed deacons' courts and committees of management to make full and detailed returns to the Treasurer on or before the 30th April and the 31st October, each year, of all the moneys collected for religious or charitable purposes, whether expended under the direction of the Synod or that of deacons' courts or committees.

On Monday, a committee, consisting of the Moderator, Mr. Greig, Mr. W. McIntyre, and Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Greig convener, was appointed to make any further arrangements that may appear desirable with respect to the studies and the examination of candidates for the ministry.

In the evening, the Treasurer read the financial report, which was unanimously adopted. The cordial thanks of the Synod were then conveyed to Mr. Buyers for the zeal and ability with which he discharges the duties of general Treasurer to this Church.

The Synod appointed the following collections to be made during the ensuing year, viz.: – A Collection

For the Church extension scheme, in January;

For the New Hebrides Mission, in March;

For the Church extension scheme, in June;

And for the Synod Fund, in September.

Mr. McMillan's case, which had been repeatedly postponed in the hope that, especially as he was in town, he would appear to answer for himself, was now resumed, when, after deliberation, it was unanimously resolved that "the Synod, finding that the inferior Court has called upon Mr. McMillan to substantiate the charges made by him against an office-bearer of this Church, that he has hitherto failed either to substantiate or retract them, that, so far as appears, he has no intention of doing either, and that, the charges made by him must, therefore, be regarded as wholly unfounded, unanimously resolved that he should be suspended from the office of the eldership and from Church privileges, and he was suspended accordingly. The Moderator was instructed to communicate this deliverance to Mr. McMillan, and to point out to him his duty in the circumstances.

On Tuesday forenoon the Synod authorised Mr. McInnes to associate with himself such elders in his congregation as are available, as an *interim* session, to enable him to dispense the Lord's Supper, and the Synod further authorised this *interim* session to perform all the duties of a session till a permanent session shall be formed.

The Synod then sanctioned certain preaching stations, which it authorised presbyters to erect into charges, if they saw cause. The Synod also disposed of the question of supplies.

At this and other meetings various items of routine business were transacted, which we do not deem it necessary to report.

The Synod adjourned, to meet in the same place on the first Wednesday of November, 1869, at 7 o'clock p.m.

ABSTRACT OF FINANCIAL REPORT, FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st OCTOBER, 1868

Congregations	Sustentation Fund	Ministers Scheme & Church Extens.	Synod Fund	New Hebrides Mission	Mission Dayspring	Congregation Funds	Totals
Sydney, St George's		£15 0 0		£5 5 0		£852 17 10	£871 2 10
Bombala	£160 0 0	10 11 6		4 0 0		303 0 0	477 11 0
Manning River	136 15 0	3 19 10	2 19 11	1 2 0		222 16 8	377 6 9
Ahalton & Raymond Terrace	83 0 1	2 14 8½	2 16 3½	2 2 5		40 7 6	131 1 0
Maitland	53 17 1	2 16 9			10 0 0	12 7 9½	79 11 7½
Clarence R., Grafton		31 0 0				9 0 0	40 0 0
" Rockymouth	85 0 0	43 16 0				20 0 0	148 16 0
Inverell	68 0 0	30 0 0					98 0 0
Singleton		7 10 0					7 10 0
Barrington	9 13 0						9 13 0
Seaham		6 8 3½					6 8 3½
Clarence Town		10 0 0					10 0 0
	£596 0 11	£101 17 1	£5 16 2½	£12 9 5	£19 9 5	£1460 19 9½	£2257 1 0

FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF VICTORIA.

The half-yearly meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria took place in the Gaelic Church, Geelong, on the 20th ult., the Synod being constituted with reading of the Word and prayer. Sederunt – Revs. P. McPherson, the Moderator, and A. Paul, ministers; and W. J. Reid, Esq., of Woodbourne, Meredith, elder.

The Moderator delivered an interesting address, founded on Luke 16 initio, and bearing on the present state of religious parties, and the aspects of providence, as related to the testimony of the Free Presbyterian Church. In accordance with an understanding come to at the last annual meeting, this address was held as the Moderator's inaugural discourse.

The minutes of the meetings of 21st and 22nd April being read, were approved. Mr. Paul moved, and Mr. Reid seconded a motion, tendering the thanks of the Synod to the Moderator, for the interesting, instructive, and seasonable address, delivered by him at the opening of the meeting, and requesting the Moderator to allow the Synod to publish it. The motion being carried, the Moderator acknowledged the vote, and put the address at the disposal of the Synod for publication. The Moderator, without leaving the chair, read the draft of a minute, intended for insertion in the records, expressive of the Synod's approbation of the late Moderator's administration, during his lengthened period of office. It was agreed to insert the draft, as read, in the minutes.

It was as follows: – "Considering the prolonged services of Rev. A. Paul as moderator, the Synod deems it proper to enter on their minutes a recognition of his services more fully than can be done in an ordinary vote of thanks. Mr. Paul's term of office has been extended to four years, during which time there have been constantly evolving events requiring the exercise of his peculiar qualifications for conducting the public business of the church. It is a matter of congratulation to the Synod that their affairs have been under the guidance of one who has shown himself so well able to conduct important business with the departments of Government, as well as harassing correspondence with unfaithful churches. The Synod would single out for special mention the case of the late Synod of Victoria Bill, in its passage through Parliament. The unrighteous provisions of that bill, as at first drafted, were so effectually set aside by the vigilance, promptitude, and ability, of Mr. Paul that the Bill had to be remodelled in its preamble, enacting clauses, and schedule. Instead of effecting the extinction of the Free Presbyterian Church in this colony, it has itself become a permanent record of the fact that a second Act of the Victorian Legislature has failed to accomplish that extinction. Still, farther, it is a matter of sincere thankfulness to the Great Head of the Church that the Synod had one so well qualified to uphold the character of the church in regard to that distinctive testimony, which – by the grace of God – it has been the privilege of this church to hold, and for which it has been the honor of this church to suffer, while so many Presbyterian Churches are making a merit – directly or indirectly – of falling from that testimony; as if the interests of the kingdom of Christ could be really advanced by making open questions of the claims of the King. In dealing with the questions thus concerned, the Synod have had in Mr. Paul one who was quite competent to take the most comprehensive views of principle, to give clear expression to principles, and deal at the same time with the practical details ever and anon emerging. In conclusion, the Synod would record their prayer to the Great Head of the Church that Mr. Paul be long spared in health and strength to uphold, in its fulness, that testimony for the headship of Christ which has been already so signally obscured by the numerous union movements in various parts of the world."

Correspondence between the Moderator and the Treasurer, and between the Moderator and Commissioner of Lands and Survey, was reported; also a letter from the Moderator to the adherents of this Church at Hamilton, which had not been replied to as yet.

Consideration of the propositions tabled by Mr. Paul, at last meeting, being resumed, it was moved, seconded, and carried, that they be adopted, with one alteration, as expressive of the view which this Synod holds of its position towards other Presbyterian bodies, and, that a committee be appointed, to consider what effect should be given to this step in the formula; the committee to consist of the Moderator and Mr. Paul.

Subscriptions to an amount, not under £150, were reported by Mr. Reid, as having been obtained for the erection of a church at Meredith, and the grant for the year was finally allocated in aid of that object.

The Synod adjourned, to meet, in ordinary course, on the third Tuesday of April; the Moderator being, however, empowered to call a meeting at the beginning of next year, if expedient, on giving a week's notice of time and place to the members. Closed with prayer.

CANON LAW.

The following account of the extent and operation of the Canon Law, which we extract from "Rome and Civil Liberty," by Dr. Wylie, a book which our statesmen should carefully study, clearly shews the utter irreconcilableness of popery with free institutions, and, indeed, with the discharge of relative duty under the guidance of the Word of God and of individual conscience. Popery and the Canon Law suppress in their victims the sense of direct personal responsibility to God, and hand them over to the priest to be disposed of by him as he pleases. The connection between the moral constitution of our nature and our relation to God, on the one hand, and the discharge of

social duty, on the other, and, consequently, the very foundation of the confidence on which society rests, are thus destroyed.

"A glimpse into canon law will show us how largely the papal aggression was political, and how inevitably its development must fill and absorb the whole realm of Britain, expelling all, annihilating all, and becoming the one sole all controlling power in the country.

446

The two grand characteristics of canon law are, first, it is an infallible code. It is not merely infallible: it is the one infallible authority in the world. All other codes are subordinate to it, and must be modified by it. The Bible itself is to be interpreted according to it. It is the organ through which an infallible Church speaks to the papist. The voice of canon law is to him the voice of God. It governs his conscience with the power of omnipotence.

The second characteristic of canon law is, that it is the code of a body whose head is as really a temporal as a spiritual prince. Being the common law of the Roman States, – for none other is there known, – it must necessarily rule as well political and social rights as religious, and be the measure, not of spiritual privileges only, but of temporal also. It must apply in all matters that appertain to men as citizens as well as Church members; in short, it must take under its one compendious jurisdiction all that in other countries is embraced under two, – the spiritual and the temporal, to wit. This, indeed, is the fact. Cardinal Wiseman came to inaugurate, not a part only, but the whole, of this code; for it cannot be cut in two. It is easy, then, to conceive how much homage is left to the Queen, and how much obedience is reserved to the law, on the part of a community placed under a code which requires of them that they shall love and serve their Lord and Sovereign the Pope with all their heart, and all their conscience, with the unqualified devotion of their persons, and the unlimited surrender of their goods.

Keeping these two characteristics of canon law in eye, let us next inquire what is the range over which its authority extends. As laid down by popish jurists, canon law embraces three departments: – 1. Doctrine; 2. Morals; 3. Discipline. There is not much in these words to alarm one. But let us weigh well their import. The Roman Church has a wonderful faculty for embodying the hardest meanings in the mildest terms. Let us lift up our eyes, and survey, in the length thereof and the breadth thereof, the territory over all of which canon law is the one supreme, infallible authority. It is, in truth, a territory wholly without limits.

The first department is doctrine. Canon law infallibly prescribes what the Romanist is to believe. With this, it may be said, we as Protestants have nothing to do. We therefore pass it, and proceed to the second department, – Morals, to wit. By morals, Roman theologians mean absolutely all actions whatever, which a man, in whatever capacity or relation, can do; and therefore in every action they hold him amenable to the Church's discipline. From every action, say they, there flow good or evil consequences to the Church; and therefore over every action of man it is requisite that the Church should stretch her disciplinary control. To canon law, – that is, to the priest who administers it, – it appertains to say to what school a man is to send his child; with whom his son or daughter is to contract marriage with whom he is to buy and sell; what opinions he is to hold on all political and social questions; what party he is to support by his vote; when he may obey the law peaceably, and when he must meet it with riot and insurrection; when he may account the sovereign of the country in which he resides legitimate, and when he must hold his title invalid; and, especially if he be a rich man, does it minutely instruct him in all matters appertaining to a death-bed, not infrequently, as the widow and the orphan have cause to know, adding to its letter of direction the personal and watchful superintendence of its priests. There is not, from the cradle to the grave, an act done by the man, or an office filled by him, in which canon law does not come in with its infallible supervision and control.

The third department embraced by canon law is Discipline. Discipline is a mild term. It signifies in the Protestant sense only

spiritual inflictions; but in the Roman Church it has terrors unknown to us. The theory of the Church of Rome under the head of Discipline is, that the Church, being a perfect and complete society, must possess within herself everything nec-essary for the ends of government.

No doubt, the Protestant Church says, in terms, the same thing. She equally holds that the power of discipline is inherent in her as an independent spiritual society, and that its exercise is essential to her welfare. The difference lies in the *discipline* exercised. The Protestant Church holds that this punitive power must, like the Church herself, be exclusively, and in every case, spiritual. Not so holds the Church of Rome. Rarely indeed are her sentences, even in their form, exclusively spiritual; and in no case do they end within the spiritual sphere. They always embody a civil element; they almost always inflict a corporal and temporal penalty; and they are ever, when resistance is offered, to be carried out by the civil arm. That Church accounts it not enough to warn, exhort, rebuke, and, in extreme cases, to visit with deprivation of spiritual privileges. Her discipline runs on through the ascending stages of fine, imprisonment, confiscation of goods, loss of political and social rights, up to its last and extremest penalty, which is death by burning. In the rear of her Church courts stands an array of physical penalties, – the rack, the dungeon, and the scaffold. Such is the ecclesiastical discipline of Rome. Such is her ecclesiastical discipline as prescribed in the canon law, as exercised in its whole extent at this hour in the Roman States, as exercised in France, and Spain, and other popish countries, to all the extent to which Rome has been able to extort permission by her concordats; and such is the discipline under which the whole Romanist body in Great Britain has now been placed, to its whole extent *in theory,* and to an extent *in fact,* that is already large, and is daily widening.

