# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 40. SYDNEY, JANUARY 1869.

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. 40 JANUARY. Vol. 1

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Good and Faithful Servant … … … … … | 465 |
| William Manson, Esq. … … … … … | 466 |
| The place assigned to the Bible by the Church of Rome… … | 467 |
| St. George's Mutual Improvement Association … … | 469 |
| Correspondence … … … … … … | 470 |
| Religious Liberty endangered in England … … … | 471 |
| The Spanish Revolution … … … … | 471 |
| The Emmigration of the Jesuits from Spain … … … | 473 |
| Queen Isabella's Confessor … … … … | 473 |
| A Presbyterian Minister and Pius IX … … … | 474 |
| Presbytery of Maitland … … … … | 475 |
| Moderatism in Victoria … … … … | 475 |
| Protestantism in Madagascar … … … … | 476 |
| The Prohibition of Christianity in Japan … … … | 476 |

## THE GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT.

(*The substance of a sermon preached in St. George's Church, on Sabbath, 27th ultimo, the first Sabbath after the death of William Manson, Esq., one of the office-bearers of the congregation.* )

His Lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord. – Matt. 25: 21.

In respect of obligation, all men are the servants of Christ, for he administers the divine government, all power in heaven and on earth having been given to him. But, in respect of the recognition and discharge of obligation, believers only are his servants. While all ought to feel and act towards him as being his servants, it is only believers that actually do so.

And believers are the servants of Christ, not after the manner of hired servants, but rather, as the term rendered "servant" in our text implies, after that of slaves. Hired servants render a stipulated service for a stipulated consideration; but slaves are their master's property, and on this ground owe him all the service they can render. And believers occupy this latter position in relation to Christ. To all such the Apostle says, "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price," (1 Cor. 6: 19, 20,) "Ye are Christ's." 3: 23.

It is only when men are thus Christ's that they are really free. It is alike the duty and the wisdom of all to dedicate themselves to him, and when any do so, and their choice is thus in harmony with their obligations and their interests, they are then, and then only, free. It is in this that true freedom consists, that no power withholds us, or is able to withhold us, from the course which we ought to pursue, and which we must pursue that it may be well with us; and it is only those who have dedicated themselves to Christ and are his "servants," that have attained to this freedom.

All Christ's "servants" are "good and faithful" servants, but some of them are eminently such. They are "faithful" servants, and, as being faithful and in other respects, they are "good" servants. The term "faithful" presents their character under one aspect; the term "good," which is more comprehensive, affords a general description of it We shall consider it first as it is described by the more specific term.

To each of his servants Christ, to use the phraseology supplied by the parable in which our text occurs, delivers a portion of "his goods," to some more, to some less. The "goods" thus delivered to them, estimated in the parable as so many "talents," consist of all things whatsoever, capable of being employed or turned to account in his service, that are possessed by them; for it is by him as their Creator or in the administration of providence and as head over all things to the Church, that all such things have been bestowed upon them. From this general description it is evident that the "goods" under consideration comprehend the bodily and mental powers of the servants, their attainments and culture, their spiritual graces and endowments, their material possessions, the relations they sustain, the offices they bear, and the social positions they occupy; for all these are capable of being turned to account for Christ, and, so far as they admit of being thus applied or are otherwise desirable, they proceed from his hand and appointment. And these "his goods," which he thus delivers to them, he delivers to them with instructions, that, viewing them and, indeed, themselves as his, they put them to their proper use, and make the proper application of them, acting throughout as his servants and for him.

Faithfulness on their part consists, accordingly, in their carefully and thoroughly, in the use they make of these "his goods," carrying out his instructions with respect to them. Some of the goods delivered to them indicate the form and special bearing of the service which they are called to render, and others of them determine the ability and resources at their disposal in rendering it; and, when they honestly and earnestly render the service thus prescribed to them according to their ability and resources as thus determined, they act the part of faithful servants. A father, for example, acts so far the part of a faithful servant, when, recognising that, sustaining the relation of a father, he is required to render the service of bringing up his children for him whose servant he is, doing all in his power to secure their interests and to fit them for

and thus to promote the cause of Christ and the glory of God, he diligently strives to render this service, availing himself of all the advantages for doing so which the portion of his Master's goods delivered to him confers. In like manner, whatever sphere is occupied, when the occupant of it renders, according to his ability and means, the service which as occupying it he is required to render, – when he honestly determines the details of the service which devolves upon him as occupying it, as they consist of duties of a general character common to all servants, and of the more special duties that spring from the distinctive facts and features of his position, and, in the conscientious application of the goods delivered to him, renders that service in all its details, he bears the character of a faithful servant.

We have hitherto contemplated the faithfulness of Christ's servants as it consists in conscientious care and diligence on their part in putting his goods to the proper use, or, in other words, in rendering the service which devolves on them, on the general ground that they are his servants, or on the special ground that they are servants to whom he has delivered the particular portion of his goods with which they have been entrusted; but we shall fail to form a correct conception of their faithfulness, if we do not distinctly recognise that in putting his goods to the proper use they are influenced by an earnest concern for his interests; that in rendering the service which they owe they are animated with a spirit of devotedness to their Master. They not only proceed according to his instructions, so far as regards their activity and the operations in which they engage, but they proceed according to them, desiring earnestly that he may see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. Their rendering of service springs from a deep sense of his claims upon them, and of the obligations under which they lie to him. They recognise that they are wholly his, and that they are indebted to him for the possession and the prospect of unspeakably precious and dear bought benefits, while he is infinitely worthy of a far higher homage than creatures whose nature is so feeble and whose sphere is so limited, than any mere creature can yield to him; and the service they render is the practical expression and embodiment of this conviction and of the affections and desires which it awakens.

But the servant addressed in our text is described not only as a "faithful," but as a "good" servant. He is a good servant in being a faithful one. But the description of him as good embraces more than this. It conveys not only that the service which be owes is rendered in its whole extent and with zeal and devotedness, but also that he possesses, and exercises the qualities and qualifications which constitute excellence in a servant; that he is not only diligent and devoted in discharging the duties which devolve upon him, but is at the same time capable of discharging them, and that he does discharge them, and discharge them well.

Let us now consider the reward of the "good and faithful servant." The reward which Christ bestows upon his servants is not due to them as a reward earned and merited by themselves. It is his righteousness imputed to them, and not any righteousness wrought out by themselves or any merit of their own, that forms the basis of their title to eternal life. Still the reward they receive, seeing it is bestowed "according to the deeds done by them," maybe called a reward. According to the view of this reward presented in our text, it comprehends the Master's express and emphatic announcement to them of his approval. This announcement is compressed into one of those brief and forcible utterances in which strong feeling, in this case a feeling of admiration or one of a kindred character, bursting forth, hastens and labours to express itself – "well done;" and the effect of this utterance is heightened by the employment of terms of high commendation to designate each of those to whom it is addressed – "good and faithful servant," and by a special reference, for such it seems to be at least in part, to the comparatively repressing circumstances under which faithfulness was displayed – "thou hast been faithful over a few things."

Having thus announced to his servants his high approval of them, Christ will declare to each of them "I will make thee ruler over many things;" and he will give full effect to this declaration by the fiat, "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." The joy of their Lord is the joy that accrues to Christ from the glorious issue of his mediation, – from the salvation of his people and the manifestation of the divine perfections which their salvation affords. Those results he regards with unspeakable satisfaction and delight, and he admits his servants to participate in the joy which he thus experiences. Bearing his image and being of one mind with him, they view the results of his mediation in the same light in which he himself views them, cordially sympathising with and concurring in his appreciation of them, and thus, in their measure, they participate in the joy with which he regards them, their position affording them every advantage for doing so. And, besides, the joy which he experiences is itself a source of joy to them. From their love, their gratitude, and their devotedness to him, his joy becomes theirs. It becomes theirs also from their union to him.

The participation of Christ's servants in his joy comprehends in it their being, in association with him, "rulers over many things." They shall be raised not only to blessedness, but also to exalted dignity and glory. They shall be kings and priests to God, they shall reign with Christ. "To him that overcometh will I grant," Christ proclaims, "to sit with me in my throne, as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Rev. 3: 21.

Let us see to it that we bear the distinctive character of Christ's servants. He has delivered to each of us a portion of his goods; let us see to it that we be found putting whatever goods he has thus delivered to us to their proper use, and doing so in the spirit of fidelity and devotedness with which we should be animated as his servants.

Whatever difficulties and trials Christ's servants may encounter, they may well bear them patiently, for great is their reward in heaven. Each of them will in due time enter into the joy of his Lord, and will reign with Christ "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Cor. 2: 9.

Those who have been bereaved of beloved relatives or friends who were the servants of Christ, should not "sorrow, even as others who have no hope." To the servants of Christ "to die is gain." Phil. 1: 21. To all such when their period of service here terminates, Christ says, he says, to them one by one, "Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord;" and one after another, accordingly, they enter into his joy. Ought not those who love them to rejoice and give thanks on this account, while, having suffered sore bereavement, they cannot but mourn, and, indeed, ought to mourn.

As a congregation we have just suffered a severe bereavement, and by this bereavement some of us are more deeply and painfully affected; but let us all remember, in the circumstances in which we are thus placed, and let us remember with gratitude and not without joy, that "blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."

---

## WILLIAM MANSON, ESQ.

William Manson, Esq., of the firm of John Frazer and Co., 

died at his residence, Roslyn Terrace, Sydney, on the 23rd. ult. Mr. Manson was born at Thurso, in the north of Scotland, on the 20th March, 1820, and was educated in his native town. Even when a boy he was habitually quiet and thoughtful, and, during his attendance at school, applied himself with great earnestness and diligence to his studies, from which he would allow nothing to divert or withdraw him. He accordingly made highly satisfactory progress in the knowledge of all the subjects, including classics, which the course of study embraced; but attained to marked proficiency in algebra and mathematics, which could scarcely fail to present special attractions to a mind so exact and methodical. From his earliest years he was remarkable for his affectionate and dutiful deportment towards his parents and his brothers and sisters. And when he grew up and had funds of his own at his disposal, his filial and fraternal affection prompted him not only to give assistance cheerfully when he knew it was needed, but even to request that if at any time it should be needed he should be informed. This recognition that the family is one organic whole, and that the members of it owe to each other effective sympathy and assistance, while it is a beautiful element of character and eminently beneficent in its operation, contributes powerfully to place those in whose case it is exhibited in the right relation to Divine Providence, and thus on the right path to attain to satisfactory results in their personal history and experience. The influence which it exerts in this direction is distinctly recognised in the fifth commandment, and may often be traced in the history of individuals, as we think it may in that of the subject of this brief notice.

When about eighteen years of age, Mr. Manson became greatly concerned for his salvation. When thus awakened to give heed to the things that pertained to his peace, he devoted himself greatly to the reading of the Scriptures, to meditation on their truths, and to prayer for Divine teaching and for an interest in Christ's finished work. We are not in circumstances to trace the progress of his spiritual history, but the latter portion of it furnished no obscure evidence that he found what he sought.

Mr. Manson's fidelity and devotedness in discharging the duties of a situation which he held in his native town led him to expose himself, perhaps unduly, in very inclement weather, and the consequence was that he caught a severe cold, which resulted in a permanent derangement of his health. Under the circumstances which thus arose he was advised to emigrate to these colonies, which he accordingly did; and, after a short sojourn in Victoria, he arrived in Sydney in 1843. In March, 1859, he became a member of the firm of John Frazer and Co. In the position which he thus occupied he enjoyed the great advantage of being associated with a partner of congenial character; and their united operations, conducted with great diligence and ability, were crowned by Divine Providence with abundant success.