This makes sufficiently plain what is, and only can be, the real position of the Romanist body in Great Britain. They are under canon law; and by that law they are cut off and separated from all around them. The moral force of all other authority and law is completely evacuated as regards them. They form absolutely, in political as really as in religious matters, a distinct and different community. There are two nations on the soil of Britain: Queen Victoria the sovereign of the one; Cardinal Wiseman [now Manning], as the representative of the Pope, the sovereign of the other."

MODERATISM IN VICTORIA. – LIEUTENANT HENDERSON.

(*Concluded from page* 437.)

There was some noise on the subject, but Mr. Henderson prudently kept quiet. It is certainly ground of congratulation with the reverend philosopher, that he has learned, even from Darwin, that the great Creator is a God of order – a truth which some very respectable people have learned independently of Darwin – a truth which many more are under the impression they believe even in spite of Darwin. But we are not quite done yet with Mr. Henderson's philosophy in this matter. Had he not given his verdict on Darwin already in the book "Christianity

and Modern Thought ?" It was, perhaps, foolhardy for the lecturer to attack the lion in his den – to try conclusions with the rifleman at his own butts. What, then, do we find in Mr. Henderson's "Christianity?" &c. I have quoted so much that I must refrain now, else I could give you a page of as sheer nonsense as is to be picked up in a week's reading. Still I must endeavour to give you some idea of the game of "hide and seek," which Mr. Henderson plays. You will notice, that in complimenting infidel writers he must take care to steer clear of a direct charge of error 447
against himself. Mr. Henderson describes the theory propounded in the "Vestiges," &c., as resting on two propositions – first, that life is an effect of electric force; and secondly, that creatures got organs as they wanted them. The fish felt it would be good to walk and got legs, or felt it would be agreeable to fly and so got wings. Darwin's theory is pronounced more philosophic than this, and what is it? Creatures advanced by a law of development from a monad till they reached the advanced estate of the monkey. At last some higher ape "took refuge in the then unknown port of humanity, and settled and begat sons and daughters there." Now all the world knows, that the "Vestiges" and Darwinianism are quarries from which the choice weapons of infidelity are manufactured, and therefore Mr. Henderson is very careful to provide himself with a back-door of retreat in close proximity to his announcement of each of these infidel theories. Hence, of the theory in the "Vestiges," he pronounces the propositions "exceedingly questionable." As to Darwin's theory, he is not prepared "at once to accept of that theory as all sufficient." These back doors are convenient. But Darwin and the author of the "Vestiges" get ample compensation. The quarrel with their theories must not be made too wide, says Mr. Henderson. If they keep to their proper field, perhaps there is no need to "fasten any quarrel upon them at all." So long as they do not try to explain the spiritual in man, Mr. Henderson does "not think that, from a theological point of view we have much to say to them;" and again, "I do not see that anybody need be the worse for believing in Mr. Darwin or the 'Vestiges,' if he don't just get too proud of his ancestors." If an old wife believes that the moon is made of green cheese, or schwert-zerocaseous matter, as it has been learnedly expressed, it would be a case of deplorable ignorance, but still her belief might not be productive of much harm, unless, indeed, she tried some dangerous expedient to get a slice of it. But if a man or woman believes that a wafer is the actual body and blood of a person who lived 1800 years ago, we cannot divest that belief of its known associations with the most crushing spiritual despotism that has ever blighted this earth. Just as little can any whitewashing on the part of such as Mr. Henderson divest the theories under consideration of their connexion with the efforts of infidelity. Was it electric force that produced Adam? or from what ape did he develop? How long did Adam's felt want of an helpmate operate in producing Eve? How did she come to occupy so very different a relation to him from his hands, and his legs, and his eyes, and his teeth, all of which he, or his ape progenitors, must have got by feeling the want of them? Then, according to Lieutenant Henderson, theology has little to do with all this, although we have an authoritative account in the case, which is belied by the infidel theories so patronisingly treated by him. A man's theology or Christianity are but little affected by believing in Darwin or the theory propounded or maintained in the "Vestiges," &c. Then suppose we operate upon Lieutenant Henderson by way of experiment. He has a very kindly aspect towards the development theories referred to, but how fares it with his theology – his Christianity? By their fruits ye shall know them. Grapes are not to be gathered of thorns, nor figs of thistles. Infidel theories are not a congenial soil for the production of all holy conversation and godliness – *teste Henderson ipso.*

It is only fair to Mr. Henderson to take cognisance of the fact, that his ecclesiastical liberalism is not altogether indiscriminate. There is at least one religious denomination in the colony towards which his sentiments assumed something like shape, and consistency, and definiteness – I mean the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria. By the grace of God, the testimony of that witnessing body has been upheld against the assaults of two General Assemblies of the Free Church of Scotland, two Acts of the Colonial Legislature, and an incalculable amount of back door

influence through colonial committees and government officials. The records of the Free Church of Scotland, and the records of the Parliament of Victoria, bring up the testifying position of a witnessing Church in this colony, just as certainly as the inscription of Diocletian, intended to commemorate the extirpation of Christianity, brings up the existence of witnesses at the time at least to be extirpated. Had there been no Christians in the time of Diocletian, no monument would have been required to commemorate their extirpation. The Victorian Acts of Parliament in 1859 and 1867 not only give solid historical evidence of the fact that there were Free Church witnesses at these dates, but they embody the mortifying fact, that the work of extermination had not been completely successful. But what has Lieutenant Henderson to do with all this? The Free Church testifying body is the one towards which Mr. Henderson's sentiments assumed such a decided shape as already stated. But was the shape favourable or unfavourable? Now I put it to the reader to consider what is the testimony of the Free Church, and according to all ideas of consistency, according to all considerations of natural affinities, is it likely that Lieutenant Henderson would be found amongst the fast friends of such as the Free Church? Of course not. Looking over some of his contributions to the press on the subject, I find the following charge against the Free Church witnesses: – "They have denounced us at these meetings in words of cursing too horrible for me to mention here, words that would have been very far from respectable in the mouth of the roughest bullock driver in the colony." From such an one as Mr. Henderson, no doubt this ought to be very severe. We have had some specimens of the exquisite delicacy of Mr. Henderson's sentiments and diction, and more could be adduced *ad aperturam* of his published sermons – for Mr. Henderson has written a book called "Christianity and Modern Thought," already referred to – a regular nugget of diggeresque divinity! Some separate sermons have also appeared. Glancing over these we find a good deal of very coarse language. There is a considerable amount of intellectual vigour, and unquestionably he occupies a far higher place in the scale of real ability than such perpetually buzzing insects as the Rev. Geo. Mackie and J. W. Inglis! But with these qualities, and the obvious tendency to muscular Christianity, as becomes the president of a gymnastic club, it is, perhaps, not wonderful that there is a tendency to strong language. One notices the words "damned," "damnation," "damnable," pretty frequently in the sermons of Lieutenant Henderson. Trite, all these words are in Scripture. But it stands to reason, that the most emphatic words, in the most awfully solemn connexion in which they can be employed in the Word of God, are not lightly to be transferred to other associations. In 2 Peter 2: 1, we have the warning against those who privily shall bring in "damnable heresies." The chapter altogether gives one of the most lucid glimpses to be got in Scripture of the dark workings of sin, and the perdition of the wicked, as exhibited in God's reserving the angels that fell in chains of darkness, and in the fiery overthrow of the guilty cities of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Now in what connexion do we find the emphatic word in Lieutenant Henderson? Take the following: "Now I have just to tell you, that if your religion has taught you that you have only to do with yourselves, that as religious men you have nothing to do with the affairs of the commonwealth, it is altogether a bad, what I have not the slightest hesitation in calling a damnable, sort of religion." This is from the sermon at the drumhead to the Volunteers. From the tone of the passage, one would almost imagine that the reverend lieutenant was taking advantage of his position to indulge in a little swearing at his comrades without fear of retaliation. Of 448
course it was only to be expected that the rifleman, who was in such strong charges, would find some opportunity of firing off the great gun from Macbeth, "out damned spot." The performance took place in the Ballarat pulpit for the behoof of the diggers, and may be found in the series of sermons in "Christianity and Modern Thought." His discourse on the Law of Chastity is, without exception, the coarsest production on any subject that I have ever read. It was published, too, "by request." Like priest, like people. The "living down" process produces equilibrium of a sort.

So much for the gallant rifleman. What serious friends may have done privately to keep Mr. Henderson from making those exhibitions, which illustrate the "living down" process, I do not know. But I do observe that on one public occasion Dr. Cairns tried to give him a practical admonition. He expressed his affection for Mr. Henderson, and said he regarded him as a son. But there was one thing he wanted his son to do – lay aside his "little rifle" and keep to the "canon" of the truth, as the weapons of our warfare are not carnal. This was ingenious; but the ingenuity and all the adventitious solemnities of a soiree, failed to impress the gentleman. The President of the Gymnastic Club kept the Doctor at arm's length. He denied that a rifle was a carnal weapon any more than a steel pen! Leviathan was not to be turned with a straw! He got a much sharper admonition from a man of much sterner stuff than is to be found in Dr. Cairns' composition – I mean the Rev. Arthur Paul, of St. Kilda. I wonder if Lieutenant Henderson has forgotten it – for it is still pending, being, as yet, an unsettled case of appeal. "I appeal, you, William Henderson, and the majority of this Court for whom you have acted, to the bar and judgment of the Lord Jesus Christ for your lordship exercised over God's heritage!" I might now stop, but I am disposed to take a glance beyond the ranks of Presbyterianism. Within that legion itself, no doubt it may be said that Mr. Henderson is only an individual, still he is one of the Magnates of the Presbyterian Union. Perhaps there are not three equal to him in the Presbyterian Church. In that view he can fairly be taken as a representative man. True – he does not wield an influence similar to that wielded by Rev. I. Hetherington, who has, probably, the greatest share of all the Union ministers in pulling the strings behind the scenes. Yet Mr. Henderson is comparatively free of the persevering cunning and persevering scheming, by means of which Mr. Hetherington accomplishes his manipulations. If, then, in Mr. Henderson's case, we can readily gather up so much scum that has worked up to the surface, as shown in the preceding paragraphs, what state of things does that betoken for the Presbyterian Church? Yet, in a recent article in the *Union Magazine,* there is great rejoicing over the movement begun in Victoria – now extending like a tide-way to Britain and America. The neat, feeble, flowery diction, redundant sentences, and hysterical style, along with the initial "C" point at once to Dr. Cairns. Now if something like a millennium is coming upon Britain it is hard to suppose, on Dr. Cairns' own showing, that it is one resting upon true godliness. For, after an absence of ten years, Dr. Cairns returned to Scotland some time ago, to discover that the godly simplicity, sincerity, and piety of earlier days were disappearing before wealth and luxury. And what is the state of things here? For the last two or three years what has been the history of the churches – Anglican, Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist – where shall I stop? What say the records of the church courts and committees of examination? What say the records of the civil courts from Petty Sessions up to the Supreme Court? I do not know that there has been a time in the history of the colony when so many clerical delinquents have been before the public in some disgraceful connexion. Terrible to relate, it is licentiousness that is in the ascendant as the charge against ministers.

Here is one of the numerous cases to which reference might be made. A minister has a servant in the house, and by him she be-

comes *enciente.* Meanwhile she gets married, and the minister performs the ceremony! This is worthy of Corinthian depravity. Looking at the array of cases and the parties concerned, I observe that some stars of the first magnitude have fallen from the ecclesiastical heavens. Am I wrong in suggesting that there may be some connexion between all this licentiousness and the bazaar morality, which came to its zenith some time ago? Has it not been pointed out that the principles, which guide persons in the choice of cigar girls and barmaids, were the same as those which guided the conductors of bazaars in the distribution of young ladies to attend charitable stalls and lotteries? Similar causes must produce similar effects. Now what are the natural effects in the case of the cigar girls and the barmaids? Who will say that all the levity, &c., &c., which has characterised bazaars, and the numerous other irreligious inventions for church and charitable purposes, has been productive of no permanent demoralization? Then how does Dr. Cairns indulge the prospect of a bright epoch at hand? True there has been a large amount of church building; but on what foundation does this rest? Is it the prompting of true piety? Is it not an unanswerable fact that, in the Union and out of it, churches owe their existence to the extended patronage given to those religious introductions to licentiousness afforded by bazaars, concerts, and entertainments of various kinds? The greatest impetus to cathedral building in Scotland took place at the very midnight of the dark ages.

In conclusion, with regard to the propriety of ministers joining the volunteers and certain societies, I do not require to come to any strong deliverance. I do not assume *a priori* that it is wrong for Mr. Henderson to enlist in the Ballarat corps. But I do say that if he sees his way to join it, he requires to give all due circumspection that through him the ministry be not blamed. I appeal to what is adduced in the foregoing paragraphs, and what is the verdict to be pronounced on Mr. Henderson's walk and conversation altogether? Has it been a "living up" or a "living down" process, with regard to the interests of true godliness? The reader may judge for himself from the specimens given. As to myself I lift my testimony against the conduct reviewed as degrading to the character of the Christian ministry, and as calculated to injure the interests of true godliness.

I am, &c.,

PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, 7th October, 1868.

PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND.

The Presbytery of Maitland met by permission of Synod during the sittings of Synod. There were present Revds. J. McCulloch (Moderator), Allan McIntyre, W. S. Donald, and Dun- can McInnes, ministers; and Messrs. Samuel Porter and Malcolm Gillies, elders. The Presbytery took up the case of Mr. Donald Shearer, Rocky Mouth, when the Moderator read a letter which he had received from Mr. Shearer. After deliberation, a deliverance was adopted to the effect that the

expression of regret contained in Mr. Shearer's letter, regarding certain remarks made by him at a Congregational meeting at Rocky Mouth, was satisfactory. The clerk was instructed to forward to Mr. Shearer this deliverance, and to admonish him.

Reference having been made to the valuable services of the Rev. Alexander McIntyre at Grafton, it was unanimously, resolved that the Moderator should convey to Mr. McIntyre the thanks of the Presbytery, and should express the hope that he would continue to labour on the Clarence as long as it would be in his power to do so.

The Presbytery appointed supplies for Clarence Town, and for the sanctioned preaching within its bounds.

Correspondence

(*To the Editor of* "*The Testimony*.")

SIRS, – I doubt not that you are aware, that in the published proceedings of the late meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, a report is given of a speech delivered by the Rev. Mr. Mackray before the Assembly. To a great deal of that speech no exception can be taken. But, so far as it refers to the Union consummated in this colony, and to Union negotiations in Scotland, there is not a little which we deem highly objectionable, and on which we now proceed to make animadversions.

One would think that Mr. Mackray might well have spared his allusion to the last speech of Dr. Cunningham on the Victorian Union question in the Free Church Assembly. The praises of that speech surely admitted of some modification, seeing it contained a very savage attack on those who persistently adhered to their principles, and to the instructions they received, when they left Scotland, from the Free Church as to the maintenance of her principles in the colonies, and refused to enter the Victorian amalgamation of heterogeneous elements. In regard to these men Dr. Cunningham expressed the hope or belief that they would soon die out, adding the sooner the better. Was that a "noble advocacy" of colonial unions? If Mr. Mackray and others think so we do not envy them such advocacy. In speaking of the position of Free Church ministers, Mr. Mackray betrays a sad amount of ignorance; at least so far as this colony is concerned; and, if we mistake not, the remark applies to Victoria. He speaks of the Free Church acquiescing in and approving of "her ministers and members in these lands withdrawing from old relations and assuming an independent ecclesiastical status." Now, the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and, we presume, the same is true of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, has had, from its formation in 1846, as independent an ecclesiastical status as any Church in the world. And the old relations to which he refers were simply these, that the Free Churches in the colonies regarded the Free Church of Scotland as a sister Church, held the same principles, and maintained close fellowship with her. That those ministers and members who left the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, and joined the Union Churches in these colonies, have withdrawn from these old relations we frankly admit. Moreover, it is well known that they form part of a Church, which avowedly stands in the same relation to the Established Church and the Free Church of Scotland, and is as willing to receive her supplies from the former as the latter. And not only so, but, at the Assembly of the United Church in this colony, in 1866, arrangements were adopted to the effect that their committee would correspond, in applying for ministers, with three committees formed respectively of ministers and members of the Established, the Free, and the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland; and thus the Union Church of New South Wales was positively placed on the same level with the Free Church, a Church which Mr. Mackray, along with other Free Churchmen, regards as Erastianised. Verily the conduct of the Free Church in recognising and co-operating with such a body, and that, too, in preference to those who refused to withdraw from the old relations to her, is not only disinterested but very astounding. If the Free Church thus rec-ognise and co-operate with a Church, that avowedly places her and the Erastianised Establishment on the same level, does this fact not justify the conclusion, that surely she does not now attach great importance to her past contendings and her present position.

However, it was not always so in the history of the Free Church. In 1852, the late Dr. Bonar, convener of the Free Church Colonial Committee, addressed a letter to a minister of the Established Church party in Tasmania, which contains the following passage: – "It might seem sufficient that they both signed the Westminster Confession; but, as the Established Church still professes to hold by that standard and to subscribe it, it becomes absolutely necessary to distinguish in what sense we do adopt and sign it." And, farther on, he says, as to the Ministers to be admitted to any Church which the Free Church could approve, "It is necessary that we should have some assurance that they are neither voluntaries, on the one hand, nor Erastians on the other; and that they do not approve of the establishment as it at present exists in Scotland."

Now, those who refused to enter the Union Church in this colony acted in full accordance with these views, which Dr. Bonar enunciated in the name and as the views of the Free Church, and they were its views at that time. And yet, forsooth, in 1868, it is declared, by a deputy from the Free Church, that, by our refusing to enter that Union, we have acted contrary to the advice of that Church, and deprived ourselves of her recognition and assistance. If we were inclined to make any appeal in vindication of our course, as thus referred to by Mr. Mackray, we would simply appeal from the judgments of the Free Church in 1860, 1861, and 1866, to her judgment in 1852, – a judgment which, we believe, she has not yet formally retracted. Will it be said that the Free Church had some assurance that those, with whom many of her Ministers and members in this colony entered into Union, "did not approve of the establishment as it at present exists in Scotland?" If so, we reply, that no one acquainted with the facts of the case, will believe it. It is well known, however, that those in this colony, who were connected with the Scottish establishment, declared to the last their unabated attachment to and approval of the principles and position of that establishment, and shortly before the consummation of the Union sent home a deliverance to that effect.

In the course of his speech Mr. Mackray bestows great praise on Mr. Dykes' speech in the last assembly of the Free Church. With reference to this praise, we only remark that, in a former communication, we showed that the speech of Mr. Dykes contained, in some instances, inaccurate and in others unfaithful representations.

We now proceed to notice some of Mr. Mackray's statements regarding the present negotiations for Union in Scotland. In the course of those statements he is reported to have said "The statements, which have been drawn up by the Union Committees on the vexed question of the mutual relations of Church and State, form a valuable contribution to the literature of this subject, and their articles of agreement undoubtedly cover the great principle of our Lord's universal headship, and national religious

responsibility. In the application of this principle to the lawfulness of State endowments of religion, it is true that different views are maintained by the negotiating Churches," &c. Now, how can these statements be consistently made by one, who glories in his connexion with a Church, which took her stand in 1843, on the establishment principle, and still holds it? Does not the Free Church still maintain that it is a part of a nation's religious responsibility to acknowledge and support the true religion, – to do so through her legitimate organ, the Government of the country?

Do the Ministers and members of the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland admit that this is a part of a nation's religious responsibility? It is well known that they do not, but positively deny it. How then can it be said that the articles of agreement cover the great principles of our Lord's universal headship and national religious responsibility? According to Mr. Mackray's 450 way of reasoning, articles of agreement, covering the principle of the headship of Christ over the Church, could be drawn up, in which the Ministers and members of the Established Church could unite with those of the Free Church of Scotland, the former of course dissenting from certain applications of the principle. Why, then, do Mr. Mackray and other Free Church men deny that the Ministers and members of the Scottish establishment hold the doctrine of the headship of Christ over the Church? Further on Mr. Mackray says, "I suppose that it is hard to avoid trimming and coquetting in conducting Union negotiations; you had something of this kind I dare say among yourselves." To the former statement we demur. The latter, we freely concede, expresses the fact in the case. In regard to union negotiations at home, the speaker expressed the hope "that, in answer to the prayers of God's people, this union may be consummated without any important secession from our ranks." If it be such a union, as seems to be contemplated by many of the Ministers of the Free Church, we hope that there are not a few of the Lord's people who are praying against the consummation of it, inasmuch as it would involve a compromise of truth. We do not know what Mr. Mackray would call an important secession, or, rather, as it ought to be called minority, adhering to the principles of the Free Church; but many, we venture to think, would anticipate that it would be by no means an unimportant party, seeing about one fourth of the members of the last Free Church Assembly voted for Dr. Julius Wood's motion. And among those who refuse to go along with the majority, are men of such eminence as Drs. Begg, Gibson, Wood, James Buchanan, John Duncan, and Horatius Bonar, Professor Smeaton, Messrs. Moody, Stewart, Main, &c. Mr. Mackray, in speaking of the Establishment calls "it the *Elder* branch of Presbyterianism in Scotland." This is strange language in a Free Church minister's lips. The Free Church has all along maintained that she is the true Church of Scotland, – the Church of Knox and Melville, and that the present Establishment is a mere substitute for it, receiving the emoluments but not holding the principles of the Church of Scotland. But here is the deputy of the Free Church acknowledging that this substitute for the Church of Scotland, which had no existence till 1843, is the elder branch of Presbyterianism in Scotland. In this connexion occurs a remark, which evidently shows that the Free Church deputy believes that a portion of the Union Assembly in this colony still approve of the Scottish Establishment, – a Church which he, in common with other Free Churchmen, regards as an erastianised Church. His remark is, "and as some of you regard it, (the Scottish Establishment,) the most important branch of Presbyterianism in Scotland." And this forsooth is the amalgamation, which the Free Church recognises and co-operates with, and from those, who will not take her advice to enter into such an amalgamation, her recognition and assistance must be withheld. The last statement of Mr. Mackray's speech, on which we shall animadvert, is the following: "But it might greatly accelerate the desired consummation, (union of Presbyterians in Scotland,) if the united Presbyterianism, in these sunny lands, in the vigour and promise of healthy youth, confederating with the Presbyterian Churches of our American colonies, – were in some legitimate way to gather round that small but noble land of the mountain and the flood, so long honoured of God to maintain and suffer for the inalienable liberties of men and the crown rights of the Redeemer, and as with the voice of sons and daughters, to press upon the Churches there the sin and weakness of continued separation, and the power and blessedness of Christian union." We are rather astonished at Mr. Mackray's speak-ing of the united Presbyterianism of these sunny lands as being in the *region* and promise of *healthy* youth, for if we have not been greatly misinformed, he has spoken to the effect that he felt thankful that he did not belong to the union Church in this colony. But, to pass that by, to what purpose is it to recommend to the Presb-

yterian Churches of the colonies to press on to the home Churches "the sin and weakness of separation and the power and blessedness of Christian union?" What could be accomplished by dealing with the question of separation, and of union in such a vague and general way? We humbly think it would be much more scriptural, and so more to the purpose, if the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland should make a thorough search as to the causes of their present separation, – wherein any or which of them are chargeable with defection from the truth, and should labour for the bringing back of any who have been guilty of defection, to their original position. Going about this work in a Scriptural way, they would be fully warranted to expect that their efforts would be attended with success; and thus a stable foundation would be laid for realizing the power and blessedness of a Scriptural union.

But it is not in this direction that the unionists of the present day are disposed to move. They talk in a vague and indiscriminate way of the sinfulness of division, and are for sinking points of difference, as matters of forbearance or mutual concession, without troubling themselves much as to the claims of those truths from which one or more of the divided churches, have deviated.

As to colonial Presbyterian Churches taking the lead in the Union movements of the present day, this does not impress us the more favorably as to these movements. True religion in most, if not all, of the colonies, has been, and still is, in a lower condition than in the home country, and, this being the case, it is not to be expected that Churches in these colonies would be pre-eminent in their regard for the claims of truth, in conducting Union negotiations.

Yours truly,

PRESBYTER

20th Nov. 1868.

P. S. As to the point of articles of agreement covering certain principles, whilst it is well known that the parties agreeing differ widely as to the meaning and application of these principles, we would commend to the consideration of Unionists at home and in this colony, the following extract from the "Ten Years' Conflict," by Dr. Robert Buchanan: –

"The adoption of the resolution was moved by Dr. Cook. After going over the old ground of the veto law, and expatiating with considerable warmth on the evils of agitation and strife, he came at length to the important question of the doctrine of Christ's Headship, touched in his second resolution. 'What I maintain then is,' he observed, 'that when the general doctrine that Christ is the Head of the Church is conscientiously held, – there is nothing wrong in believing that there may be ground for

diversity of sentiment as to what is comprehended under that Headship in all cases, or particularly where there are not express and unambiguous declarations of Scripture upon the matter and consequently that the members of a Church may remain in the same communion, although they are not agreed under the view of the matter which I have taken as to the extent of the Headship, or as to what must be embodied in it. Holding the Head as we all do, it is quite natural and right that the members of a Church should, by constitutional means, or by the influence of representation and argument, endeavour that their own notions upon this subject may be embraced by the whole Church; but this is merely what takes place as to all points as to which men differ, – and differ without once imagining that the difference dissolves the social or religious ties by which they are related. Much as we have of late heard of *spiritual independence,* and much as has been spoken and written about it, it is still of moment to define it, or to endeavour to form clear notions of what 451
is really included under it.' This appears very much the same thing as to say that if the office-bearers of a Church will only consent to sign its creed, they may disagree as much as they like about the true meaning of the articles which that creed contains. If this license be good as regards one great cardinal doctrine, it must be equally so as regards every other."