In 1858 Mr. Manson became a member of St. George's congregation. Soon afterwards he was chosen to be an office-bearer, and ordained. About the same time he was appointed superintendent of the Sabbath-school, and discharged with great efficiency and zeal, till within a few weeks of his death, the duties which devolved upon him in that capacity. As an office-bearer, he attended with great regularity the meetings of the court of which he was a member, and not only as a member, but also as the clerk of that court, he contributed largely, under circumstances of great difficulty, to the wise and successful management of the affairs of the congregation. Such, however, was the financial position of the congregation, – burdened, when its present minister became connected with it, with £12,500 of debt – that the management of its affairs could not be conducted to a satisfactory issue without the exercise of large-hearted liberality. And such liberality Mr. Manson exercised. Besides various handsome donations, his contributions for the last six years or more ranged from six to eight hundred pounds annually. The liberality exercised by him in the testamentary disposal of his property is the more to be prized when viewed in the light of this fact, for, viewed in this light, it is seen to bear the character of a continuation of a previous exercise of liberality, and not of an attempt to compensate for the previous neglect of it. When we speak of the liberality exercised by Mr. Manson towards St, George's congregation in the testamentary disposal of his property, we refer to two munificent bequests, one of £1000, the income to be applied annually towards paying the salary of the minister of St. George's congregation, and another of £2500 towards paying off the debt on St. George's Church.

Mr. Manson made also the following bequests for religious and charitable objects: – £1000 to the Sydney Infirmary, £1000 to the Benevolent Asylum, Sydney; £1000 to the Destitute Children's Asylum, Randwick – each of these sums to be invested, and the interest of it paid annually to the institution to which it is left; £100 to the Ragged School, £100 to the Deaf and Dumb Institution, £100 to the New Hebrides Mission, and also £50 to each of the following institutions, viz.: – the City Mission, the Bethel Union, the Night Refuge, the Soup Kitchen, the London Missionary Society, and the Home Visiting and Relief Society.

Mr. Manson's bequest of £2500 places St. George's congregation in a position to pay off, it is believed, without much difficulty, and soon, the remaining debt on their church, a result which he greatly desired to see achieved.

The following minute expresses the high estimation in which Mr. Manson was deservedly held by his brother office-bearers:

William Manson, Esq., one of the members and the clerk of the Deacons' Court, having departed this life on the 23rd inst., the court unanimously resolved to record their sense of the great loss the congregation sustained in the death of Mr. Manson, and their high appreciation of his services as superintendent of the Sabbath school, of the wisdom, ability, and diligence with which he discharged his duties as an office-bearer, and of the large-hearted liberality with which he contributed not only towards the ordinary funds of the congregation, but also towards liquidating the heavy debt with which the Church was burdened, – a liberality which he continued in the testamentary disposal of his property, bequeathing to the congregation in two legacies not less than £3500. The Deacons' Court sympathise deeply with Mrs. Manson; but they rejoice that she is not left to mourn as those who have no hope, but may derive consolation from the announcement, Blessed are they that die in the Lord.

---

## THE PLACE ASSIGNED TO THE BIBLE BY THE CHURCH OF ROME.

We make the following extract from a Lecture on the "Heathenism of Popery," delivered by the Rev. William McIntyre, A.M. –

"If the Church of Rome professed to have derived its entire system from the scriptures alone, appealing to no other authority, it would be difficult to believe that its system is corrupted with heathen elements to any great extent or indeed at all. It does not however make any such profession. On the contrary, it places unwritten tradition on the same level with the sacred scriptures in respect of authority. And, as it is itself the sole custodian of tradition, it can, of course, make it be, teach, and sanction whatever it pleases. It is thus under no necessity of confining itself within the limits of scripture teaching. It was, indeed, the evident object of the elevation of tradition to the place and

authority assigned to it, to relieve it from this necessity. But, in order that this object 468
might be effectually accomplished, it was not enough to place tradition side by side and on the same level of authority with the scriptures; it was necessary further to secure, that the teaching of the former should not be disproved or counteracted by that of the latter. The scriptures represent and describe themselves as a sufficient revelation. 'All scripture,' they testify 'is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works' – 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. Of course a revelation, intended and fitted to make all who truly embrace it 'perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works,' is itself perfect; and not, as the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome with respect to tradition imply, a defective revelation, to which, that it may afford the requisite guidance to the Church, a large addition must be made. But it is not only as involving a rejection of their claim to be regarded and received as a sufficient and perfect revelation, that tradition comes into conflict with the scriptures; it comes into conflict with them also in its teaching, and that in multitudes of instances. It is clear, therefore, that if tradition is to be maintained in authority and is to do its work, it must be protected from the direct and decided opposition which, from first to last, is offered to it by the scriptures. To afford to it this protection, two most effectual, but, at the same time, most audacious expedients have been adopted. In the first place, the sale, possession, and reading of the scriptures have been laid under the most rigid restrictions. Thus the 4th of the rules on the subject of prohibited books, drawn up by a committee appointed for the purpose by the Council of Trent, and app- roved of by Pope Pius IV., is in the following terms: – 'In as much as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be allowed to all indiscriminately, more evil than good will, from the temerity of men, arise from such permission, – it is referred to the judgment of bishops and inquisitors to allow, with the advice in each case of the pastor or confessor, the Bible, translated by Catholics to be read in the vulgar tongue by those, whose faith and piety, they have reason to believe, will be augmented and not injured by such reading; and the licence thus granted the parties to whom it is given must possess in writing. But, whosoever shall presume to read or possess the Bible without such license, he shall not receive absolution until he has delivered such Bible to the ordinary. Moreover, booksellers, who shall sell or otherwise dispose of a Bible in the vulgar tongue to one who does not possess the aforesaid licence, shall forfeit the price of such book, to be applied by the bishop to holy uses, and shall be subjected to other punishments, according to the quality of the offence, as the bishop may think fit. Regulars, unless they have a license to that effect from their respective superiors, cannot read or buy Bibles.' * Such is the law of the Church of Rome on the subject of the sale, the possession, and the reading of the Scriptures; and I doubt if there is a single lay member of that church in the colony at this moment, who is in a position to purchase, read, or possess them in accordance with it, that is, who has from the proper authority a written license to purchase, possess, and read them. This law, it is true, is allowed to be very much in abeyance in this community, the presence of protestants and the influence of protestant sentiments and institutions rendering the enforcement of it inexpedient, if not impracticable. But, if it were enforced, it would not, probably, leave a single lay papist in the colony in possession of a bible; nor would its operation stop here; it would deprive protestants also of their bibles, for the Church of Rome claims as her subjects all who have been baptized. And it is enforced elsewhere, and the effect of such enforcement is the almost entire expulsion or rather exclusion of the scriptures. It is enforced, for example, in Rome, the headquarters of popery, and the effect there is, that, to use the words of a recent traveller in Italy, there is not in that city, 'one copy of the bible that is accessible to the people.'

But, however rigorously this prohibitory policy might be pursued, the scriptures might still get into the hands of some, and others might become acquainted with some portions of their contents. To provide for such cases, and also for the rare cases in which a license in writing to possess and read the scriptures might be sought and obtained, a second and most extraordinary expedient had been resorted to, – the expedient of imperatively requiring that none shall understand the scriptures. 'In order to restrain,' says the Council of Trent, in a decree passed in its 4th session, 'in order to restraint petulant minds, the Council further decrees, that in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, no one, relying on his own discernment, shall dare to interpret the sacred scriptures, even though such interpretation shall never be published, wresting them to his own sense of them, contrary to the sense of them, which holy Mother Church, whose right it is to judge of their true meaning and interpretation, has held and still holds, and contrary to the unanimous consent of the holy fathers. Whosoever shall transgress, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law.' * To obey this decree, the papist, if he read the scriptures, must carefully abstain from exercising his judgment on what he reads with the view of understanding it. Whatever meaning it conveys to his own mind, he is not to attach to it any meaning, except the meaning attached to it by all the fathers, and now and always attached to it by the Church of Rome; and, if he does not know that meaning, – and, to say the very least, in multitudes of instances, there is no such meaning for him to know, he is not, of course, to attach to it any meaning at all, – he is not to understand it, no matter how plain and intelligible it may be. In the face of such a prohibition it is useless to read the scriptures. It is even dangerous to read when it is a sin to understand.

This legislation, it may be observed in passing, is singularly inconsistent with itself. It treats those, whose conduct it is intended to regulate, as being both able and unable to understand. It treats them as being able to understand, as is evident from the fact, that it furnishes the rule under consideration and similar rules for their instruction and guidance, which of course would be useless, if they could not understand them; and, at the same time with glaring

* Cum experimento manifestum sit, si sacra Biblia vulgari lingus passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parte judicio Epiacopi ant inquisitoris stetur: ut cum consilio Parochi, vel Confessarii, Bibliorum a Catholicis autoribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione, non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. Qui antem absque tali facultate ea legere seu habere praesumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatoram absolutionem percipere non possit. Bibliopolae vero, qui praedictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovia modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usus pios ab Episcopo convertendum, amittant, aliisque paenis pro delicti qualitate ejusdem Episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. Regulares vero non, nisi facultate a Praelatis suis habita, ea lagere, aut emere possint. – *Canons and Decrees, p.* 337. Paris, 1823.

* Presterea; ad coercenda petulantia ingenia; decernit ut nemo. suae prudentiaeinnixus; in rebus fidei, et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium, sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens,

contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione. Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam (2) contra unanimem consensum Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat; etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo umquam tempore in lucem edendae forent. Qui contravenerint, per Ordinarios declarentur, et poenis a jure statutis puniantur. – *Canons and Decrees, p.* 22.



inconsistency, it treats them as being unable to understand the far plainer and more reasonable rules of scripture.

At present, however, we have to do with the enactment of the Tridentine fathers, as an expedient for getting rid of the interference of scripture with tradition: and, viewed as a means to that end, nothing could be more skilful in design or effective in operation. The first expedient, vigorously applied, is quite capable of almost wholly abolishing the possession and reading of the scriptures; and what it may leave undone, the second expedient, which may be regarded as its completement, will fully accomplish, abolishing wholly the intelligent reading of the scriptures. And, as our minds are so constituted that we shall not read if we are not permitted to understand, I may say simply that it will wholly abolish the reading of the scriptures.

The scriptures have been almost wholly shut out of circulation by the first expedient, and the few straggling copies, that might have escaped this process, having been completely silenced by the second, and even reason itself having been overawed to suspend or rather abandon its functions within the sphere of religion, tradition might, of course, be wrought in any direction and to any extent that those who wrought it chose; and clearly the preparatory arrangement indicated that they intended to work it unsparingly. It is to be observed, however, that it was not under cover of the doctrine by which the teaching of the scriptures has thus been set aside, as a doctrine already developed and enunciated, that corruptions of the gospel were introduced, but under the influence and as the result of successive defections in the direction of that doctrine; and that the doctrine itself was resorted to, as necessary to render practicable any sort of defence of accumulated corruptions already introduced. The design of the doctrine is thus chiefly retrospective and defensive; and the enunciation and maintenance of it are virtually a confession that the system to which it is attached will not bear the light of the scriptures * and cannot be defended if the scriptures are not silenced; or in other words, that it contains unscriptural elements, elements derived from other than scriptural sources, and that the presence of those elements would be inevitably detected if the scriptures were read."

---

* This is the Italian view of the matter. "How curious," says Dr. Richard Chenevix Trench, Dean of Westminster (now Archbishop of Dublin), after remarking on the Italian proverb, Revenge of a hundred years old hath still its sucking teeth, "How curious again is the confession which speaks out in another Italian proverb, that the maintenance of the Romish system and the study of Holy Scripture cannot go together. It is this: Con 1'Evangelo si diventa eretico, '*With the Gospel one becomes an heretic*.' No doubt with the study of the Word of God one does become an heretic, in the Italian sense of the word; and therefore it is only prudently done to put all obstacles in the way of that study, to assign three years and four years imprisonment with hard labour to as many as shall dare to peruse it; yet certainly it is not a little remarkable that such a confession should have embodied itself in the popular utterances of the nation." – *Proverbs and their Lessons,* 4th Edition, p. 56. The fact and the conversation, related in the following extract, reveal the same conviction of the danger of the bible to popery which the proverb expresses. "I have conversed with a noble Christian who was exiled from Rome for introducing in that city some copies of the Latin Bible. After having in vain sought for a Bible in many shops in Naples, I said to my valet, a sensible man of fifty, 'John, have you ever read a Bible?' 'No, sir,' was the reply. 'Have you eve seen a Bible?' Again the reply, 'No, sir. 'As God has given the Bible to man, why is it not found in Naples?' 'The bishop and priests forbid its circulation, sir, and forbid us to read it.' 'And why, John, do they forbid you reading it?' 'O,' said he, with a shrug of the shoulder so peculiar to the Italian, 'they think that if we should read the Bible, we would become Protestants, and they would not like that.'" *Romanism at Home,* by Kirwan, p. 28.