To the Editor of "*The Testimony*."

Sir, – The report, as you may have observed, of the Home Mission and Church Extension Committee of the Union Church in this colony, suggested to the Assembly that application should be made to the three Churches in Scotland represented in that Church for aid in the shape of money as well as men. It appears that this suggestion gave rise to a considerable amount of discussion, in the course of which Mr. Grant "wished to know whether official application was to be made to the Home Churches. He contended that they could not make such application, as such a course was contrary to the resolution affixed to the articles of Union. The resolution was passed to prevent application being made to the Free Church for ministers. The effect of the present resolution would be to rescind *per saltum* that resolution. If expedient, that resolution might be rescinded, but it should be done in a proper way." Mr. Bain "regretted that this question had been raised, because it had brought up a discussion of our relations with the Home Church." Surely Mr. Grant is not aware that the resolution to which he referred was virtually set aside two and a half years ago, and that, too, *per saltum.* In the Assembly of 1866 an arrangement was adopted, or rather sanctioned (for it had been previously adopted by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension), to the effect that the said Committee should correspond, with the view of obtaining ministers, with three Committees formed respectively of ministers and laymen of the Established Church, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian Church.

It will not, we presume, be denied that what a Church does through a committee it does itself. To correspond with Committees representing the Home Churches is to correspond with the Churches of which those Committees are the representatives. Very probably Messrs. Grant and Bain feel ill at ease on the relation of their Church to the Home Churches, knowing well that their Church stands in precisely the same relation to what they consider to be an Erastianised Church as it does to the Free Church. At the outset the Union Church placed the various Churches at Home on the same footing, refusing to have official correspondence with any of them as to ministerial supplies, and yet receiving such supplies with equal readiness from all of them. Two years ago it took a step in advance, and arranged that it should make official application to each of the Churches, including the Established Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland, to which it had before resolved it would not make such application.

Yours, &c.,

PRESBYTER.

APPREHENDED DEFECTION ON THE PART OF THE FREE CHURCH.

From a letter published by Dr. Dill of Derry, in the *Evangelical Witness,* the following extract is published in the *Watchword*: –

"But what are we to say of our friends of the Free Church? Are they really prepared to give up a great principle for the sake of union with the United Presbyterians? Is it come to this that, for such a poor consideration, that Church is willing to forget her noble contendings, in time past, for 'Christ's Crown and Covenant?' Is it so that the leaven of error has begun to work, and that its pernicious influence has brought her ministers to this point, that they are will-

ing to leave it an 'open question,' quite a debatable point – in fact, a matter of little consideration – whether, as a Church, they will recognise and do homage to Christ's Royal prerogative as 'Prince of the kings of the earth?' To give up a scriptural principle, for which she has been a chosen witness among the Churches of Christendom, would be sad indeed. We would like to hope better things of the Free Kirk of Scotland. But we cannot conceal our fears, especially when we see such men as the author of the 'Ten Years Conflict' changing their ground, and falling into the absurd mistake of supposing that our present position, in relation to endowments, is like the position of the Church of Scotland immediately before the Disruption. Why, there is no sort of resemblance. The State has never interfered, and does not now propose to interfere, with our ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction. Whereas it was mainly on account of such unwarrantable interference, on the part of the State, that the Disruption took place – whilst, in repudiating the interference of the civil magistrate in spiritual things, the Free Protesting Church of Scotland declared it to be the duty of the civil magistrate to support and maintain the Church in every way competent to him; and to aim, in his official capacity, at the glory of Christ and the advancement of His kingdom.

Now, should our friends swerve from this position, it will become with us here a serious question, whether we can (with truth to history) continue to recognise them as, in any sense, the Church of Scotland, except in the sense of *being in Scotland.* Certainly, should this change take place (which Heaven forfend) we have been deceived, and the Church of the Disruption was not what we took it for."

LECTURE ON PURGATORY.

We are indebted for the following report to the *Empire.*

A lecture on the doctrine of Purgatory was delivered on the 10th of November by the Rev. Colin R. Greig, in St. George's Church, before a numerous and intelligent audience. The Rev. W. McIntyre, as president of St. George's Mutual Improvement Society, in connection with which the lecture was delivered, took the chair on the occasion. The Rev. Allan Mc-Intyre and the Rev. James McCulloch also accompanied the lecturer. Mr. Greig first examined the alleged Scriptural foundations of the doctrine of purgatory, and proved that they furnished no warrant for the assertion of a purgatorial fire. He then showed the incompatibility of such a dogma with the Divine plan of salvation, and the promises contained in the Word of God as to the blessedness upon which true Christians enter at death. In a strain of eloquence marked by clearness of

reasoning, and by the fervour of conscious sincerity, he contrasted the hope set before us in the Gospel with the perplexing and dark anticipation of a purgatorial fire. The audience signified their approbation of the views put forth by the lecturer, and their admiration of his eloquence, in the usual manner.

It is not enough that the tree bears no ill fruit, but it must bear good fruit, else it must be cut down and cast into the fire.

The man is as his end is, and his value is as his end is. If that be naught all is naught.

That love that accompanies salvation is very active and operative. It is like the woman in the Proverbs that set all her maidens on work.

The Testimony

"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT, THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

NO. 39 – VOL 1. SYDNEY, DECEMBER, 1868. PRICE SIXPENCE.

NOTICES

THE TESTIMONY will be published on the 20th of each month. When the paper is delivered in town the subscription is 5s. per annum. When it is sent by post 6s. payment in advance in both cases. To persons taking five or more copies the subscription will be 4s.

Advertisements will be received up to the 18th of each month, at the following rates: –

Two lines	…	…	…	0s. 6d
Half inch	…	…	…	1s. 0d

For advertisements of four or five inches, the charge per inch will be 1s. 6d. On all insertions but the first of standing advertisements, a reduction of 20 per cent. will be allowed.

The Rev. Mr. MacPhersons letter on "Moderatism in Victoria" we are unable to publish in this issue.

The Testimony.

No. 39 DECEMBER. Vol. 1

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Christ's Command the Church's Sole Directory … …	453
The Two Cathedrals … … … … … …	455
The Parable of the Dishonest Steward … … …	456
Laying the Foundation Stone of the Free Presbyterian Church, Meredith	457
Establishment Principle … … … …	458
Laying the Foundation Stone of St. Mary's Cathedral … …	459
Disorganisation of the Church of England … … …	462
Revolution in Spain … … … … …	463

CHRIST'S COMMAND THE CHURCH'S SOLE DIRECTORY.

And Jesus spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you and, lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world. – MATT. 28: 18-20.

We cannot well exaggerate the importance or overstate the necessity of a close and faithful adherence to the teaching of Scripture in all that pertains to the constitution, government, worship, and various services of the Church. In a peculiar sense the Church is a divinely instituted form of society. It is true, indeed, of other forms of society, as of the state and the family, under which, perhaps, all other forms of it may be comprehended, that they too are divinely instituted. They lie, however, within the original constitution of things, and provision was made for their existence in the nature and circumstances of man. They are thus natural forms of society; and, therefore, natural principles and the light of nature are largely available, – we do not say that, in man's present state, they are by any means sufficient, – for the regulation of them. It is otherwise with the Church. This form of society lies beyond the original constitution of things. It has been introduced and is maintained by supernatural means. It is founded on the atonement, which is itself a supernatural interposition, and involves much that is supernatural; and it is by the supernatural agency of the Spirit that efficacy is imparted to its ministrations, and that its genuine members are constituted such. It may, therefore, be justly represented as a supernatural form of society; and, hence, its constitution, privileges, and functions, must be learned from supernatural revelation, which alone, from the nature of the case, can convey this knowledge.

It is a fact of fundamental importance in its bearing on the Church, and, indeed, in its bearing, on human affairs and interests in their whole extent, that all power has been given to Christ in heaven and on earth. And this unlimited power has been given to him as Mediator, and given to him, therefore, that he may employ it in executing his mediatorial office, and that not only in some instances and as regards some portion of his employment of it, but in every instance in which and as far as he employs it at all. And, as all power has been given to Christ, all legitimate power possessed by men, whether within the sphere of the State, or of the family, or of the Church, has been conferred upon them by him, and conferred upon them, therefore, to be employed by them in the interest, in which all power has been given to himself to be employed by him. For example, all legitimate power possessed by civil magistrates was conferred on them by Christ, to be employed by them, no doubt, with a view to the temporal ends of civil government, but also, at the same time, with the higher aim of promoting the gracious objects of his mediation. In conferring it he acts as mediator, that is, he is engaged in the prosecution and has a view to the accomplishment of his mediatorial design; he confers it to be employed by those on whom he confers it, and to be employed by them deliberately as becomes rational and responsible agents, with a view, as regards the higher end sought by them, and throughout, in entire accordance with the view with which he confers it. If civil magistrates do not seek, in the exercise of their power and in the performance of their functions as civil magistrates, the advancement of Christ's cause, they virtually deny that all power has been given to him as mediator, and consequently that it is from him as mediator that they derive all the legitimate power they possess, as it is from him alone they could derive any portion of it.

In dealing directly with the Church as its Head, Christ, in the exercise of the power given to him, has authoritatively and finally determined all that pertains to its constitution, government, and ordinances. That he has done so is evident from the passage before us. In the meantime he appointed extraordinary office-bearers, and gave them full authority and instructions to organise the Church, and to communicate to it his commandments or law with respect to its entire character, arrangements, and services.

"Go ye, therefore, and teach," or, rather, *disciple,* "all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Here the work which he assigns to them is described generally as discipling

all nations, that is, first of all bringing them into the relation of disciples to Christ, into the position of persons who submitted themselves 454
to his teaching, and, guided by his teaching, received him as their Saviour. In discipling men they were, further, to baptise them, to admit them into the fellowship of the Church, applying to them the sign of an interest in the covenant of grace, a sign which, in connection with the exercise of faith on their part, would prove a seal of their own personal interest in it. And, further still, they were to teach those whom they discipled to observe all things whatsoever, of which he had commanded them to teach the observance.

The Apostles derived the whole of their authority to prescribe religious observances to the discipled from the commission given to them by Christ. Apart from that commission, and beyond the observances "commanded" by Christ to which alone the commission applied, they had no such authority. Christ "commanded" certain observances, and he commissioned them to prescribe those observances to the discipled. Thus far, accordingly, their authority extended, but it extended no farther. As they would have had no authority to prescribe any observances, if Christ had not commissioned them to do so, they had no authority to prescribe any observances but those to which the commission given to them by him applied, and it applied only to those things which he had commanded them. And, of course, the discipled themselves could not warrantably introduce any observances which the Apostles had not prescribed to them. The Apostles were to teach the discipled to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them, – these all and these only; and the discipled were to observe all things whatsoever the Apostles taught them to observe, – these all and these only. The authority of the Apostles to prescribe observances was confined within the limits assigned to it by the command of Christ, and the liberty of the discipled to adopt observances was confined within the limits assigned to it by the teaching of the Apostles.

The instituting of religious observances, of ought to be observed by the members of the Church as such, is an exercise of authority so far above the sphere of the discipled, and even of the Apostles, that it is only in virtue of the gift and communication to him as mediator of "all power in heaven and in earth" that Christ himself assumes it. Accordingly, in proceeding to give instructions to his Apostles with respect to the gathering, organisation, government, and ordinances of his Church, or, in one word, with respect to all that the members of his Church were "to observe," he, first of all, announced the momentous fact that all power had been given to him in heaven and in earth, and then, in the exercise of this power, issued his instructions, "go ye, *therefore,* and disciple all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Nothing, therefore, can well be more arrogant than the assumption by the Church of authority to institute ought to be observed by its members, – an authority which Christ alone possesses, and of which the possession by him has such an origin.

The Apostles having been commissioned by Christ to teach the Church to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them, executed this commission orally and by their writings. Their execution of it by oral teaching was available only for those whom it reached; but their execution of it by their writings is available for all countries and ages. And, as it is this latter form of the execution of it alone that is thus universally available, it is a full and effectual execution of it. In the New Testament, taken, of course, in connection with the Old, for the two form one whole, one Bible, and are not to be separated, the Apostles teach the members of the Church "to observe all things whatsoever" of

which Christ commissioned them to teach the observance, that is, all things whatsoever of which the observance is a duty. They were commissioned to perform this office for the members of the Church "even to the end of the world;" and, if they do not perform it for them in the Scriptures, they do not now perform it for them at all, and they executed their commission only where and when they taught in person. But Christ not only gave them a commission to teach the discipled to observe all things whatsoever he commanded should be observed, but also effectually secured that the commission which he gave to them should be executed; and it has, accordingly, been executed. By their writings the Apostles have always taught and will always teach the members of the Church all that Christ commissioned them to teach them. Christ knew that they would thus teach them, or, rather, he knew that he would himself secure that they should do so, and he, therefore, promises absolutely "lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." No doubt, the fulfilment of this promise was suspended, as regarded the relation of events to each other, on the execution by them of the commission given to them; but provision was made that that commission should be infallibly executed, and the promise, therefore, is in the form not of a conditional but of an absolute promise.

That the teaching of the written word of God is characterised by all the fulness and completeness, which we claim for it, might be evinced by a detailed exhibition of its contents. Such an exhibition would shew that with respect to "all things whatsoever," with which it devolves on the members of the Church to deal in the discharge of their duties as such members, all necessary instruction is imparted. Hence all attempts to supplement the teaching of the Bible have resulted, and resulted necessarily, not in supplementing it but in substituting for certain portions of it antagonistic doctrines and commandments of men.

It is alleged by some that the Apostles execute to a great extent by unwritten tradition the commission to teach the discipled all things whatsoever Christ had commanded. But unwritten tradition does not convey to us the teaching of the Apostles; on the contrary it contradicts and sets aside their teaching. The evident object of the theory of such tradition is, to enable the professed custodians of it to teach what they like and to claim what they like, and it has been largely and successfully employed for this purpose. The written word, indeed, stands seriously in the way of such employment of it, but this obstacle is removed by the monstrous and pernicious doctrine, that the Scriptures can be understood only by the custodians of tradition, and that without the interpretation of those custodians therefore, others are not to presume to understand them, a doctrine which most thoroughly makes the Word of God of none effect.

The allegation that the Church has authority to prescribe observances does not possess even the plausibility of the claim on behalf of tradition. It is not pretended and, indeed, there is no room for pretending in this case, that the observances prescribed are sanctioned by the teaching of the Apostles. The ground taken is, that the Church has authority to prescribe them without this sanction. But this ground is wholly untenable. Christ has given the Church no such authority, and

the assumption of it, therefore, involves an invasion of .his prerogative and a practical denial of his headship.

The only dutiful and safe course for the Church is, to adhere closely at all points and in every instance to the teaching 455 and guidance of Scripture, to be in all respects, as regards organisation, government, worship, and operations, what exact conformity to Christ's institution and requirement will make it. There are two forms of deviation from this course to be carefully guarded against. One of these consists in mere outward conformity to the teaching of Scripture without the spirit of which this conformity should be the embodiment and manifestation. It is in this direction that those who occupy such a position as that of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia are specially in danger. The conformity to Scripture, which, in the face of many temptations and difficulties, they have been enabled to reach and maintain, gives them a great advantage, but without zeal and devotedness they shall fail to turn this advantage to good account and to discharge the obligations which the possession of it imposes. It is not enough that a Church's principles and testimony be scriptural; it must itself be thoroughly under the influence of its principles and testimony, and prove by its character and works their practical value. The other form of deviation consists in departure from what the Scriptures teach Christ requires the Church to embrace and practise. It is exhibited in full development in the popish system; and the prevalence of it in the Church of England, always considerable, has of late greatly increased, and, threatening as it does the protestantism of that Church, and involving, therefore, no small danger to the protestantism of the empire, it forms an alarming feature of our national condition. The Church of England having failed at the Reformation, chiefly from the adverse influence of the Court, to bring its organisation, government, and worship within the limits and into the form prescribed by Christ, was unhappily led to maintain, in defending the position which it thus occupied but could scarcely be said to have chosen, that the Church has authority to go somewhat in some cases beyond Christ's prescription. And this ground having once been taken, the Church, so far, became its own lawgiver and ceased to be under law to Christ; and, of course, it now depended upon its own will and choice how far and in what direction it would exercise the independence thus assumed by it. And, where the Church was not under law to Christ, it might be presumed that the members of it as such were not under law to him, and, if not under law to him, were scarcely under law to any inferior authority, and might therefore as members of the Church proceed very much as they pleased. Such precisely are the views which now prevail and are actively applied in the Church of England, the application of them imparting to it such a Babel character, that, if it is not speedily and thoroughly reformed, it will inevitably fall in pieces and perish, or become an insufferable nuisance that must and will be abated. Unhappily, however, while the reformation of it would probably contribute more than any other change to the advancement of the Redeemer's cause, and to the security of our liberties and the stability of our institutions, there seems to be but little prospect of its being effected. This we deeply deplore.

The desire of improving, forsooth, what Christ has "commanded" to be observed, that is thus endangering the very existence of the Church of England, has of late been developed even among Presbyterians, who had previously been distinguished by adherence in all matters of religion to the guidance of Scripture. Hence, no longer satisfied with inspired psalms, supplied to the Church by the Holy Spirit, congregations must have uninspired hymns, and, weary of the simplicity of the scriptural form of praise, they must have instrumental music. Such expedients, how-ever, will not restore the power of godliness, of which recourse to them proclaims the absence, nor will they supply its place. It

is not by seeking out many inventions, but returning to the old paths and walking in them, that spiritual prosperity can be reached.

THE TWO CATHEDRALS.

Within the last few weeks Sydney has been much occupied with cathedrals, having consecrated one and laid the foundation of another. If we could persuade ourselves that a cathedral is a legitimate portion of the machinery of a Christian Church, we should sincerely rejoice that the Protestant Episcopal Church in this colony now possesses one in Sydney. We cannot, however, adopt this view. Cathedrals are associated with diocesan or prelatic episcopacy, and cannot exist apart from it. Claiming a place among Churches analogous to that which prelatic bishops claim among pastors, it is only where this latter claim is admitted that their claim an be even preferred. "Where the bishop is," Dr. Barker remarked, in the sermon which he preached on the occasion of the consecration of the cathedral, "where the bishop is, there his seat, – his cathedral, – should be;" and we may add it is there only it can be! Where there is no prelatic bishop here can be no cathedral. No Church whose government is presbyterial can have cathedrals. The Apostolic Church, therefore, though fully organised, had none, and, while it had none in point of fact, its government being presbyterial it could not have any. From the connection which thus obtains between cathedrals and prelacy an argument may be derived against both. Prelates are an order of pastors wholly unknown to the Scriptures, and which, therefore, ought not to exist; and, this being the case, it, of course, follows that edifices, conceived and provided in adaptation to prelacy, to be the "seats, – the cathedrals," – of prelatic bishops, do not form a legitimate part of the machinery and equipment of a Christian Church. On the other hand, from the fact that not only are distinctive services performed in cathedrals, and services which exhibit a great and glaring deviation from the simplicity and spirituality of Gospel worship, but that the performance in them of such services seems to be necessary to set them apart from other churches as a separate and higher class, and to justify their existence as such, the inference would be inevitable, though the history of the Church were silent on the subject, which, however, it by no means is, that, as the services in question are a departure from the instituted worship of the Church, prelacy and cathedrals are a corruption of its instituted organisation. Dr. Barker represents the English cathedrals as being used "in a somewhat restricted manner for daily worship and services of a musical character," and he intimates that a less restricted use will be made of St. Andrew's Cathedral. In specifying the use that will be made of it, he says, "it will be open every day, and of the three services on Sunday one will be similar to those in our cathedrals at home." There are thus two kinds of services, one kind for ordinary churches, and another for cathedrals. But Christ has not instituted two kinds of services. All the ordinances which he has instituted, and none others ought to be observed in every Christian Church, and the observance of them is the only service that has his sanction. Dr. Barker, indeed, indirectly and incidentally admits that the distinctive cathedral service is not of divine institution, as all religious services ought to be, for all that he alleges on behalf of "its services" is, that they "are in accordance with the practice of many ages." But in the matter of religious observance every practice, that did not originate in Christ's institution, was an innovation and a corruption when first introduced, and the fact

that it has obtained for "ages" in no way, divests it of the character which, as being a corruption, it originally bore, and in no way, therefore, strengthens its claims to acceptance. Nay, the longer a corruption has disfigured the worship, hindered the edification, and impaired the efficiency of the Church, the more emphatically ought it to be condemned, and 456
the more resolutely rejected. No form of sin, and the adding of anything to the instituted services of the Church of Christ and the diminishing of anything from them is a very decided form of it, can become venerable or entitled to adoption from its having long prevailed. On the contrary is having long prevailed, while, to say the least, it does not diminish its inherent demerit, furnishes the additional ground for detesting it, that it must have done much mischief.

Dr. Barker seems himself to be dissatisfied with the distinctive cathedral service, for it is, we presume, from his being so that, deviating in this, as he informs us, from the usage of the mother country, he has arranged that of the three services to be held in St. Andrews on the Lord's day, only one shall be similar to those in "cathedrals at Home." He evidently feels that the other form of service, the form used in ordinary churches, is more suitable for the purposes of the Christian ministry. And he may well have this impression, for, assuredly, if the object be to promote the glory of God as it is promoted by the conversion of sinners and the edification of those who believe, and if this object be sought under the guidance of the scriptures, a "service of a musical character" will have no place among the means employed. This style of service could have originated only in a desire to supply or procure aesthetic gratification, for it is not fitted either to awaken or express genuine intelligent devotion.

If Dr. Barker on the authority of tradition or, as he expresses it, "the practice of many ages," continues even one cathedral service on the Lord's clay, why may not Mr. Vidal have his reredos on the same authority, and the different grades of ritualists their fantastic vestments, their processions, their flags, &c., "&c.? The authority of tradition may be alleged in the one case as well as in the other; and, if sufficient in either, it is sufficient in both.

The laying of the foundation stone of St. Mary's Cathedral, so soon after St. Andrew's Cathedral was consecrated, carries us back to the origin of this class of ecclesiastical edifices. They derive their origin from the corruptions which gave rise to popery. Hierarchical distinctions of office, the corresponding classification of ecclesiastical buildings, elaborate ritualistic devices, and the artistic and sensuous decorations of worship, as they are regarded, which seek in show a substitute for life, must all be traced to the same polluted source, and have always had and will always have the same pernicious operation.

He that is most tender of Gods honor shall find by experience that God is most mindful of his comfort. – *Brooks.*

THE PARABLE OF THE DISHONEST STEWARD.

At the meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, on the 20th October, an address, based on this parable, – Luke 16: 1-13, – was delivered by the Rev. Peter MacPherson, A.M., on his appointment to the office of Moderator, and afterwards published at the request of the Synod. In the address Mr. MacPherson considers the stewardship both of churches and of individuals, but dwells chiefly on the former. After illustrating separately the exercise of its stewardship by the Jewish Church, under the former dispensation, and by the Church of Rome, under the present, he founds upon the facts, to which he adverts the following comparison.

"Here then is a summary way in which we. can square accounts between Jew and Gentile on the subject of stewardship.

1st. By excess. The Jew neutralised the written Word by his traditions. (Matt. 15: 6.) The Gentile steward has almost buried the Word out of sight by his traditions, and claims for them a place of authority along with the inspired Scriptures. (Council of Trent, Sess. 4).

2nd. By defect. The Jew cut out the very heart of the command-

ments of God. (Matt. 5: 22, 28, 32, 34, &c.) The Gentile steward has done as bad. He has cut out the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith alone, and he has obscured the Mediatorship of Christ alone by the powers ascribed to saints, angels, and the Virgin Mary. (Council of Trent, Sess 6.) (25 Catechism III. 2-9-14., IV. 5-8).

3rd. As to the Incarnate Word, the Lord Jesus Christ himself. The Jew nailed Him to the Cross. Now, it is not possible for Jew or Gentile to commit any indignity on the glorified person of Christ, and how then has the apostate Gentile steward succeeded in producing any parallel here to what was done by the unbelieving Jew? If the Head is indeed in glory, and beyond the reach of injury, it is otherwise with his mystical body. The members of that mystical body are his believing people, and their sufferings are reputed his. . . . How then has it fared with the followers of Christ at the hands and under the administration of the Gentile steward? *Dies declarabit,* when the light shall have entered thousands of dungeons and revealed the deeds of darkness which have never reached the rolls of history. These latter, as it is, make known to us that the victims who have had to bear the cross of Christ against sword and flame are counted by millions."

Passing on to the stewardship of Churches more immediately connected with the body over whose supreme court he presided, Mr. MacPherson directed attention to the part acted by the Established Church of Scotland in connection with the disruption, and by the true representatives of the Church of Scotland, in the same connection.