## ST. GEORGE'S MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION.

The annual public meeting in connection with this Association was held in St. George's Church on the evening of Tuesday, the 12th instant. The chair was occupied by James Barnett, Esq., the Colonial Architect, and the meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Alexander McIntyre. In submitting its report, which was unanimously adopted, the Committee congratulated the members on the success which attended the working of the Association during the past year, success which it regarded as mainly attributable to the readiness and zeal evinced by members in performing the several duties assigned to them by the conveners of classes.. The number of members is forty, shewing an increase of five since the beginning of the year. After stating this fact, the report proceeds – "But, while the Association has made the progress now indicated in respect of numbers, it has suffered a severe toss in the death of William Manson, Esq., one of its Vice-Presidents, who was ever ready to promote (especially within the sphere of the congregation of which he was an office-bearer, and with which this Association is connected) such objects a those of the Association." During the year forty-six meetings were held, with an average attendance of fourteen during the first six months, and twenty-one during the last six months of the year. During the year thirteen essays were read, sixteen discussions held, and thirteen readings and twenty-four recitations given. The report concludes with the following reference to the attendance of ladies: – "Your committee would deem it improper to close the report without adverting to the increased interest imparted to the meetings by the attendance of lady visitors. One of the principal advantages conferred by an association for mutual improvement arises from the fact that certain duties, such as reading ways, offering criticisms, and conducting discussions, are not only performed by the members, but performed by them in the presence of an audience; and there can be no doubt that the audience is rendered more effective for the purpose which it thus serves by the presence of ladies."

After the adoption of the report, the President delivered a short address to the following effect: – The object of the Association is the improvement of the members, they themselves being the principal agents in effecting this improvement. If the views entertained as to what man is or ought to be are materially defective, any scheme of improvement based upon them will, of course, be equally defective. If, for example, man be viewed as an intellectual being merely – a being endowed with powers that fit him for intellectual activity and achievement, all the improvement that will be attempted in his case will be directed and confined to the development and cultivation of those powers. And this, we apprehend, is all that is aimed at by Schools of Arts, Mechanics' Institutes, and, probably, by some Mutual Improvement Associations. This Association, however, aims at more. Its object is to promote not only the intellectual, but also the moral and spiritual improvement of its members. Two distinct methods are adopted in attempts to effect moral improvement. One of these is based on the view that all that is necessary is to develop and cultivate what already exists in a rude and immature form – that it is not necessary that anything should be implanted. Accordingly, in applying this method, what is aimed at is to secure that the rules that ought to be observed shall be known and accepted, that corresponding purposes shall be formed and executed, the influence of the proper

motives being thus practically acknowledged, and that right habits shall contracted and established. The other method proceeds upon the opposite view, that, in order to the satisfactory moral improvement of man, the implantation of a new principle is necessary in his case; that in his natural state he is spiritually dead, and that, in order that his moral improvement may be carried to a satisfactory issue, it is nec- 470
essary that spiritual life be communicated to him. Accordingly, in pursuing this method, the means will be employed with which the Holy Spirit, who alone can communicate spiritual life, is wont to connect his agency in communicating it, and in afterwards maintaining it and maturing its powers; and those means will be employed with the desire and in the hope that the Spirit will exert in connection with them His mighty power as the author of spiritual life and of holiness. Moral improvement, sought and secured according to this method, which alone meets the case, is identical with spiritual improvement. It will perhaps be urged that the moral improvement contemplated by the former method will, at least, accomplish much. That we may be able to arrive at a correct estimate of its merits and demerits, let it be observed that man's duties are determined by the relations he sustains – namely, his relations to material things around him, his relations to his fellows, and his relations to God. Now the efficacy and success of the method of moral improvement of which we are now considering the claims, extend only to the duties which spring from the first two classes of relations, and are but partial, even within this sphere. As regards all our duties, it is necessary to the discharge of them that we discharge their with the right reference to God; that we discharge them from love and in obedience to him. It is from this reference to God that the discharge of them acquires the character of a discharge of duty. Now, any moral improvement reached by mere development will not secure a due reference to God, and will not, therefore, secure the discharge even of the duties which arise from earthly relationships – that is, a discharge of them that will really be a discharge by those on whom they devolve of the duty which they owe in the case to God. In moral improvement we must begin at the highest point, and not at the lowest. We must endeavour, first of all, to secure that those whom we seek to improve shall be rightly affected towards God. When this result is once realised (but then only), they shall be able to carry, and they will actually carry, the discharge of duty through all the ramifications of their lower relationships. But, in order that any may be rightly affected towards God, it is necessary that the Holy Spirit impart spiritual life to them, bringing them into that vital union to Christ, in which alone spiritual life on the part of man is possible.

Certain resolutions of a routine character, which were moved by members in appropriate speeches, having been unanimously passed, the meeting, which was well attended, and in the proceedings of which the audience took an evident interest, was closed with the benediction.

## Correspondence.

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

Sir, – We live in ominous times – times in which events, whether apparently favorable or unfavorable to the interests of Antichrist, turn out to the furtherance of those interests. In your last issue we took notice of an event of the former kind, the laying of the foundation stone of St. Mary's Cathedral. By the tactics adopted on that occasion in connection with the blessing of the stone, and the speeches afterwards delivered, the interests of the Church of Rome in this land have doubtless been greatly promoted. Since then an event of a very different kind has occurred – the burning of the temporary Cathedral, which also is likely, all things taken into account, in no small degree to advance the interests of that system. Such an event furnishes, in the present state of things, an occasion of exciting sympathy in behalf of the Church of Rome, and raising suspicions against those who are opposed to it. To the bringing about of these results the *Sydney Morning Herald* has been largely contributing. We refer more esp-

ecially to an article devoted to the subject of the burning of the Cathedral. In that article the following sentences occur: – "Meanwhile we may say that among all whom we have encountered there has been only one expression – that of regret, and not without sympathy. The profound difference which divides the various sections of Christians we are not called upon either to deny or to measure; but we believe there are very few indeed who do not regard this calamity as a misfortune to the whole city, as tending to create distrust among us." Now the event referred to, viewed as involving the destruction of a great amount of property belonging to fellow citizens, is, no doubt, a cause of regret. But that is surely all the length that intelligent and consistent pro-testants can go in their regret or sympathy. In speaking of the "profound difference" (or, as it ought to be stated, the profound differences) "that divides the various sections of Christians," there is evidently an attempt to place the differences between the various sections of Protestantism and the vast differences bet-ween all these and the Church of Rome very much on the same level. Such an attempt is what might be expected to flow from such a quarter. As to "this calamity being regarded as a misfortune to the whole city, as tending to create distrust among us," there would be much less danger in regard to this were it not for the wretched twaddle of the *Herald* on this and other kindred subjects. But we now pass onto consider the onslaught made on certain papers published in Sydney, including one or more papers of a Protestant character. Very probably the *Protestant Banner* at least is one of the papers against which such an onslaught is directed. Now, whilst we do not approve of everything that appears in the *Banner* – nay, there are communications sometimes published in it calculated to do injury to the object it has in view – still, as a whole, it ought to be hailed by every sound hearted Protestant as doing good service in the cause of truth. No doubt the decided and justifiable stand taken in the leading articles and many of the communications in that paper, not only against Popery, but also against lukewarm and time serving Protestants, is very distasteful to the *Herald.* It is also quite possible that a side stroke at least is aimed at the *Testimony,* since it, too, speaks out very decidedly against Romanism and also against inconsistent and truckling Protestants. But, so far as the *Banner* or the *Testimony* are concerned (if either be intended in the onslaught referred to), the following assertion contains a most base misrepresentation: – "Whose sole aim is to stimulate the passions, and to make men enemies to one another on account of their nation or their faith." No doubt these periodicals contain faithful exposures of a system that has too well proved itself to be highly dishonoring to God and pernicious to men's interests, and which, if its principles could be carried out, would subject communities to the most abject bondage, both civilly and religiously, and would give no quarter whatever to any that would refuse to bow their neck to the yoke. And if ever there was a time when such exposures were specially needed, not only for the victims of the systems referred to, but also for the sake of ignorant and misguided Protestants, it is the present. By plausible professions and representations on the part of priests and others, the Protestants referred to are in no small danger of being induced not only to favor Romarism, but to

become victims of the system. Exposures of this system may prove the occasion of rousing men's evil passions, and causing strife and division; but is not such a result, however much to be deplored, what the Divine Author of Christianity has predicted? "I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled?" "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on the earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division." Did not His own exposures and condemnation of the vain and superstitious tradit-
471
ions of the elders stir up hatred and animosity among his countrymen? Did not the same results follow the exposure and condemnation of Judaism and heathenism by Christ's disciples? According to the reasoning of the *Herald,* their sole aim was to produce such results, and it was not proper for Governments to permit their teaching. If such serious results as the *Herald* hints at should take place, that paper will be greatly responsible, as parties who are well known to be, according to their training, disposed for acts of violence, will be ready enough to take encouragement from such hints.

But if the Government should ever adopt the hint as to their mode of dealing with certain publications, how can the Herald itself escape? Are there not appearing in it, from time to time, articles of a most insulting and inflammatory character towards not a few of her majesty's subjects in this land? Were not the statements regarding Irish Protestants attaching more importance to the Battle of the Boyne than to the occurrences on Calvary of such a character? To use the *Herald's* own mode of reasoning, – How long are "the Christians of this country to allow the liberty of the press to degenerate into such atrocious licence." As to writing for "sensation and sale," the *Herald* should be among the last to talk of that policy. As to the vile suspicions that have been thrown out regarding the burning of the Cathedral, the thing is quite absurd. Any man, with but a small amount of consideration, cannot fail to see that in the midst of so much favourable feeling among many Protestants towards the Romish system, such an occurrence would, in various ways, be in favour of Romanism and against Protestantism, – as has been indicated at the outset of this communication. A Romanist would have much more temptation, in the present state of things, to do such a deed than a Protestant. We would conclude by remarking that we consider the *Herald* to be one of the most effective agencies for advancing the interests of the Church of Rome in this land, among a large class of so called Protestants.

Yours, &c.,
PRESBYTER.

15th January, 1869.

---

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ENDANGERED IN ENGLAND.

We have observed, with considerable anxiety, the proceedings that have recently taken place in Bolton and Manchester, in connexion with the lectures of Mr. Murphy. We express no opinion as to the manner in which Mr. Murphy conducts his lectures, but we think a very serious question is now involved – viz., the right of freedom of public speech, as hitherto protected by the laws of the country. It would appear that Mr. Fowler, a stipendiary magistrate of Manchester, when an examination was being conducted in connexion with Mr. Murphy's case, laid down the following proposition: – "If you come here and swear an information that any person is going to lecture, and that the delivery of such lecture is likely to cause a breach of the peace, or cause a riot, I will grant on your information, a summons or a warrant." The meaning of this is, if correctly reported, that a summons or warrant will be granted not against those who are to create the riot, but against the lecturer, however innocent.

Such a doctrine as this would soon put an end to all liberty of discussion. For it would be the easiest thing possible to find diversity of opinion on any subject, and to find men willing to silence a lecturer, not by argument, but under the threat of a riot. Thus any clergyman or Protestant lecturer, however judicious, would be prevented from delivering a public lecture, or, as in Glasgow, a public sermon; but certainly any lecture on the doctrines of the Church of Rome, or the principles of Protestantism. If a speaker is to be silenced in this way, it would not be possible for any clergyman to obey the command of Christ, to "preach the

Gospel to every creature." Such a power as this will be taken full advantage of by the Romanists, who abhor discussion, "loving dark-ness rather than light." This matter assumes further importance when we bear in mind that the Encyclical letter of the Pope, recently published in this country, condemns as an error "public manifestation of opinion," and declares that such freedom of speech is contrary to the "teaching of the Holy Scriptures, the Church, and the Holy Fathers." It is there further declared that such a liberty is "insanity," and to be the "liberty of perdition."