"Let us see how the matter stands in regard to the Churches, Let us look to the Parent Churches, and endeavour to ascertain how the stewards therein have been administering, so as to secure the revenue of glory, which is intended to be gathered in to Christ. He is a King, let us see how his steward or stewards have vindicated his interests and replenished the royal treasury. 'What have you done in the way of advancing the kingly claims of Christ?' 'We preach the Headship of Christ as fully and freely as those who make very great pretensions in the matter, and there is nothing whatever to prevent us from doing so.' 'Then let us condescend on some particulars. You have heard of Strathbogie, Auchterarder, Stranraer, Lethendy, &c., &c. What was your position in regard to these cases? 'We know the names right well. Caesar, our lawful sovereign, came to us, telling us to be subject to the powers that be, and as good and peaceable subjects to obey the law of the land.' 'Just so. When Caesar came to the door of Christ's house with his influence and appliances to force in drunken and immoral ministers, also with your stipends in his pocket, you obeyed the law of the land (you say) and helped to break the rule of Christ's house, and yet (you say) you preach the Headship of Christ fully and freely and there is nothing to prevent you from doing so.'

Now take another. 'What have you done in urging the kingly claims of Christ?' 'We preach the Headship of Christ over the Church and the nations,' 'Let us again condescend to particulars. We have had brave words already about fully and freely preaching the Headship of Christ. You have heard of the names of Auchterarder, Strathbogie, &c., &c. What was your conduct in these cases?' 'Caesar came to the door of Christ's house with all our stipends in his pocket, wishing to thrust in amongst us certain immoral and drunken men as ministers, and we resisted,

and took occasion to preach to Caesar himself that he was only a subject of the King of Kings whom we served, and called upon him to do homage to our King. And when he and others with him persisted in their course, we told him he could keep our stipends, but that we would not let him or the drunken and immoral ministers invade the house and courts of Christ, and for a perpetual memorial we caused it to be written of them thus. 457

'They have invaded the jurisdiction of the courts of the Church, – have subverted its government, – have illegally attempted to coerce Church courts in the exercise of their purely spiritual functions, – have usurped the 'power of the keys,' – have wrongfully acclaimed, as the subjects of their civil jurisdiction, to be regulated by their decrees, ordination of laymen to the office of the Holy Ministry, admission to the cure of souls, church censures, the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments, – and have employed the means entrusted to them for enforcing submission to their lawful authority, in compelling submission to that which they have usurped, – in opposition to the doctrines of God's word, set forth in the Confession of Faith,' &c. (Claim, Declaration, and Protest, 1842).

It in unfortunately necessary to draw attention to the date. Chalmers was alive then, and he was the Administrator to whom the dispensation was committed. But he has gone to his reward, and a new state of things, a very different economy is in operation now. But going back to 1842, which was the honest and which the dishonest steward? Which attended to his Lord's interests at the sacrifice of his own, and which secured temporary tabernacles within the Establishment by a shrewd compounding of matters, a sacrifice of his Lord's interests?"

In the following passage, Mr. MacPherson derives an illustration of dishonest stewardship on the part of individuals, and of churches under their influence and guidance, from Union doings in Victoria.

"We have still one more illustration. How does all this apply to us in this colony? There is, undoubtedly, an important administrator amongst us who has practically laid the foundation of an economy as regards the Presbyterian Churches, and it behoves us to look well to it. Let us glance at the materials with which we have to deal. In the first place, there is in a position of considerable influence, a body representing a Church which was scarcely ever more than half reformed from Popery, under the auspices. and caprices of a reprobate monarch. The important department of Church Government was to a large extent regulated more by human wisdom, or rather weakness, than by the Word of God. This and other radical errors have been producing the appropriate fruits of confusion in that Church, and some of its most ardent friends are looking hither and thither in dismay at the dark storm clouds which are drifting past. This body, then, was one of the existences in the colony, and mark its effect on the great Administrator whom we have in view. The Headship of Christ had been asserted in a certain document. That assertion was in reference to the functions of Christ's Church, and was contained in the following words: 'With these and the like functions it is equally presumptuous and unwarrantable in the magistrate to interfere.' (First articles of Union.) It is not questioned that here was a just claim. Then why is it not pressed? Hear the words of the Victorian Administrator speaking through like minded memorialists in Collins Street, Melbourne. 'Your memorialists further object to these words, as they convey a very strong and uncalled for condemnation of the form of government of the Church of England, which by its constitution permits the interference of the civil magistrate in its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and of which Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria is the temporal head.' In compliment to the gross erastianism of the Church of England, a claim of Christ, of such practical bearing as produced the disruption in Scotland in 1843, must be allowed to fall to the ground. But the Administrator goes on. There is the erastian Church of England, and there are also the individual members of that church who form a considerable portion of the two Houses of Parliament. The Administrator continues: 'Your memorialists would still further urge that these words ought to be omitted, because in applying for a Legislative enactment to give legal effect to the propos-

ed Union, it will be necessary to submit the Articles of Union to both Houses of Parliament, as also to Her Gracious Majesty's Representative, His Excellency the Governor, and your memorialists much fear that these words, if retained in their present form, will not only give unnecessary offence to members of Parliament, and of Her Majesty's Government, but that they will prove a serious obstacle to obtaining the legislative sanction that is required.' The loyalty to Caesar is marked enough. It is surely rather unfortunate that it is pushed forward so prominently in the very act of pleading for the suppression of a claim of Christ. Are we not to bear in mind at such a juncture some solemn words of our Lord, 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me,' &c. (Mark 8: 38.) But the alternative. This claim of Christ, where there are so many erastians of the Church of England, might prevent the union. But is not that a most ominous consideration for the Union? It becomes Union versus an admitted claim of Christ. The Administrator is on slippery ground here. But this is not all. There are other delinquents than the Church of England. There are those who uphold the unfaithful establishment which actually submitted to an administration which allowed Caesar to invade the courts of Christ's house. There is interesting tenderness for them. 'The words are looked upon with suspicion by those who have been members or ministers of the Established Church of Scotland.' Hence the further objection to the very respectable word 'faithful,' and the strong desire to avoid everything that has a tendency to raise what are called 'unprofitable questions regarding the purity or faithfulness of other churches with which individual ministers or sections of the United Body have been more or less connected,' &c. Now what is the drift of all this? The claim of Christ is not disputed. But the Administrator finds that to assert it will not be agreeable to Episcopalians nor to Presbyterian Erastians. In fact to assert Christ's claim in this matter would have endangered the Union. Then we are disposed to say so much the worse for such a Union. Is there any difficulty in determining the character of the ruling influences by which the Administrator has been guided? The claim referred to is declared to be 'altogether unnecessary' in the Presbyterianism which the Administrator has been set up? Surely the royal prerogative of the exalted Mediator has fared but poorly in the Victorian economy which has been inaugurated. However, there is abundant proof of worldly wisdom, and the economy has established itself a habitation in the colony."

While it is not Mr. MacPherson's object to give a full exposition of the parable, his remarks afford valuable assistance, in the way of indication and suggestion, toward the correct interpretation of it; and they place in a striking, and startling light the dishonest stewardship associated with our colonial unions.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION STONE OF THE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MEREDITIL

The new stone building in connection with the Free Church at Meredith has been in progress since the 3rd of November, and on Thursday, 3rd December, the foundation stone was

laid. The bottle deposited in the foundation contained a document in which the history of Presbyterianism in the district, from its first introduction, was briefly related. From this document which was read by the Rev. Mr. MacPherson, we derive the following facts: – On the 3rd December, 1861, a Congregational meeting was held at Meredith, at which it was moved by Mr. David Hamilton, and agreed, to petition the Synod for the services of the Rev. Peter MacPherson, A. M., then laboring as a probationer at Broadford, near the Goulburn. The petition was granted. Revs. Arthur Paul and Alexander McIntyre moderated in a call to a minister on the 14th May, 1862, both

those gentlemen having since become much associated with the spiritual interests of the district – the former as moderator of Synod and otherwise, and the latter by the services rendered in the Gaelic language to the Highlanders. The call was given to Rev. P. MacPherson, who was ordained in the church on the 18th June, 1862, to the pastoral charge of Meredith and Lethbridge.

A manse has been erected at Meredith and as been occupied by Mr. MacPherson since 1864. With the increase of population, the charge has extended north and west. In the beginning of 1868 a third preaching station was established at Stony Rises by the building of a church on a site obtained from the Crown. This building was the first erected on ground which has since been surveyed as the township of Elaine. It was opened by public worship 21st February, 1864. A fourth preaching station has been established by the building of a church on a crown grant of two acres obtained at Cargerie. The church was opened by divine service on the 7th June of this year. The following are the Elders for all the combined charges: – William James Reid, Donald Matheson, and Allan MacPherson.

Along with the document which supplied us with these facts, there were deposited: – (1) a communion token, having on one side the burning bush, with the words, "*Nec tamen consmebatur*" On the other side, "Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria; 1 Cor. 11: 28." (2) The Sydney *Testimony,* for Nov. 1868. (3) The *Geelong Register* of Dec. 2., 1868. (4) The *Geelong Advertiser* of Dec. 2, 1868.

The foundation stone was laid by W. J. Reid, Esq., who made some appropriate observations in connection with the event.

ESTABLISHMENT PRINCIPLE.

1. The Establishment principle *involves the Headship of Christ over nations,* and therefore cannot but be a matter of vital moment to every true follower of Christ. To tell us that the Headship of Christ over the nations is held by the United Presbyterians, in what we were wont to consider the Scriptural sense, and that it is embodied in the Articles of Agreement, so that it is not this vital principle that is at issue between us, but some subordinate application of it, is to assert what is contrary to the clearest evidence. Will any man, except a Voluntary, venture to assert that a nation acknowledges the Headship of Christ over it, in any scriptural or intelligible sense, *in whose statute book* you will search in vain for *any law owning its subjection to him, its attachment to his truth,and its obligation and desire to promote his cause and kingdom throughout its borders*? And can any Church be faithful to the Headship of Christ over the nations, which does not testify and contend for such recognition of God's truth, on the part of the State, any more than a Church can be considered faithful to the headship of Christ over the Church, which does not testify against the State's Erastian usurpation? Can our Church still be faithful to Christ as King and Head of nations, if, in order to union with the United Presbyterians, who disapprove of it, she *cease publicly to avow her approval* of the ratification by parliament of the creed and jurisdiction of the Reformed Church? It is all one which of the many crowns that Christ wears, the Church plucks from his head. If it cease to contend for his crown rights in anything, it dishonours him, and cannot expect to be honoured of him.

2. The Establishment principle *lies at the very foundation of civil society,* and is essential to its peace and well being. In the language of the present Dr. McCrie, "To carry the Voluntary scheme into effect would be to wrench from the social edifice its main support and firmest pillar. It would be *to sin against society,* as well as against God, and would pave the way for universal anar-chy and confusion." It will be in vain for any ruler to think long to preserve justice and peace between man and man, if he should adopt the Voluntary principle, that in regulating the affairs of the

of the nation he is to trust to the use of merely secular means, and that the preservation and support of religion forms no part of his duty. The man who is not instructed in the fear of God will not be disposed to honour the king. And if the maintenance of the king's honour is essential to the stability, yea, the very existence of the throne, it must be the primary duty of the king and nation to concern themselves to secure that the people are duly instructed in the principles of religion. And as it is the duty of the Church to communicate this instruction, it must be the duty of rulers to do what in them lies, in the duty official capacity or legislatively, *to countenance and support* (and not merely protect) the Church in the prosecution of her work. "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God;" how is it possible for a ruler to do this if in all *acts of government* he is to proceed upon the Voluntary principle, and maintain a strict *neutrality* in regard to religion (a scripturally impossible position). "He that is not with me," says Christ, "is against me, and he that *gathereth not with me* scattereth abroad." We cannot express this consideration better than in the language of Dr. C. J. Brown, who says in a lecture delivered in Edinburgh in 1836, "That state which should give itself no concern for the religious instruction of its people, would neglect the principal means a Providence has placed in its hands, for maintaining the authority of law, preserving order, protecting the rights of property, and securing the observance of justice between man and man." Again, "States are bound, as they would avoid the commission of *national suicide,* to use every means within their reach for *promoting* that religion which is virtue's only solid basis." "The endowment of the Church," he says, "instead of being prejudicial to the State, is so necessary to its welfare, that the State is bound to endow her *for the sake of its own interests*."