It is most extraordinary that an English magistrate should lay down a doctrine which apparently coincides with the doctrine of the Romish Church. This freedom of public speech is in accordance with one of the first principles of toleration, and one of the first fruits of the Reformation. Instead of the speaker being arrested or punished, those who threaten to break the peace, are the parties on whom the penalty of the law should be inflicted. If not, the power and authority for which the magistrates have been ordained – "a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well" – will be abrogated and perverted.

The circumstances in which the country is at present placed increase the gravity of the subject; and we earnestly hope an investigation will be made in order to ascertain the real facts of the case; and that nothing will be allowed to take place to imperil a boon which has been handed down, to us by the struggles of our ancestors, and which is productive of so many advantages to the social, civil and religious interests of the commonwealth. *The Bulwark.*

---

## THE SPANISH REVOLUTION.

The following facts in connection with this most momentous event are full of interest and promise: –

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN SPAIN – IMPORTANT INTELLIGENCE. – The friends of Spain, a few of whom in this country have never ceased to work for her true emancipation and enlightenment, even in these last years of darkness and persecution, will rejoice to learn the following important announcement, which we copy from the *Gibraltar Chronicle* of 25th September last: – "During the short visit paid by General Prim to Algeciras, he found time to accord an interview to three refugees, Senores Cabrera, Alhama, and Hernandez, who have been for a long period exiled from their native country on account of their religious opinions. The General received these gentlemen with the utmost kindness. In reply to their remark, that their only crime had been that they did not profess the Roman Catholic religion, the General said – 'From this day forth there shall be liberty in our country – real liberty; every man shall be master of his own conscience, and shall profess the faith which seems best in his own eyes. You, gentlemen,' he added, 'may return to your country by the first steamer, and you are at liberty to enter Spain with your Bibles under your arm, to preach its doctrines.'" None can foresee what may be the end of the present revolution in Spain, or what kind of Government may be established. But it is a most hopeful circumstance that General Prim, on his return to Spanish soil, should have made to the Protestant exiles such a declaration of his views in regard to

freedom of conscience. The people of Spain, like that of Italy and Austria, are to a great extent wearied with the domination of the Church of Rome, that has been so fatal to their liberties and to their progress. It will interest many of our readers to learn that Senor Cabrera, the leader of the deputation to General Prim, has been for some time pastor of the Spanish Reformed Church at Gibraltar, under the auspices of the Spanish Evangelisation Society of Edinburgh; and, with his companions, Alhama and Hernandez, and two other ministers, formed some months ago the first consistory of the Reformed Church of Spain that has met since the Reformation.
472

Madrid, Oct. 13, noon.

The Junta, considering all religious communities and associations to be contrary to liberty, proposes the extinction of those which have been established since 1835, and the abolition of all their privileges, as a measure urgently necessary for the safety of the State. It further proposes that the members of the other religious corporations should be empowered to declare themselves free.

The minister of Justice has issued a decree suppressing the Society of the Jesuits throughout Spain and the Spanish islands, ordering that its colleges and institutions be closed within three days, and declaring its moveable and immoveable property to belong to the State. Several other important decrees have been issued. One grants to all general officers and soldiers exiled for political reasons, the power of returning to the service of the country, and of retaining their rights of seniority. It also restores the pensions to the widows, orphans, and widowed mothers of persons who have been shot for political offences, or who have died in exile.

By another decree the rural guard is dissolved, and a decree issued by the Minister of Finance abolishes the Customs House at Madrid, and grants freedom of traffic in the interior for both Spanish and foreign merchandise. The Customs' establishments at Grun, Santander, and Bilbao, will be organised in conformity with this decree.

THE SPANISH JESUITS AND THE REVOLUTION. – The Jesuits are flying across the frontier at Guipuzcoa. A proclamation, drawn up by a general assembly, orders all members of that society to quit the country. The Junta of Seville has decreed the suppression of twenty-three churches and thirteen chapels. The general proclamation by the Juntas of liberty of conscience is likely to be misunderstood, and some Continental correspondents caution Englishmen in particular against too rapid conclusions on the subject. Spain, they say, is a Catholic country which contains many free thinkers, but no Protestants; and what is meant by freedom of worship is something quite passive; it is much less the power to open new churches than the right to keep away from the old ones.

The *Gazette* publishes a decree of the Minister of Public Instruction ordering that henceforward primary education shall be absolutely free, restoring the normal schools, and reappointing the professors removed by the late Government. The Ministry is also preparing measures for establishing free secondary and superior education.

A decree issued today (Madrid, October 19) by the Minister of Justice, orders the immediate suppression of all monasteries, convents, colleges, congregations, and other religious establishments of both sexes, founded since the 29th July, 1837; all their property, moveable and immoveable, is to become the property of the State. The monks and nuns belonging to these institutions will not receive any pension from Government. The convents established before 1837 are to be reduced in number one half, and those left are forbidden henceforward to receive novices. The monks and nuns released from their cloisters can enter the conventual establishments, which are not suppressed, or return to secular life. In this case they are to address a petition to that effect to the civil Government, and they can claim back the money made over by them to the convents at the time of their entry. The civil Government will decide by arrangements with the bishops which convents are to be allowed to continue in existence. All congregations of women who have devoted themselves to the education of youth will be preserved.

It is also expected (Madrid, 19th October) that the *Gazette* will publish on Wednesday official decrees proclaiming liberty of conscience, liberty of the press, the right of association, liberty of teaching, and universal suffrage.

The expected manifesto of the Provisional Government has been published today (Madrid, 20th October). It is in the form of a diplomatic circular, and is very lengthy. It explains the reasons which compelled the Spanish people to throw off the yoke of the Bourbon dynasty, enumerating the grievances of the nation against the late Government, and says – "The people must now regain the time which it has lost. The principle of the popular sovereignty, which is now naturalised in Spain, is the principle of national life, and the ideal type of the nation's aspirations. We may therefore be permitted to affirm that the national sovereignty, exercised in the first place by the vote of all, and subsequently by those elected by the people, will decree a complete system of liberties, which form, or will form soon, the rich and inalienable patrimony of a civilised country."

The circular also examines at length the question of freedom of public worship, and expresses hopes for the free exercise of every religion. It also states the desire of the Government to be on good terms with foreign Powers, and to obtain the moral concurrence of foreign Governments, adding – "But if we should fail in this respect, if the example of America in recognising the revolution be not followed, we shall not be discouraged. We can tranquilly proceed with our task; for our independence is not threatened, and we have no foreign intervention to fear. To legitimise the revolution, we have sought the sole criterion now considered infallible – namely, an appeal to universal suffrage. The aim which we have in view is to place ourselves on a level with the most advanced nations, and thus far to form no dissonance in the great concert of nations. We have a perfect right to expect from foreign countries respect for the state of things which we have created, and we entertain a justifiable hope that the Governments which march at the head of civilisation will not refuse to Spain those proofs of amity and fraternity which they accorded to the power that crushed and humiliated us."

Madrid, 21st October. – Senor Lorenzano has sent a circular to the foreign representatives of Spain abroad, in which the Minister explains the causes, character, and political bearing of the revolution. "Spain," he says, "had, under the rule of her last two monarchs, presented the sad spectacle of a loyal and generous people, lavishly devoting their wealth and their blood for the benefit of Kings, who repaid these heroic sacrifices with the blackest ingratitude. The people patiently waited until their cup of sufferings was overflowing. That moment having arrived, the people have taken their stand upon the ground of modern popular right." The circular treats upon the question of religious liberty, stating that the useless legal obstacles hitherto thrown in the way of other creeds would disappear, even as they had already disappeared from the habits of the people. In conclusion, the Minister says the Spanish revolution could cause no alarm to other countries, and therefore the Government was in hopes that foreign nations would not refuse to entertain friendly relations with revolutionary Spain.

A decree has been issued by the Minister of Justice, dissolving the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and ordering the civil governors to take an inventory of the papers and funds belonging to that

society.

Madrid, October 24th..

Senor Sagosta, the Minister of Justice, has issued a decree promulgating the absolute liberty of the press, abolishing the office of a special judge for press trials, and placing all press offences within the jurisdiction of the ordinary penal code. The decree also suppresses the censorship on literary and dramatic productions.

An order has been issued stopping the annual pension of 6000 piastres paid to Archbishop Claret.

In almost all the cities and towns in Spain the statues of saints and the crucifixes placed at the corners of the streets, and lighted during the night with a lamp, have been removed.

473

The British and Foreign Bible Society is about to take prompt advantage of the tolerance of the Spanish Government by establishing depots of Bibles in Spain, and arranging for their distribution.

A decree has been issued authorising the erection of a Protestant church.

---

## THE EMIGRATION OF THE JESUITS FROM SPAIN.

The emigration from Spain, which still continues to flow into France, has, I am assured, attracted the attention of Government, and is now being reported upon by the prefects of several districts of the empire. It is calculated that there are now in France in round numbers something like 2000 Jesuits and members of the society of St. Vincent de Paul. They are none of them wanting in funds, and have taken up their quarters, mostly dressed as laymen, in small hotels and lodging-houses. There are a number of brothers and sisters of monasteries and nunneries, who seem to want no assistance. All these members of religious orders are waiting for commands from their superiors, and expect to be sent more particularly to England and America. Accounts reach us from Belgium of a similar influx of Spanish Jesuits and members of religious orders, and, according to a Swiss journal, a few have got to Geneva. Probably others have got to Rome, and some no doubt have reached the various Jesuitical establishments which have lately prospered in Great Britain. We may be sure under any circumstances that the society of the rich and political circles will be invaded by a new set of intriguers, who have really ruled Spain, and brought about the fall of Queen Isabella. Here in France the number of Jesuits has very much increased during the last ten years, and it would be useless to deny that Church influence has made its appearance in high places. The Parisian journals speak occasionally of "Roman dictation in our high Governmental regions." The Jesuits have done their work here in France. The Imperial Government, through M. Rouher, has told the Italians that they shall "never" possess Rome. France fought the battle of the Pope at Mentana, and has just lately declared that she will not retire from Civita Vecchia. In the early days of the reign of Napoleon III., Church influence only looked into the windows of the Tuilleries; Church influence has now taken a seat amongst the Cabinet Ministers, and will exercise considerable influence at the next general elections. There is not much work for Jesuits here; the clever ones will probably mostly go to England. They have, according to continental reports, established a commanding position in many English families of distinction, in various ways, and under various guises; if so, you will find divisions in families, and a new vein of politics pervading men's minds. I observe that some London journals pretend to believe that the Spanish Government is acting harshly in breaking up the nests of the Jes-uits and the St. Vincent de Paul haunts. It is argued by some sim-ple people that a Liberal Government ought not to persecute any class of subjects or any religious community. Now, the fact is that no freedom of conscience, or freedom of any kind, can exist when the Jesuits and the Church of Rome influence the Sovereign and Government of a country, and no people can be educated for political freedom when Roman Church influence has the teaching of youth. You must get rid of these political intri- guers if you want a nation to enjoy liberty and progress. You must act with apparent injustice and illiberality in self-defence. And is any one simple enough to suppose that any Government can effectually expel them and clear society of their pernicious influence? If so, they are in error. How many countries have they been expelled from since the institution of the order in 1540, and never left! They have been often sent out of France for attempting to murder sovereigns; for example, Henry III. and Henry IV.;

but they have always contrived to carry on their influence at Courts. In the seventeenth century they were expelled from Bohemia, Malta, and other places. In 1723 Peter the Great banished them from Russia. They were sent out of France in 1757 for attempting to murder Louis XV., one Damiens being the instrument of the contemplated crime. After Father Malagrida had murdered the King of Portugal in 1758, they were ordered away from that country; fled at the great French revolution, and in our day the Swiss got rid of the Jesuits. In fact, at many periods sovereigns and governments have tried to do what the Spanish revolution is seeking to accomplish; what Queen Elizabeth attempted, by the way; and all have failed. In some shape or form the Jesuits are everywhere; and as they always contrive to possess considerable funds, they never fail to triumph over so many things which money can achieve.

---

## QUEEN ISABELLA'S CONFESSOR.

(*From the Morning Advertiser.*)

Sir George Bowyer vouches for the fact that Monsignor Claret, the confessor of Queen Isabella of Spain, is "a most exemplary ecclesiastic;" that "his whole life is devoted to charity and piety;" and that he is "universally venerated as a most devout and practical Christian."

Lady Herbert, the widow of the lamented Sydney Herbert, who, since she was left a widow, has herself gone over to the Romish Church, adds her testimony, in her "Recollections of Spain," assuring us that Monsignor Claret is "a man remarkable for his great personal holiness and ascetic life."

We accept these testimonies without any difficulty, and shall offer no resistance to the admission of M. Claret into the company of that small body of ecclesiastics who are exceptions to the general rule. The ordinary repute and general estimation of the Spanish clergy is, that they are not holy men – that they are not even decently moral men. As to this fact our readers may consult Blanco White, himself a Spanish priest, or Inglis, or Meyrick, or any other of a dozen travellers who have described the state of Spain within the last twenty years.

Monsignor Claret, however, is to be taken as an exception to the general rule. According to Sir George Bowyer and Lady Herbert, he is a very saintly man. But this fact introduces, of necessity a very awkward and difficult question.

Here is a priest of great holiness. He is confessor to a Queen of whom, only a week ago, the *Times* told us that "every one of her children has a different father;" of a Queen who, during the present week, has lost a throne because she would not part with her present favorite, a Senor Marfori – against whose presence in her suite her Ministers thought it their duty to protest.

This Queen is a "very religions" Queen. She is constantly in the habit of going to mass, and of communicating. But she cannot do this without first confessing and receiving absolution. She must have lived, then, for years in the habit of daily sin of the most

flagrant kind; and in the habit of going from an immoral bed, day by day, to kneel before her confessor, and tell him, again and again, of her habitual transgression, and then to receive from him a full and free absolution and pardon, so that she rose from her knees before him a cleansed sinner, fit to go straight to church, and receive into her lips the "tremendous and unbloody sacrifice." And all this horrible and wicked travesty of sacred things has been transacted, day by day, for years past; and this Monsignor Claret has been the chief actor in it; and yet we are assured by Sir George Bowyer and Lady Herbert that he is a "most holy," "most exemplary," and "most devout" man!

Now, these most frightful and revolting facts bring the whole 474
Romish system before us; and, if we would understand the matter at all, we must find our way through a whole wilderness of very tangled questions. In fact, we have here what Romanists and Ritualists term the "sacramental system" brought to a practical test.

Disguise it as they will, the belief which both these sections of the Apostate Church inculcate is this, that the priestly absolution, given after confession, is a real and substantial thing; and that the sinner rises from his knees after receiving it a cleansed soul, fit to appear at the judgment seat, and therefore fit to receive the "tremendous and unbloody sacrifice." We have not the slightest doubt that every one of Dr. Manning's disciples, and every one who, after confession and absolution, received the wafer at St. Albans, in Holborn, last Sunday morning, would have thought it flat heresy to doubt that, had sudden death overtaken him, he would have been certain of an instant flight to Paradise. It is this reliance on mere outward and visible signs and symbols which constitutes the very essence of "the sacramental system," or, in other words, of Popery.

Yet, look at the fact now rendered notorious throughout Europe. Here is a royal lady, married to a husband for whom she cares nothing. She has taken to herself sundry male favorites, so as to have, as the *Times* explained last week, a whole family of children, every one of whom has a different father. She has been living this life for nearly twenty years. And yet she has had, all the while, living in her palace, a special confessor of her own, whose business it was to hear her confession at all proper periods, to counsel her, and to give her absolution for all her offences, and a passport to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This Father Confessor of hers is described by Sir George Bowler and Lady Herbert as a most holy man, a most saintly man. And yet, under his cognisance and with his sanction, this poor woman has been going on, week by week and month by month, sinning openly and notoriously, and going to confession regularly, and getting absolution whenever she asked for it; and all this without the least change of life or purpose of amendment. The final protest against her sin comes, at last, not from the saintly Monsignor Claret, but from her Ministers. They say to her, "Come to Madrid, but come without Marfori." She angrily rejects their recommendation, and will probably forfeit her throne rather than give up her sinful practices. But what has her Church done for her? It has helped her to lose her throne. Has it done anything towards getting her a better one in the world to come?

The broad fact, which stands in the view of all the world, is, that Queen Isabella has been living the life which Louis XIV. lived, and which many other sovereigns have lived; but which is made more than usually revolting in their cases by the cloak of religion which is cast over it. We have had, nominally Protestant sovereigns who have lived no better lives than Isabella of Spain; but then we give them up to plain censure, and we say that the less any talk of religion is heard in their cases the better. The single point which offends us in the present instance is, the thrusting forward a dignified priest of the Roman Church as having a part in all this immorality. The people of Spain have thrown down the statue of their Queen, and have dragged it through the streets. This was the verdict of common sense, and of outraged national feeling. But if the people were substantially right, then the saintly Monsignor Claret must have been frightfully wrong. He has seen, for a dozen years past, the Queen sinning, constantly and perseveringly, and not repenting. He has seen her going on unblushingly, and in a reckless course of profligacy. And yet he has, in the full knowledge of all this, "confessed and absolved her," week by week, or even day by day; and has left her to believe the fatal lie, that he, a poor, weak, and sinning creature,

could actually pardon and cancel all her sins. Others may call Monsignor Claret "a holy" and "deeply religious man," if they will; but we should be unwilling to award him any such commendations.

It is not, however, of him, so much as of the system, that we complain. Without any doubt or hesitation, we say that the Romish Church has flagrantly sinned in the case of Queen Isabella. Her moral offences were known to all men, yet her confessor could "shrive her," week by week, and even her "Holy Father, the Pope," could stoop to send her a signal token of his approbation, the golden rose, blest by him, and held to confer peculiar privileges. Thus sanctioned and approved by the chief men in her Church, how was poor Isabella to imagine that she was, after all, a wretched offender against even the decencies of life, and an object of loathing to nineteen-twentieths of her own subjects?

Now, assuming for argument's sake that all this pious devoutness is really genuine, and not assumed to mask their real aims, is it not in conformity with all experience that Ultramontanism should choose agents of this kind to use as instruments and tools in carrying out its designs? Is it not notorious that the Jesuits, for instance, have been always careful to select, for some of their agents, persons whose simplicity and respectability placed them above suspicion, while their bigotry and enthusiasm rendered them the most useful of emissaries?

But Ultramontanism has already made itself so odious, even at Naples and Vienna, that it has been totally ejected in the one place, and its power broken in the other. The only places where it has lingered thus long are Rome – its natural seat and centre – and Madrid. But the Spanish people have awakened at length to the evils of the system, and in spite of the Pope, and the pious and immaculate Father Claret and his coadjutress the Bleeding Nun, and the myriads of clergy spread all over the country, have "pronounced" against this bad Government and its authors, the Bourbon dynasty.

---

## A PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER AND PIUS IX.

The Rev. Dr. White of the Presbyterian Church, Islington, Liverpool, has just forwarded the following letter to the Pope: – "To His Holiness Pope Pius IX., King of Rome and head of the Roman Catholic Church. – May it please your Holiness. – You have condescended to invite Protestants to return to your Church in connection with the proposed general council. As a minister of some little standing and experience in communion with one of the largest sections of Christ's Catholic Church, permit me to say why I am unable to comply with your invitation. In the Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter xxv., section 6 – which, I, in common with all evangelical Presbyterian ministers and office-bearers in Great Britain and throughout the world, have solemnly subscribed and of course conscientiously believe – it is thus written: – 'There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor is the Pope of Rome in any sense head thereof, but is that Antichrist, that

Man of Sin and Son of Perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God.' Such being the case, I can no more recognise your position and gathering against Christ's crown and kingdom than I could countenance a Fenian conclave in Ireland to subvert the rightful supremacy and wise administration of our own beloved and gracious Queen. With every wish for your Holiness's personal comfort, and with the most fervent and constant prayer for your own conversion to the simple truth of the gospel and the speedy and utter overthrow of your system which for centuries has crushed the liberties, civil and religious, of some of the fairest portions of the world, I beg to subscribe myself, your faithful servant in Christ, VERNER M. WHITE, LL.D., minister 475
of the gospel at Liverpool. – October 5, 1868. P.S. – I sincerely congratulate your Holiness on the improved tone of your communication. Might I venture to suggest that you would carry out the assumed spirit a little further, so as to grant to all the inhabitants of Rome liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; and also to exert your great influence to obtain the release of those who are pining in Spanish and other dungeons in Roman Catholic countries for reading the Word of God?"

---

THE PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND.

The Presbytery of Maitland met on the 29th ultimo at East Maitland. The meeting was opened and closed with prayer. There were present – The Rev. James McCulloch, Moderator; the Rev. Duncan McInnes, and Mr. S. Porter, Elder. The Moderator was appointed to visit Grafton in February, if circumstances permitted; and, in the event of his being able to do so, Mr. McLeod was appointed to supply his pulpit for three Sabbaths. Mr. McInnes was instructed to preach at Grafton as soon as practicable after his return to his congregation at Rockymouth.

The Rev. Mr. Donald is at present laboring at Inverell, and the Rev. Mr. McLeod at Clarence Town and neighborhood.

The Presbytery of Maitland, at a meeting held on the 9th November, instructed the Moderator to convey to the Rev. Alexander Mc-Intyre the thanks of the Presbytery for the valuable aid he had been for some time and was then rendering on the Clarence River. The Presbytery also expressed the hope that Mr. McIntyre would remain as long in that district as might be practicable for him.

---

Of the following letter on "Moderatism in Victoria," we can only give a portion in this number: –

MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

REV. FRANCIS RAE.

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

Sir, – It was not likely that the earthquake wave of scandal, which has been rocking the Churches here, should leave the pretentious Presbyterian Church unmoved. No doubt the outburst has not been so strong nor so sudden as in some of the other Churches, but what it wants in these respects, it makes up in the long continued period of activity, and the frequent repetition of the vibrations. As these matters are regarded now, I have to acknowledge, at once, that there is nothing pertaining to first class sensational doings in the Presbyterian Church. The substance of the case which I have in view involves only confessed lying and alleged drunkenness, with associations illustrative of Moderatism in Victoria, which I shall try to unfold a little. You may remember, that in January last the Rev. Francis Rae – a recent arrival in the colony – blazed up all at once like a comet into public notoriety by the display of peculiar talents for giving readings, recitations, &c., &c., from Shakespeare. But events progress rapidly in these railway times, and in February of the same year, a Geelong printer must have been busy with four foolscap pages of testimonials, professing to be published "in refutation of certain rumours that have been circulated affecting the character of Mr. Rae and the interests of the Church." We scan the document, and seek in vain for the slightest intimation of the rumours which are supposed to be refuted. Whether Mr. Rae has been industriously represented as a Mormon or a Mohammodan; whether he has been accused of monkery, or bigamy, or polygamy, or profane swearing, or breaking the pledge, we are left none the wiser by the refuting testimonials. We are left to conclude they bear at some occult point, but what that point is, they tell us not – we must, then, await the revealing hand of time. Then what are the testimonials? The contents of the four pages of foolscap may be summarised as follows.