3. The Establishment principle has *direct Divine sanction.* A civil establishment of religion once existed by express and immediate appointment of God among the Jews. The Church was then, by Divine direction, rendered the chief object of the magistrate's care, it was as truly a Church of Christ as is the Church now, and as truly distinct from the nation, and an independent spiritual kingdom. The Church was not the nation under the Jewish economy, nor was the nation the Church. Then, as now, each had its distinct rulers, courts, laws, subjects, and penalties. We do not now speak of the peculiarities of the Jewish Establishment, but we refer to the fact that God did constitute the relation which subsisted between the Church and State, as proving that the Establishment principle has the highest sanction, and cannot be given up without sin and unfaithfulness to truth, or without injury to both Church and State. Dr. McCrie says: – "In the Israelitish commonwealth we have an instance of a system of legislation, devised by Jehovah, *adapted to the state of a people favoured with Divine Revelation. The laws* expressly recognised religion, provided for the maintenance of its

ordinances, and the rulers were taken solemnly bound to support them in their station. Thus those principles . . . . by which all *nations* are bound to regulate themselves in framing their constitution and administration, *so as to promote the honour of God,* and to accord with, secure, and advance religion, the highest of all their interests, – were recognised and sanctioned by Jehovah himself and applied to the true religion revealed, from heaven. In *this respect the Jewish constitution is exemplary to Christian nations*." Surely it is very daring and presumptuous for any man, in the face of the direct sanction thus given by God to the Establishment principle, to rise up and ask what is the value of that principle. The kingdom of Christ is just as much of this world now as was the Jewish Church of this world then. The fact being, that neither of them is of this world 459
as earthly kingdoms are, but though spiritual and heavenly, each of them has a connexion in various ways with the things of this world, so as to be capable of receiving countenance and aid from civil governments as regards external things; and the Jewish rulers were expressly commanded by the Lord to afford such countenance and aid to his Church and cause; and *when* or *where* have rulers under the Gospel dispensation been relieved from their obligation to do the same?

4. The principle of Establishments, as embodied in the Westminster Standards, and hitherto defended by us, has been maintained as a Scriptural principle, *by all the Protestant and Reformed Churches,* with the exception of the United Presbyterians. Is there not enough in this fact of itself; we would say, to make United Presbyterians themselves consider if they may not possibly be holding unscriptural views of the relations of the magistrate to religion and the Church, seeing that they are so *undoubtedly opposed to the harmonious confession of all the Reformed Churches*? Or is there anything, in the isolated belief of the United Presbyterian Church on this doctrine, to make us doubt the Scriptural nature and importance of a principle which we hold in common with the Reformed Churches, and to justify and call upon us *to divorce ourselves from Christendom,* we may say, that we may identify ourselves with them?

We do not say these things, as though we would rest the truth of the doctrine upon the authority of Churches, but as affording a sufficient reason why serious and reflecting men should not rashly surrender a principle not only believed by all the Reformed Churches, but believed to be of so great importance as to be embodied in their Confessions. This was well expressed by an able writer in the Original Secession Church thirty years ago."I despise," he says, "the idea of receiving any doctrine merely because our fathers believed it; but I would require very strong evidence indeed to convince me, that the whole number of those judicious, and learned, and holy men, who lived during the space of one hundred and fifty years from the time of the Reformation, had all agreed in believing, teaching, publishing, and embodying in the confessions of their respective Churches, a doctrine utterly and obviously opposite to the Word of God, and subversive of the whole character and prosperity of the Church. I would require stronger evidence by far than I will ever obtain, to convince me that *there is any ecclesiastical body in our country* – how much soever it may arrogate to itself the merit of new discoveries in religious truth – *whose judgment will bear, even for a moment, to be compared with the venerable Assembly of Westminster.* The truth is, we live in an age distinguished for its boasting respecting its own illumination. The profound humility that graced the master minds of former days has departed with them; and now it is no unusual thing for the youth, whose studies in theology have scarcely passed beyond the surface of its doctrines, to declare most promptly that, even on such subjects as that of the relations of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church, he has more knowledge than all his fathers, or the most learned divines of former days.

5. The Establishment principle, as embodied in the Westminster Standards, is our only guarantee for *true toleration and lib-erty of conscience,* as it is our only defence against intolerance and persecution. It is very frequently said, by way of apology for the great and good men who compiled the Westminster Standards, that the principles of toleration were not so well understood in those days as they are now. This may have been the case, or it may not, but this we would say, if the Scriptural principles of toleration were no better known by these men than they seem to be by many among us, they must have known very little about them. Of this, at least, we are sure, that had such been the case, many of the chapters in the Confession and answers in the Larger

Catechism would never have been printed. But if their principles were so intolerant and persecuting, as is alleged by United Presbyterians, and some among ourselves, it is somewhat singular that it was when these principles were enunciated and carried into *practical operation,* that God's most signal blessing rested upon Scotland, so that it became literally the glory of all lands in a manner and degree that she has never approached, in the most distant way, since. And, on the other hand, it has been in proportion as the Voluntary principles of so-called toleration have become prevalent; and rulers have come short in their duty towards the Church and religion, that Popery, irreligion, and the host of evils under which the nation groans, have gained a footing and made such lamentable progress, as to threaten the very existence of our civil and religious liberties. If there are laws ratifying the Protestant religion, and otherwise tending to promote its interests in the land, they have become, under the prevalence of this great Voluntary principle of universal liberty, or license of conscience, such a dead letter that the fruits of this system, of which Dr. McCrie speaks, are all too manifest in the reign of errors, heresies, fanaticism, superstition, and idolatry, and the threatened triumph of ignorance, irreligion, and infidelity. So that it will not do for men to turn round and ask, What good has your Establishment principle done in this land? It has with God's blessing, done much, and, had it been faithfully acted out by the nation, and *not obstructed in its operation by Voluntaryism,* we have the best reason to believe that the influence of the magistrate would have been as signally for the good of this country as were the efforts of the reforming kings in Israel for the land of Judea.

It will not do for men to point to existing Establishments in this country as evidence against the Establishment principle. The abuse of a principle is in itself no valid argument against it. And certainly, whatever may be said against existing Establishments, we are not entitled to draw an argument from their condition in favour of that Voluntaryism which has had no small share in bringing about the state of things which we all deplore. It was through the influence of the sectaries, or Voluntaries of those days, that England, and Ireland were deprived of the benefit of an Establishment after the model of the Westminster Confession, including the form of Presbyterial Church government, at the time of the Westminster Assembly. And it was traceable in no small degree to the same Voluntary influence that our rulers rejected the claims of our Church prior to the Disruption. A system, therefore which has had a leading part in preventing the realisation of a Scriptural and pure Establishment in both countries, where it was hopefully in progress, is not a system which is likely to receive much countenance from intelligent men by any reference to *its own discreditable work* in marring the *national* reformation in these lands. – *Watchword.*

Correspondence

(*To the Editor of* "*The Testimony.*")

LAYING THE FOUNDATION STONE OF ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL

Sir, – No doubt the readers of the Testimony have before this heard of that great event of the day, "The Benediction and Laying the Foundation Stone of St Mary's Roman Catholic Cathedral." The proceedings connected with the event are recorded very fully, and, of course, in a plausible manner, by the *Sydney Morning Herald.* Of these proceedings, as thus recorded, the effect on many of the Protestant readers of the Herald is likely, considering the prevalent ignorance of Popery, to very damag- 460
ing. To expect that the *Herald* would publish anything fitted to counteract such a mischievous tendency would be utterly futile. The conductors of that paper are too wise in their generation as commercial men even to dream of such indiscretion. But, knowing that the page's of the *Testimony* are readily available for the exposure of the works of the Papacy, we gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity thus afforded for animadverting on the proceedings referred to. As to the attendance, we are told that a vast concourse was present, comprising his *Grace* the Archbishop, his suffragan Bishops, many of the clergy, and many thousands of the laity. No doubt many so-called Protestants helped to swell the number, and amongst the many who were invited to grace the occasion, and who occupied a tent in the proximity of the exact site of the future high altar of the Cathedral, on which the idolatrous and blasphemous rites of the mass will be performed, were the Mayor and many of the Aldermen of the City, some of these being Protestants. As these gentlemen seem to have little more than the *name* of Protestants, the sooner this is renounced by them the better. For what could be more absurd than to see men who, by their designation, protest against the system of Popery, yet lend the influence of their high position in countenancing and promoting that system? An account is given of the different orders of the clergy and their dresses, things quite in accordance with the unscriptural and superstitious character of Popery. There is given also an account of the Archbishop first blessing the salt and water, and then with his crosier in his left hand, sprinkling the water that had been blessed – silly and childish acts, fitted to draw forth only feelings of contempt and derision. At this stage a sermon is said to have been preached by the Rev. Padre Barsanti, which is characterised by the *Herald* as an eloquent sermon. But, judging from the report of it, we can discover nothing that would entitle it to such a character. And it furnished a very poor substitute for a lucid and Scriptural exposition of the text selected, and a faithful inculcation of the important practical lessons deducible from it. The sermon, however, was rather remarkable. It contained here and there portions of Gospel truth side by side with effusions of genuine Popish error, and these latter not delivered in the most outspoken and offensive manner. We apprehend that the Popish part of the audience were indebted (if, indeed, they should think it any obligation) to the so-called Protestant part for getting so much Gospel truth from a Popish priest. In the first part of his sermon the preacher referred to the burning of the former Cathedral, and to pleasing reminiscences connected with that building. Among other things in which many had great enjoyment, and by which they served God in that place, was particularised their being present at the performance of high mass – that is to say, God is served by the performance of a blasphemous and idolatrous rite. According to the dogmas of the Church of Rome, the bread and wine, after the consecration by the officiating priest, are changed into the body and blood and divinity of Christ, and in the elements thus transubstantiated is offered up a true, propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. But what could be more dishonoring to God than such anti-scriptural and monstrous tenets and practices? The Scriptures declare explicitly and abundantly that Christ was once offered to bear the sins of his people, and that this offering was complete. He is spoken of in the New Testament as the only sacrificial priest, and his death as the only propitiatory sacrifice. In speaking further of the burning of the Cathedral, the preacher alludes to the good brought out of the calamity. An instance of this is given in the proof with which they were furnished of the kind feelings sustained for them by thousands who were not with them in the unity of the faith, and by persons in high and influential stations "who were known to be of other religions." How skilfully and plausibly is this tribute worded! Wonderful that he could speak so softly of those

whom, as a true Papist, he must regard with feelings of the greatest horror and detestation as accursed heretics; and yet in this plausible statement there is a sting These poor Protestants are not with them (the Papists) "in the unity of the faith." Of course there is no dispute about entertaining and showing kindly feelings towards Papists, viewed as fellow citizens. But the kindly feeling to which he referred had respect to them as the adherents and upholders of a system which Protestants, according to their very name as Protestants, regard as opposed to the Word of God. Hence the conduct of such Protestants, in helping their Popish fellow citizens to promote a religious system, against which they protest, must appear contemptible, not only in the eyes of their fellow Protestants, but also in the eyes of intelligent Romanists. But to proceed with the Padre's sermon (professedly founded on Isa. 28: 16), he makes very fanc-iful use of the word "stone," as occurring in various places of Scripture, as prefiguring Christ. For instance, the stone with which David slew the giant of Gath was declared to be a type of Christ striking down the devil. And, wonderful to be told! he finds in the seven eyes upon the stone spoken of by Zechar- iah the seven sacraments of Rome. He said St. Cyprian says it, and, of course, that proves it sufficiently to the faithful.

"The preacher further proceeded to say that the text appeared to him to be as a frame, in which, like a picture or like a mirror, was presented to our view all the great truths of the Catholic religion." Doubtless the great truths of the Catholic religion, or, more properly speaking, the truths held by the Catholic Church (but not what he calls the Catholic Church) may be traced to the great central truth contained in the text quoted by him. But what intelligent candid reader of God's Word would ever dream of finding in that text such doctrines as the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, transubstantiation, the mass, purgatory, etc. Again, be says, "As a house could not stand without a solid and sure foundation, so, of course, it was with the Church of Christ. The Apostles were not primary, but secondary stones in the Church. The primary stone was Christ, on whom the whole fabric was reared. On him – the great foundation stone – the first and the most excellent, was the weight of the whole building imposed." And what is the sapient conclusion drawn by this Romish divine from the preceding sentences. It is the following: – "If this was so, how blind must not those men be of the so-called reformed religion, who had departed from the old faith, who had abandoned the original and true foundation, who had attempted to found their new structures without the clear sanction of a new revelation." It would have been more to the point if he had attempted in the first place to prove wherein the Reformers departed from the

old faith, abandoned the original and true foundation. But, of course, the serfs of the Church of Rome must be contented with the mere assertions of their spiritual teachers and must not trouble themselves about getting sound arguments. The Reformers, so far from abandoning the original and true foundation, removed the vast accumulations of error and superstition by which that foundation had been all but concealed from the world, and exhibited the whole foundation as set forth in the Word of God. They abandoned the monstrous devices of men as to doctrine. and worship, and finding from the Word that Christ is the alone source of light, life, and authority, they rested on and cleaved to him. Some of the Reformed Churches, such as those of Geneva and Scotland, returned to the old faith, with great thoroughness. And some other churches, such as the Reformed Church of England, did so to a very great extent, but not thoroughly, there being found in them even to this day sad remainders of the Romish system.