Mr. Rae's eloquence is constantly referred to as striking and impressive. His discourses are described as practical, earnest, and evangelical. His expositions are said to be lucid, his delivery interesting, and his matter sound. His pulpit addresses display great care and elaboration. He is devoted, zealous, and self-denying. In the discharge of his duties diligent, faithful, and earnest. His prayers are noticed as excellent. But his work was not confined to pulpit ministrations. He was vigorous and successful in regard to prayer meetings, bible classes, and sabbath schools. In disposition among his fellowmen, he was kind, generous, and happy. He secured hosts of friends wherever he went. He had a warm, generous heart, and genial manners. His private conversation was agreeable and gentlemanly. He was an obliging neighbour, a genial good hearted Christian gentleman, scholar, and pastor. A brilliant career was predicted for him. No wonder such an one is spoken of as standing high and being a favorite, and as being one of the most promising men of the Church. We note, by the way, that while rare powers of eloquence come in for almost universal praise, the "evangelical" item occurs just once. Still, perhaps, Mr. Rae was not the right man in the right place; for you will observe these testimonials are from the Moderates of the Church of Scotland. Also there is a testimonial (if it can be so called) from the Presbytery of Ayr, in which, by some strange omission, there is not one word of all the foregoing! Strange yet true. The Presbytery accept his resignation, are sorry for his difficulties (in *a quoad sacra* charge), and hope he will prove himself a diligent and faithful laborer in the American colonies! The utmost they do is to commend him to the good offices of the brethren of the Church of Scotland in the colonies above named! People are generally willing to allow some margin for the overflowings of friendly feeling in such cases, but the Presbytery of Ayr give Mr. Rae so little margin, that it is a wonder he allowed the document to be published. Nor is our impression from the testimonials improved as regards Mr. Rae when we glance over them and note the dates. With all his brilliant qualifications, it appears he failed, in 1858, in getting the call to a Church in Ayr. In 1859 he failed to get the call to North Esk Church, also to the Church of St. George's-in-the-Fields. With all his great abilities, he was condemned to struggle on as the *quoad sacra* minister of Wallacetown for about six years. Then comes the cold *mittimus* of the Presbytery of Ayr already alluded to. This was in 1865. Mr. Rae, in due time, appears in Canada West; and we have, in the shape of a testimonial, another Presbyterial certificate conveying a still unkinder cut than that by the Presbytery of Ayr. They certify that he has been three months amongst them, praise up his documents, but as there is no suitable field there for him, some of the brethren advise him to cross the border and seek admission into the Presbyterian Church of the United States! He goes. He manages to keep things together in New York for a year and a half, and this we learn from testimonials again occurring in the shape of a viaticum. One testimonial declares it is a privilege,

as well as a pleasure, to give him the document. Mr. Rae appears next in Aberdeen, in the suggestive month of April of last year. New testimonials of course date from the granite city, the shrewd Aberdonians recommending Mr. Rae to the Australians. Having determined the laws of motion operating in the case, it is very easy now to suggest a comprehensive tour of the Australian colonies, to be duly followed up by another batch of testimonials commending him, very earnestly, to the Maories or the Patagonians! But here he is – a present existence – and he must be dealt with. He arrived in the colony about August of last year; anon we find him doing duty in a peculiarly destitute locality. It is the populous, fashionable suburb of St. Kilda. All the grandees of the Presbyterian Church have contributed their share of attention to this peculiarly destitute place. Civilians, from the Chief Secret- 476
ary downwards, have taken a zealous interest in the locality. More particularly this destitute place is that precisely in which the Free Presbyterian Church of St. Kilda is situated. What so proper, so opportune, as that a star of the first magnitude should be set to shine there! But there are primary stars, and so we find advertised, for the same day, to preach in the Orderly Room, a few yards from the Free Church, the illustrious Dykes of Sabbath train travelling notoriety, and the illustrious Rae – happy meeting at the Antipodes of the Free Church and the bond!

(*To be continued in our next.*)

---

## PROTESTANTISM IN MADAGASCAR.

The news from Madagascar continues to present considerable interest. A religious crisis seems likely to occur, as the Protestant missionaries are making great progress – a strong native party at present representing that profession of faith, even among the heads of the Government. The people are in expectation of a measure which, according to them, is imminent, namely, a conversion *en masse* to the above mentioned creed.

---

## THE PROHIBITION OF CHRISTIANITY IN JAPAN.

The Japan papers state that the following imperial decree is posted up at the gates of Yokohama and Homura: – "The Christian religion heretofore being strictly forbidden, still in the same manner as formerly is strictly interdicted. The devilish sect is strictly prohibited." From imperial decrees published it would seem that the native Christians embarked at Nagasaki on board the Sir Harry Parkes were not doomed to immediate destruction as anticipated, though their ultimate fate, it was thought, would probably be very little better. – *Daily Review,* 21st October.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 41. SYDNEY, FEBRUARY 1869.

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. 41 FEBRUARY. Vol. 1

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

The Relation of Droughts to the Sins of the Communities visited with them … … … … … 477
Day of Humiliation and Prayer … … … … 479
The Answer to Prayer and the Operation of Fixed Laws and Physical Cause 479
The Union Question … … … … … 480
Establishment Principle … … … … 483
Popery as it affects the interests of the people and the administration of Government … … … … … 484
Continuation of Mr. MacPherson's letter – Moderatism in Victoria … 485

## THE RELATION OF DROUGHTS TO THE SINS OF THE COMMUNITIES VISITED WITH THEM.

[*Substance of a Discourse preached in St. George's Church, Sydney, on Saturday, the 13th instant, the Day of Humiliation and Prayer appointed by the Government.*]

"But this people hath a revolting and a rebellious heart; they are revolted and gone. Neither say they in their heart, Let us now fear the Lord our God, that giveth rain, both the former and the latter, in his season: he reserveth unto us the appointed weeks of the harvest. Your iniquities have turned away these things, and your sins have withholden good things from you." – Jer. 5: 23-25.

In the immediately preceding context the Lord directs it to be put to his people, if, with all the evidence they had of His power, and of their entire dependence on him, they were so foolish and devoid of understanding that they did not fear Him. Considering His dealings with them, and the advantages they enjoyed, it might seem incredible that they should be so; "but," it is added in our text, "this people hath a revolting and a rebellious heart; they are revolted and gone; neither say they in their heart, Let us now fear the Lord our God, that giveth rain, both the former and the latter in his season; he reserveth unto us the appointed weeks of the harvest." The consequence of their bearing such a character and acting such a part is then announced to them: "Your iniquities have turned away these things, and your sins have withholden good things from you."

They were thus in circumstances similar to the recent circumstances of this colony, to which the observance of this day has reference. They suffered particularly, though probably not exclusively, for "the appointed weeks of the harvest" were not reserved unto them, from the want of seasonable rain. And it was because of their iniquities and their sins – because, having "a revolting and rebellious heart," they were "revolted and gone," and did not practically acknowledge the government and providence of God, and their own dependence upon Him, that they suffered thus.

Our text thus teaches us that in the case to which it refers, God visited his ancient people for their sins with drought and its consequences. Nor was this a singular or a solitary instance. It was a standing rule, and the uniform procedure of his government, that if they sinned against him, and especially if they persisted incorrigibly in doing so, drought would occupy a prominent place among the judgments with which he would visit them, for he would visit them with many judgments. "And, if," he says to them, referring to previous judgments, "ye will not yet for all this, hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins. And I will break the pride of your power, and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass; and your strength shall be spent in vain, for your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits." – Lev. 26: 18-20. "It shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken to the voids of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes, which I command this day, that . . . . thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. And the Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust; from heaven it shall come down upon thee until thou be destroyed." – Deut. 28: 15, 23, 24. "What

could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down and I will lay it waste: it shall not be pruned nor digged; but there shall come up briers and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it. For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant: and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry." – Isa. 5: 4-7. The following passage refers to an occasion on which, as on that to which our text refers, the judgment threatened in such passages as those already quoted was inflicted: – "Ye looked for much, and lo! it came to little; and when ye brought it home I did blow upon it. Why? saith the Lord of hosts. Because of mine house that is waste, and ye run every man unto his own house. Therefore the heaven over you is stayed from dew, and the earth is stayed 478
from her fruit. And I called for a drought upon the land and upon the mountains, and upon the corn, and upon the new wine, and upon the oil, and upon that which the ground bringeth forth, and upon men, and upon cattle, and upon all the labor of the hands." – Hag. 1: 9-11.

These passages, it need scarcely be remarked, though referring immediately to the Jews, are equally applicable to other communities. They teach, therefore, in the most explicit and decided manner, that God in his providence visits communities with drought for their sins. Other passages, again, record his promise that if communities obey him, he will give them seasonable and sufficient rain, so that their land will yield its increase. "If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments and do them; then I will give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit" – Lev. 26: 3, 4. "It shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently to my commandments which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve him with all your heart and all your soul, that I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full." – Deut. 11: 13-15.

When God thus promises rain and fruitful seasons to such communities as walk in his statutes, especially when the passages in which he does so are taken in connection with those in which he threatens communities with drought for their sins, we are led to the conclusion that it is only such communities as forfeit their interest in this promise by not walking in his statutes, that he visits with drought, or, in other words, that it is for their sins that he so visits communities.

It is thus conclusively established for all who acknowledge the divine authority of the Scriptures, and therefore conclusively established for you, that such a connection obtains between drought and the sins of the communities that are visited with them. It is not at all necessary for the justification of your belief, on the testimony of God, that such a connection exists, that you should be able to answer all the objections that may be urged against the doctrine that asserts its existence, or even any of them. No really valid objection can lie against a doctrine that rests on such evidence. Our inability, when we are unable, to answer objections urged in any such case, is sufficiently accounted for by our ignorance and the very limited range of our mental powers.

The only objection at all plausible that can be urged against the doctrine that it is for their sins that God visits communities with drought, is, that drought results from the operation of physical causes, whose operation is determined and regulated by fixed and unalterable laws, and that its occurrence, therefore, is wholly irrespective of the sins of those who may be affected by it. That drought results from the operation of such causes under the control of such laws we admit and hold; but we reject the conclusion deduced from this fact. The true doctrine on the subject of the occurrence of droughts is, – that God has determined all the details, and the circumstances in respect of time, place, and otherwise, of the whole aggregate operation of physical causes; that he has, therefore, as regards droughts, determined the time, place, severity, and all the circumstances of each of them; that, in doing so, he has, among other things, provided that they shall occur only when and where they shall, with all that will characterise them in each case, be not only a proper, but, so far, the proper mode of dealing with those who shall be affected by them; and that, when they do occur, he, at the time, wills and causes their occurrence, and, so far, deals by means of them with those who are visited with

them, according to his estimate of their conduct, his previous determinations and appointments, and the establishment by him of laws and a constitution of things in no way excluding the continued and co-extensive activity of his will. Thus it is true, on the one hand, that droughts result from the operation of physical causes and established laws, and, at the same time, none the less true, on the other hand, that God visits communities with droughts for their sins. The establishment by him of laws and a constitution of things, and his determination beforehand and from eternity of all that results from the operation of those laws and in virtue of that constitution, are a consequence, and, in the circumstances, a necessary consequence, of his being infinitely wise and powerful; and it would indeed be strange, if the possession of infinite wisdom and power and the legitimate consequence of the possession of them should exclude him from the immediate connection with the accomplishment of his determinations, which man, with his limited wisdom and power, has with the accomplishment of his.

It is God, then, that visits communities with droughts, and, in visiting them thus, he deals with them for their sins; and viewing in the light of this truth the drought to which the observance of this day has reference, we proceed to inquire what is the sin or what are the sins on the part of our community for which it ought to recognise it was visited with it, for which, therefore, it ought to humble itself, and which, especially under the admonition of such a visitation, it ought to renounce. When God visits a community with drought he places it in calamitous and distressing circumstances, from which it can neither protect nor deliver itself, and of which it cannot, if it do not obtain it from him, procure for itself the slightest mitigation. He thus forcibly reminds it of its dependence on him; he discovers to it, in the light of its own painful experience, that all its interests are in his hands. When God, who does not afflict willingly or grieve the children of men, proclaims to a community by such means its dependence on him, it may be safely inferred that it does not duly recognise it, that, to a great extent, it forgets and practically denies it; and that, for whatever other sin God may be dealing with it, he is dealing with it for this ungodliness. Is it, then, a marked and prominent feature of the attitude of our community towards God, that, to a great extent, it practically denies its dependence on him? A community duly influenced by a sense of its dependence on God, will be careful to obey his law, recognising that, while his blessing is necessary for it, it cannot otherwise obtain it. Is, then, our own community, in its capacity as an organised body, careful to obey

God's law? The moment we institute this inquiry the prominent and startling fact presents itself to our notice, that on the railroads of the colony, which are public property and under the management of the government, trains are run on the Lord's day. The express requirement of the divine law with respect to the Sabbath is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, . . . . on it thou shall not do any work;" and, yet, in the face of this requirement, our community provides and arranges that all the work shall be done on the Sabbath which the running of Sabbath trains involves.

A community, that it may enjoy the divine blessing, without which it cannot prosper, must be distinguished by righteousness; for "righteousness" alone "exalteth a nation." A community, therefore, that duly recognises its dependence upon God and the necessity for it of his blessing, will do all in its power to secure the prevalence of righteousness within its borders. This object, however, cannot be accomplished to any satisfactory extent, if divine truth and the ordinances and agencies which it prescribes are not brought to bear upon the people. But our community does not adopt this method of securing the prevalence of righteousness. 479

Hitherto its method of accomplishing it has been the preposterous and virtually infidel one of sending forth, as its paid agents, the advocates of antagonistic systems, that is, of truth and error, to do their best or their worst among the people; and this system, though now under sentence of condemnation, is still at large and in operation. And, as it dies out, it is to be followed by a total abstinence on the part of the government from the use of the divinely appointed means of securing the prevalence of righteousness. From the diversity of religious belief and practice, and especially from the great extent to which Popery obtains among us, this latter course may be the only one which it is practicable for the government to adopt; but, still, the circumstances to which we have referred as, probably, leaving the government no alternative but to adopt it, and the adoption of it under the influence and pressure of those circumstances, will, none the less, have the effect of placing us in the position of a community that makes no provision or effort to secure that its character and its relations to the divine government may be such, that it may warrantably expect the divine blessing, and thus of a community that does not practically acknowledge, – that practically denies its dependence on God. In the position from which it is emerging, the community practically declared that it regarded it as a matter of indifference, whether the character of its members and their attitude towards God were determined by error and superstition or by scriptural truth in its purity; that they did not deprecate or dread the influence of the former, or attach any value or give any preference to that of the latter; and, in the position which it is now assuming, it will practically emit the latter portion of this declaration. There is clearly in all this a very decided practical denial of dependence on God.

When certain features of character are very generally exhibited by the members of a community, the community itself becomes distinguished by them. Now, as regards the features of character by which our own community, though it does not exactly exhibit them in its corporate capacity, is thus distinguished, are any of them such, that just views of the divine government would lead us to regard them as exposing the colony to such a visitation as the recent drought? Some of them, we apprehend, are. It will not, we think, be denied by anyone, who in respect of knowledge and otherwise is qualified to form a correct judgment, that, while "no man can serve God and Mammon," a large portion of our population renders to Mammon a zealous, assiduous, and engrossing service. Their lives are devoted to this service and wholly occupied with it. Their sole object is, to acquire and accumulate property, and thus to procure the advantages, – and by advantages they mean various forms of gratification, – which they believe are attached to property or accessible to those who possess it. In other words, they "worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever." Ascribing to property an unlimited power of gratifying "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," that is, of accomplishing for them all they desire or relish, they idolise it. Now, when a community dishonours God and degrades itself by this idolatry, it is evidently an appropriate mode of dealing with it, to strike down its idol before its face, furnishing impressing evidence that it can neither protect itself nor help its worshippers.

In their application of property also multitudes among us practically ignore and reject the claims of God. They do not apply it to any considerable extent, or at all with earnestness and zeal, to the accomplishment of any of the objects that derive then claims from their hearing upon his glory and upon man's eternal interests. They may be even lavish in their expenditure for the gratification of their vanity, their pride, their ambition, or their love of pleasure and indulgence; but they never spontaneously and of their own proper motion, whatever they may do under the compulsion of solicitation or a prevalent opinion, make use of their possessions for the advancement of Christ's cause and in subserviency to the high and ultimate ends to which the progress and triumph of his cause and these only conduct.

When men thus ignore the claims of God in determining the purposes to which they apply their property, it is quite in accordance with the character of his government, that, by visiting them with drought or otherwise, he should cause them to experience that ultimately they effect no saving and are in no respect gainers by adopting such a course, – that they lose more than they save.

From such visitations as the recent drought, we should learn as individuals and as a community, the lesson of setting the Lord always before us, of committing our ways to him, and of seeking his glory and his blessing.

---

## DAY OF HUMILIATION AND PRAYER

### 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 in consideration of the very serious calamity from which the colony is now suffering, by reason of the protracted drought, it is proper that a day should be set apart on which all persons may unite in humiliation and prayer to Almighty God to obtain, through His divine mercy, a mitigation or removal of this calamity: And whereas it is right and expedient that an opportunity should be given to the clergy and ministers of religion of all denominations, and all others, Her Majesty's subjects in New South Wales, to observe such a day of humiliation and prayer : Now, therefore, I, the Governor of New South Wales, with the advice of the Executive Council, do hereby direct that, for the purpose aforesaid, the public offices be closed on Saturday, the thirteenth day of February instant, and express the earnest hope that all classes of the community will join with reverence and humility in this solemn appeal to the Divine Mercy.

Given under my hand and seal, at Government House, Sydney, this third day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, and in the thirty-second year of Her Majesty's reign.

(L. S.) BELMORE,
By His Excellency's command,
JOHN ROBERTSON,
God save the Queen!"

---

## THE ANSWER TO PRAYER AND THE OPERATION OF FIXED LAWS AND PHYSICAL CAUSES.

In the following extracts from the "Method of the Divine Government," the same views are presented on the subject of God's providential dealings with men, as are maintained in the discourse which forms our first article, only that Dr. McCosh fails to bring out God's immediate personal agency in such dealings.

"It is not necessary to suppose that prayer and its answer form a separate law of nature, for the answer may come as the result of other laws arranged for this very purpose. Nor is it needful to suppose that God interposes to change his own laws. The analogy of his method of operation in other matters would rather incline us to believe that he has so arranged these laws, that by their agency he may answer prayer without at all interfering with them . . . . His agents were at first ordained and marshalled by him for the accomplishment of all the wise designs of his government; and, among other ends, they may bring the blessings for which faith is expected to supplicate. He sends an answer to prayer 480
in precisely the same way as he compasses all his other moral designs, in the same manner as he conveys his blessings and inflicts his judgments. He does not require to interfere with his own arrangements in order to answer prayer, for there is an answer provided in the arrangement which he has made from all eternity. How is it that God sends us the bounties of his Providence? – how is it that he supplies the many wants of his creatures? – how is it that he encourages industry? – how is it that he arrests the plots of wickedness? – how is it that he punishes in this life notorious offenders against his law? The answer is, by the skilful pre-arrangements of his Providence, whereby the needful events fall out at the very time and in the way required. When the question is asked, How does God answer prayer? we give the very same reply, – it is by the pre-ordained appointment of God, when he settled the constitution of the world, and set all its parts in order.

There is nothing here opposed to the principles of the Divine government, but everything in consonance with them. . . . . Man is a religious as well as a moral being. There are important relations between man and his Maker, originating, no doubt, in morality in its widest sense, but rising far above a mere common place virtue. Now, just as God supports his moral law by the arrangements and coincidences of his physical Providence, so we may expect him also to support his spiritual government by the same means. We must ever hold the physical, as the inferior, to be subordinated to the moral and the spiritual, and we expect it to be employed to uphold these as the end. Just as he has arranged his Providence, as all thinking minds acknowledge, to encourage virtue and discountenance vice, we anticipate that by the same agency he may also provide an answer to prayer. And it is a fact, that all who have continued steadfast in the prayer of faith have declared, as the result of their experience, that God has been faithful, and has not failed to give an answer to their supplications. . . . No objection can be brought against this view, from the Divine immutability or the doctrine of predestination, which will not apply so extensively as to reduce it to an absurdity. (*Reductio ad absurdum.*) Since God is unchangeable, and has arranged everything beforehand, why need I pray at all? The reply is – that the answer to prayer proceeds on the foreseen circumstance that the prayer will be offered, that if the man refuses to pray, he shall assuredly find it fixed that no answer is given. Should petulance insist on a farther reply, we think it enough to show that this is a style of objection which would apply to every species of human activity. Why need I be industrious, if it is arranged whether or no I shall get the object which I expect to gain by industry? is the next form which the cavil may assume. If the objector is an ambitious man, we ask, why pursue so eagerly that expected honor when he knows that it has been ordained, from all eternity, whether he shall secure it or no? If he is a man of pleasure, we ask, why such anxiety to procure never ceasing mirth and amusement, when he knows that it is pre-determined what amount of enjoyment he is to receive in this life? Ah! it turns out that the objection, which presses with no peculiar force upon the supposed Divine arrangements in regard to prayer, is a mere pretext to excuse the unwillingness of the person who urges it, for he discovers it only in those cases in which he is unwilling to act."

---

## THE UNION QUESTION.

At a meeting of the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh, Mr. Moody Stuart proposed the transmission of the following overture anent Union: – "Whereas, in the proposals and discussions in the General Assembly on the Union of Churches, from the commencement of negotiations in 1863, till last General Assembly, it was never called in question that the Confession of Faith embodies the rightfulness of the civil establishment of religion (as distinguished from its endowment); or intimated that the basis of Union was to rest in any manner on the assumed absence of the Establishment principle from the Confession, more particularly no such intimation having been given in 1867, when the Assembly was asked virtually to sanction the Articles of Agreement; and whereas, in last General Assembly, it was maintained by more than one member of the Union Committee, with the expressed or apparent concurrence of the convener and other members, that the Confession of Faith contains no binding statement of the rightfulness of the civil establishment of religion. It is humbly overtured by this Presbytery to the Venerable the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, to instruct the Committee on Union, that in their negotiations they are not warranted either to set aside, as of a binding force, the passages in the Confession of faith in which the civil establishment of religion is implied so manifestly and so necessarily that they are void of meaning without it, or to assume that the Confession does not clearly lay down the duty of the State to establish the christian religion." In supporting his motion, Mr. Moody Stuart began by referring to the statements made by Dr. C. J. Brown, who had said that the idea of singling out and endowing one particular branch of the Church was one that could not possibly have been in the minds of the framers of the Confession of Faith. In opposition to this, he maintained that the Parliament had actually singled out and endowed the Presbyterian branch of the Church. He noticed Dr. Brown's argument for the purpose of entering his earnest protest against this novel and most unsound method of interpreting the Confession – not according to what it said, but according to what it was fancied it would have said if it had been drawn up in our days. This was only a civil mode of shelving the Confession of Faith. Let them make a new Confession if the old one was out of date, but let them not prop up their argument by an impossible Confession which was to be found nowhere but in their own thoughts, and let them not turn their existing Confession into a snare for their consciences. Noticing Dr. Candlish's challenge to them to put their finger on any period or event that implied that national establishment of religion was decidedly and formally made a primary consideration, he argued that while the Church's liberty had been first, the establishment of religion had never been secondary, any more than the salvation of