In connexion with his remarks on Christ as the primary 461 foundation stone, he asserts that Christ selected Peter as the representative of Him as the primary stone. And by what arguments does he attempt to establish this? They are the following: – Christ gave to him the key of heaven; Christ said to him, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs;" also He said to him, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." It is very easy to show that in all this there is nothing to prove that. Peter was invested with superiority over his brethren. Christ said to the rest as well as to him, "I give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven." The commission given to Peter to feed Christ's sheep was evidently a commission to himself alone, and contained a public restoration of him to his pastoral office, when he publicly satisfied Christ as to the genuineness of his repentance. When Christ said to him, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," on the showing of the preacher this rock is Christ himself, for he maintained that Christ is the stone on whom the whole fabric is reared. And Paul says that Christ is exclusively the foundation, "other foundation than that which is laid can no man lay, which is Christ."

But the Rev. Padre not only discovered that Peter was selected by Christ as the representative of Him as the primary stone, but also that when Christ uttered these words, "Thou art Peter," etc., "He spoke not merely to the first of the Apostles, but also to all the Roman Pontiffs who should come after that Apostle, succeeding him in regular and uninterrupted succession in the chair of St. Peter. Each one of these, in his turn, had been primary stones representing Christ, the great primary stone, on which they all rested." Here again there is not a shadow of proof adduced to support such extraordinary statements. Before he could substantiate such statements various positions require to be established, such as, that Peter was appointed as Vicar of Christ upon earth, that Peter was Bishop of Rome, that there has been a regular succession from him to the present possessing the same high authority – positions none of which can be established by Padre Barsanti or by any other. To take up the first point, how could it be possible that Christ invested Peter with supreme authority on the occasion referred to, in the 16th of Matthew, when at a subsequent period he prohibited the disciples from accepting or applying titles of superiority: "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren!" "And call no man your father on the earth, for one is your father who is in heaven, neither be ye called masters, for one is your master, even Christ?" Now, how could the Saviour utter such prohibitions if he had previously made Peter master of them all, and pope or father of them all? We have no evidence that the Apostles ever recognised Peter as having any such superhuman authority, but the contrary. He was not the president, although present, of the Council of Jerusalem. He was sent by the other Apostles to Samaria. Who ever heard of a pope being present at a popish council and not presiding? or of a pope sent by his cardinals to perform a certain work for the Church? Paul says that he was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles." How could he say so if Peter had been appointed by Christ as Prince of the Apostles? No doubt the Apostles are to be viewed as in a secondary sense – because of their apostolic writings and labours – the foundation of the Christian Church. But in this Peter had no pre-eminence, except that through his instrumentality the door of faith was first opened to both the Jews and the Gentiles after Christ's ascension. Paul says to the Ephesians, "Ye are builded on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Here there is no distinction except in regard to Christ Himself, who is termed "the chief cornerstone." Again, in the vision which John obtained of the Church, the Apostles are spoken of as occupying the same level, – no distinction or pre-eminence on the part of any one of them: "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the lamb." It is stated that in a certain part of the sermon "the Rev. Father made a pointed allusion to the dogma of the Roman Catholic Church to which that day was specially consecrated." Of course the dogma here referred to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God." What the Rev. Padre said in regard to such a monstrous and blasphemous tenet is not recorded. It may have been thought more wise to withhold it, for it may have been rather revolting even to the ignorant and lukewarm Protestants of the colony.

We cannot at present go far into the address presented by Mr. Plunkett to Dr. Polding and Dr. Polding's reply there to, and his speech at the luncheon. Special notice is taken of the sympathy in word and deed shown by Protestants towards them at the time of the burning of the Cathedral. And what is the return which he and his satellites make for such acts of sympathy? It is to regard these heretics who will not receive the dogmas of the Church of Rome as accursed. And, if they had the opportunity, they would, according to the oath taken by them at their consecration, persecute such heretics to the death. In these addresses great indignation is expressed at the reports which have been spread as to the Romish faith being a conspiracy against loyalty and human liberty. In this connexion the Archbishop gives the following remarkable deliverance: "The time, believe me, is not far distant when men shall recognise with astonishment and alarm that loyalty of every kind, that human liberty in every direction – intellectual, and moral, and spiritual – have their only true and sure foundation in that Catholic Church which, like her Lord, had been partly unknown and partly of malice travestied and insulted." Well might he say that such a result would be regarded with astonishment. The impudence displayed in the above deliverance is, we venture to assert, almost without a parallel. The events that have lately taken place for the obtaining of human liberty in the three most priest ridden countries on the continent of Europe – Italy, Austria, and Spain – give the lie most palpably to such audacious statements. Why had the notorious Isabella (the beloved daughter of the Pope, and the favorite Queen of Dr. Polding) to be hurled from her throne by her own subjects, and in a country where Popery had it all its own way? Human liberty of every kind having its only true and sure foundation in the Church of Rome! And yet many years have not elapsed since the head of that Church, in his Encyclical Letter, denounced civil and religious liberty. The Archbishop, with his bishops and priests, very loyal to Queen Victoria, forsooth! and yet he allows his dear, simple children, who are so

ready to obey him, to read and support a paper distinguished for its seditious matter. None but those who are exceedingly gullible will attach any importance to his talk about loyalty, knowing full well that if he had chosen he could soon have either reformed or put down such a seditious paper. Loyalty, forsooth! and yet both he and his priests wanted to have books taught in their schools containing seditious matter, as was shown in both Houses of Parliament. Loyalty to Queen Victoria, indeed! And yet none knows better than Dr. Polding that "those preparing at May-nooth for the priesthood of the Church of Rome are taught that all heretics (and therefore her Majesty) are, *ipso facto,* excommunicated, and therefore incapable of holding any public office; that they are justly punished with exile, imprisonment, and even death; that heretical rulers may be deprived of their sovereignty by the rope, and their subjects released from their allegiance; that heretics are to be exterminated, if the power to exterminate them is possessed, and can be exercised without danger to the Church."

Yours, &c.,

PRESBYTER.

18th Dec. 1868.

462

The following is a translation of the oath imposed on Archbishops, Bishops, and all who receive any dignity from the Pope, to which our correspondent refers.–

"I, N., elect of the church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N., Pope N., and to his successors canonically entering. I will neither advise, consent, nor do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands any wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel with which they shall entrust me by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to keep and defend the Roman Papacy, and *the regalities of St. Peter,*. saving my Order, against all men. The Legate of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power, and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. *Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will, to my power, persecute and oppose.* I will come to a Council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our Lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my Clergy and people; and, lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and I will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger here to especially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage, or, in default of these, by a Priest of the diocese, or, in default of one of the Clergy [of the diocese], by some other secular or regular Priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediments I will make out by lawful proofs, to be transmitted by the aforesaid messengers to the Cardinal proponent of of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred Council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the Chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff; and if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God."

DISORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

In a letter addressed a short time ago to the Times by a distinguished clergyman of the Church of England, "S. G. O.," the following observations occur, and they present we fear too faithful a picture of the present condition of that Church: –

"Any institution for the propagation of Christianity . . . . cannot exist as the promoter of leading views in strict antagonism. It cannot uphold truth and admit into its ranks those whom *the truth* it upholds convicts of grievous error; it cannot, for instance, attribute all power to God alone to forgive, and grant liberty to Christ's followers to use their own light in searching the Scriptures, and at the same time say, 'You may believe the Pope is infallible to interpret the Bible, as he and his priests are all powerful to absolve from sin.' Again, such an institution must have enough of harmony of action in all its mechanism to prove that, in pursuance of the end at which it aims, each individual agent works under the force of the discipline and under the moral obligation which, for all school purposes, must exist as binding all teachers and all who supervise them. I need hardly repeat, if the Church is Protestant, she fails at this hour grievously in that she does permit not only bishops but clergy of all ranks to teach and practise that which is in direct opposition to this her character. As to harmony in spirit and general submission to discipline, the matter is even worse. The bishops are as little guided by the archbishops as the clergy are seemingly disposed to be directed and taught by either; as to discipline, where is any, the least, proof that the rank and file have any disposition to acknowledge their officers' authority? If they do in any degree do so, it is quite clear they do it in the spirit of him who said, 'I go,' and went not . . . . I then hold, and there are a vast number of thoughtful Churchmen who agree with me, that the time is at hand, and the event of a day may precipitate it, when the question will press, – if a Church so fallen from its chief principle – as the will of the nation enforced that principle when it adopted it as the National Church – so utterly disorganised in regard of any obedience to authority, so incapable of preserving consistency in doctrine and practice, is to be the one specially privileged Church, it must be again reformed, even if the process of its reformation should endanger its very existence; that it is neither creditable to Church nor to State that the present anomalous state of things should exist. I am well aware that I shall be accused of great crime, or great ignorance, perhaps of both, for this my view. I shall be told that the Established Church is, in the persons of its ordained and in the matter of all its creeds and ordinances, above all State interference; that it will betray its commission under the King of kings, as the

one true Church, if it for one moment allows any earthly power to restrict its authority or diminish by one hair's breadth its claim to interpret its ordinances, and to assert that its 'orders' are so directly delegated from the Great Founder of Christianity as to admit of no human questioning in regard to the spiritual authority of all its ordained. I am content to incur this risk. I view the matter from two points of observation – as an Englishman and a member of the Church; I have to ask – Has this Church to which I thus belong gained upon the affections of the people, by evidence that as a whole, as an institution, it affords them the example they expect from it, and does it *as a whole* work, as far as it is reasonable to hope, *in harmony, to* the edification of the people and the furthering of the honour of God? Or is it upheld, failing in these respects, because it is in its parochial aspect so interwoven with our whole social fabric, that being so, from the individual energy on the part of a large proportion of its ministers, it does effect, in one way or another, great national service? Has it won a value in detail which counterbalances sufficiently what it has lost in respect as a whole? I must, Sir, admit I have long come to the conclusion that the strength of the Church at this day lies, so far as the clergy are concerned, in a just value given to their work in isolation – *i. e*., that they have retained as individuals 463
a power to the Established Church which she would have lost had she depended simply on her own Church platform. Can any institution, as such, be considered safe in this condition? If I regard the Church from a simply clerical point of view, I am driven to the confession that we are fast arriving at a state of things which seems to my poor judgment altogether destructive of its institutional character. I cannot see who are its governors, who its governed; I know not where to look for its laws; I am utterly at sea as to its doctrines; I behold it at one time boastful of its elasticity – that lion and lamb may lie down together under its shelter; at another I see its lions quarrelling with each other as to the best means of devouring the lambs; and I hear in the bleating of these the voice of the lamentation which bewails that animals so violent should be allowed to exist at all. When I contemplate its claims to Apostolic succession, and yet see how the apostle is trained, and how, by interest or purchase, he, as the rule, gets his fold, and often at an age when he has no shepherd experience; when I know the fold cannot change him, or he, poor man, finding he knows nothing about sheep disease, cannot take to another profession, being tied for life by a tether he cannot break; when I see that for his life's peace he must but too often follow rather than lead his flock; when I know that, being still but man, he may become a very wicked man, and that then, as such, the chiefs of the shepherds are almost powerless to remove him – he has a freehold in his flock – I own I ever tremble at the prospect of a day, if things continue thus, when the nation shall say the Church cannot demand deference for apostleship, respect for a Divine commission, when she thus permits the call to the office of an apostle to need so little qualification, and then leaves the called to work their own way, lose or keep their character, with no fear of interruption, teach what they may, or become unfit to teach at all. I, Sir, believe there is time yet to save the Church, but I am satisfied, unless reform comes from within, and that soon, the attack will be from without; and the attempt to reform will either destroy her altogether or leave her an object of compassion to all who ever loved her, of derision to her enemies. There are those who believe, because she has weathered many a storm, she is storm proof. The limpet, bred on the rock to which as it grows it still adheres, adhering gains still stronger grasp, might boast of the storms which have launched their force against it, and yet never once disturbed its hold; rock-fast it might thus argue, 'I am rock safe.' I have seen a schoolboy with a rusty knife fill his pocket with them. The Church may well be warned – the schoolboy may be abroad; or she may be exposed to a storm, proving her rock was not real, but mere sandstone."

REVOLUTION IN SPAIN.

Within the sphere of its civil institutions Spain has thrown off the yoke of Rome, and, to testify in the most emphatic manner that it has done so, it has burned its concordat with the Pope in front of the Papal Nuncio's palace. The Jesuits have been expelled and their property confiscated; and the monasteries and nunneries founded since 1837 are suppressed, and their property is transferred to the State Education is completely free. Liberty of the Press has been decreed; and formal schools re-established. But Spain, continuing still subject to Rome within the sphere of religion, it will be difficult for it to consolidate and maintain the liberty which it has thus asserted for itself.