man was secondary in redemption because the glory of God was first; for both were primary objects. Endowment, however valued, had been secondary, but the establishment of God's truth had ever been held to be a matter of life and death. Had time permitted, he would have laid his finger on every great period and great event in their Church's history, from 1557 down to 1843, and proved that in every one of them, without a single exception, the national establishment of God's truth was a primary consideration in the Church of Scotland. To support his contention he cited, *inter alia,* the terms of the bond subscribed by the Lords of the Congregation, in 1557, promising to "set forward and establish the blessed Word of God and His Congregation;" and the words of John Knox, who, in reply to the dean of Restalrig's doctrine that the Protestant religion was not legally established in 1560 – an opinion which had been anew advocated by Dr. Rainy in the *Presbyterian,* or by a writer under the sanction of his name said, in 1563, "I hear some say that we have nothing of our religion established, neither by law nor Parliament. The speaker, for treason committed against God and this poor commonwealth, deserves the gallows." (Laughter.) Mr. Moody Stuart also referred to Andrew Melville's interview with King James, and to the struggle for independence in 1638. Proceeding to take up the terms of his overture, and commenting upon the assertions of Dr. Buchanan in last Assembly, he said that clearly the doctrine of a Confession that leaves Establish- 481
ment outside is precisely identical with the Articles of Agreement, and enters essentially and inseparably into the present basis of union which, therefore, cannot possibly stand unless the Confession of Faith either now omits, or shall be altered so as to omit, the doctrine of the civil establishment of religion. The real state of the case as regarded the form of his overture was this: – He consented to the proposed articles in 1867 only on account of the explanations then given by the convener and members of the committee who drew up those articles, and he concurred in their interpretation of the Confession in accordance with the explained articles. He now objected to the articles, because the convener and members of the Union Committee have retracted the explanations by which they procured his consent; and he solemnly protested against their new interpretation of the Confession, by which they justify their new explanation of the articles. The simple way of meeting this state of things would be by an overture to the Assembly to withdraw their confidence from the committee; but this would be contrary to his feelings towards all the members of the committee. He went on to examine in detail the statements of Dr. Candlish, Dr. Rainy, and other members of assembly, whose opinion was that the doctrine of establishments of religion was not asserted in the Confession of Faith. The whole article in the 23rd chapter, he held, proceeds on the clear supposition of an Established Church. What steps, he asked, can the magistrate take to keep the truth pure and entire in the Church, except he has first officially recognised and ratified the truth as determined by the Church? What steps could he take for the suppression of heresy in all the Dissenting Churches in Edinburgh? Supposing every dissenting minister in the town were to preach as a Dutch minister did a few years ago, that "Jesus Christ never came down from heaven, never ascended to heaven, and will never return from heaven," how could the magistrate interfere? What title could he have to call Synods and Assemblies, and "take order to suppress the heresy," by complaining to the Courts of the Church? How does he know officially that that is heresy with us, and what right has he to inquire? To award property as a civil judge in complaints brought before him for a breach of contract between two Church parties is not suppressing heresy, for if the articles of the Church were Socinian he would be bound as a judge to uphold the heresy. That is also only to decide on a complaint brought before him, but the province which the Assembly assigns to the magistrate is to make the complaint to the Synod. In order to do that, he must both have a creed before him to enable him to know what heresy is, and he must have an officially recognised Church to whom he may appeal, and a legally sanctioned Church Court which be may summon for the purpose. The doctrine of an Establishment is not – as was said by Dr. Candlish – an inference from the 23rd chapter, but is the evident and absolutely essential framework into which the whole article is interwoven. Passing on to the last part of his overture – that "the Confession plainly lays down the duty of the magistrate to establish the true religion" –Mr. Moody Stuart remarked that establishment is said to be "outside the Confession" because its framers have not employed the word "established," but the equivalent, interchangeable, and slightly stronger word "settled." That a man of general education should read the sentence without being arrested by the word and apprehending its meaning, is very conceivable. But that its meaning should be overlooked or denied in our General Assembly is alike unaccountable and inexcusable; for it is one of the commonest of all ecclesiastical terms, and its meaning "established by law," or "fixed by legal and ecclesiastical sanctions," is everywhere recognised by our ecclesiastical writers without the occurrence of a doubt in their minds. The most accurate of them all, Dr. McCrie, habitually uses it. What-

ever is approved by the Church and ratified by the State is, in ecclesiastical language, "settled." A full settlement includes both, but nothing is "settled" that is not ratified by legal sanctions. He went minutely into this question, and affirmed that he had proved that "fixed by legal sanctions" is the common and received, if not the universal and only meaning of the word "settled" as used in the formal documents of Church and State during the Westminster period; its meaning as then used in the acts of our own Assembly and our own Parliament; as used by the English Parliament in calling the Westminster Assembly, in formally conferring with the Assembly, and in ratifying the Assembly's decisions; as used by Charles I in transacting with that Parliament, and by that Parliament in transacting with him; as used by Charles II in transacting with the Scottish Commissioners, and by the Scottish Commissioners in transacting with him; as used by our Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, as well as by those who sent them; as used by the Westminster Assembly itself in three other formal documents; and finally, as used in the Revolution Settlement establishing the Westminster Confession. The man who will demand further evidence would not be persuaded if one of the Westminster divines were to rise from the dead to assure him of the Assembly's meaning. (Laughter.) Taking now a calm review of the entire article on the civil magistrate – said Mr. Moody Stuart in conclusion – and reading along with it the assertions made by honored and beloved brethren, that apart from mere inference there is nothing like the doctrine of Establishments in the Confession of Faith, and that Establishments have been left outside of that Confession, I cannot but "withstand them to the face because they are to be blamed." I desire that no hard or bitter word may escape from my lips, for assuredly there is neither in my heart; yet I reluctantly recall the words of the venerable McCrie regarding those who explained away the Confession of Faith in his time; and I am constrained in sadness to say, after him, 'that these bold and unaccountable allegations have struck at the root of all certainty as to any knowledge of sentiments conveyed by the plainest and most unequivocal expressions.' Since last Assembly, I know of three members of the Free Church (not of my own congregation) who have left her communion, whose pecuniary support is the least part of the

Church's loss, although one of them was a most liberal contributor to her funds, both before and since the Disruption, an old friend of my own, whose loss fills me with sorrow, though not with surprise; the bitter first-fruits of a fast ripening harvest of grief in the mowing down of innumerable lifelong friendships beneath the stroke of a scythe bearing the sacred name of love written on its bright but cruel blade. It is now, I fear, only a question of time with ten thousands of our people; whose voice does not reach the ears of our leaders, but who are deeply feeling that the most faithful adherents to the principles in which our Church has so assiduously and so earnestly trained them from the beginning, are just those who are wounded now in the house of their friends; taught and instructed and entreated, year by year, and month by month, here a little and there a little, by those very pastors who, after their flocks have lovingly imbibed their teachings, now turn upon them for learning those lessons too well and retaining them too faithfully. The Confession of Faith is not the Bible; if it is wrong let us alter it. But meanwhile let us 'not suffer our mouth to cause our flesh to sin;' let us not deny with our lips what we have subscribed with our right hands. Yet, before we change our Confession, let us remember well the men by whom it was written, and with what pains and prayers in every clause and every word. Within the last six months the Head of the Church has given us various tokens, from which we may certainly gather that in the 48
progress towards union He is no longer going before us in the pillar of the cloud to show us the way, and that it is now full time for the Church to pause and to wait for some happier day to resume her journey. I instance three. First, the impossibility, becoming more evident every day, of advancing to union without breaking ourselves in pieces.. When, in our Assembly of 1863, we were filled with the spirit of love to each other, as well to all the members of Christ, how should we have shuddered and shrunk from the thought of dragging our Church through briers and thorns, and leaving a large portion of it behind, including not a few of our most honored brethren, for the sake of joining a new company, however respected, outside our fold. But our leaders reply that nothing is further from their intention, that they are guiding the movement safely, and that, if it become necessary, they will speak the word and arrest the whole movement before any possible rupture. And who gave them this power and this authority? Is there omnipotence in their arm, that they may drive the chariot to the very edge of the precipice, and suddenly check it on the fatal brink? Will their followers, trained in their altered views, and carrying them further than themselves, if once within sight of their expected prize, listen to their voice when repenting too late, and calling on them to halt? Will they not, against their better wills and calmer counsels, carry them irresistibly forward until our chariot of the wood of Lebanon, with its silver pillars and golden seat, and the midst thereof once paved with love, shall have been dashed in pieces on the rock of a miscalled union? The brethren who have opposed the present proposals may have erred, they may have taken steps tending to division, may have been hasty in their threats of disruption, may have recompensed evil for what they counted evil by scattering bitter words abroad. But one thing is certain, that while others are declining from the old paths, they have taken their stand on the very spot of our great Disruption; and this I venture to predict, that the name of the man, be he who he may, will not go down with honor to coming generations, who will dare with sacrilegious hands to drive his brethren or his fathers from ground consecrated by one of the noblest sacrifices which the Church on earth has ever been privileged to offer to her Head in Heaven. (Applause.) A second token that the Lord is not going before us now in this enterprise is, that within the last six months our noble and ever to be honored leaders are no longer themselves, or rather are not themselves now for a time, and in this single matter of union, which seems to have beguiled them and cut the locks of their strength and left them weaker than other men. Many of us remember those devoted and princely men, when the Lord himself led their way, and his glory was their rereward. We remember how darkness was made light before them, and crooked things straight. How often, when our Church was in perplexity and fear, when some new difficulty had suddenly arisen in her path, they stood up and unravelled every intricacy, and broke every snare. How, when some truth of God lay hid beneath a baffling surface, and their comrades knowing it to be there, could none of them dig it out, they pierced its secret mine, brought forth the fine gold of the sanctuary, and held it up pure and bright in the sight of all the people. How, in weakness and trembling, they spoke with demonstration of the Spirit and in power, for the Lord gave them a mouth and wisdom which all their enemies were not able to gainsay nor resist, and suffered none of their words to fall to the ground. How, times without number, the Church was relieved and rejoiced, the enemy was confounded and silenced, and the community looked on with admiring wonder. How we loved them, how we thanked them, how we clung to them! How we love them now, and cleave to them to our dying day! But now, in

her sorely bewildered and benighted path, when more than ever the Church is in need of such guides, their reason has fallen into sophistry, their insight into hair-splitting, their history into fancy, their unanswerable statements into groundless assertions, their well studied creeds into creations of their own fancy, their ready memory into forgetfulness of their mother tongue; and all in tampering with the Confession of their Faith, in attempting to deface and render illegible for the generations to come those lines of truth which both they themselves and our fathers, and our fathers' fathers were wont to read without a hesitating word, while none muttered a doubt of their manifest meaning. 'O thou that art named the House of Jacob, is the Spirit of the Lord straitened, are these His doings? Do not my words do good to him that walketh uprightly?' Does the noble cause of union require such expedients for its support? Have not its present advocates already lost their faith in its divine origin and sure success, when they suffer themselves to be driven to such resources? And is not this the voice of these signs in our camp, 'Go not up, O Israel, for the Lord is not in the midst of you?' A third token of the Lord's absence is that the advocates of union have run hastily into a snare, from which they can never recover themselves except by abandoning the false position in which they now stand. They cannot go forward on their present line and preserve faith with the Church; but they must give up either 1867 or 1868. In 1867 they pressed to the vote and carried a resolution for the Articles of Agreement, on the ground that the one open question in the Articles and in the Confession of Faith was endowment. In 1868 they for the first time plainly informed the Church that in that resolution it was not endowment only that was carried as an open question, but also Establishment; not merely endowed Establishment, but Establishment whether endowed or not; and that this being open in the Articles was open likewise in the Confession. There was no intention to mislead the Church, and no consciousness of having misled it; but not the less on that account the Church was misled by their representation of the case, and could not avoid being misled except by discrediting their repeated and earnest assurances that the question at issue was on the point of endowments. It was no deceit, but it was an irremediable and a fatal blunder, the skaith of which must in all honor and in all justice fall on those who committed it, and not on

the Church against whom it was committed. The advocates of union must either retract their declarations in last Assembly, and return to endowment as the only open question in the Articles and in the Confession; or else they must ask the Church to cancel the resolutions of the previous Assembly, which they carried upon that representation. One or other of these is the only honorable course now open to them; either of the two will remove the negotiations from their present footing; but, however painful that may be, it will not deter upright men from adhering to their own words on which they caused others to rest, even if they have uttered them to their own hurt. Would to God that our Church were wise at last, before it be forever too late! In many things we offend all, and none of us hath a right to condemn his brother. We who have hitherto sat still, saying little and doing nothing in this great cause, have no, better title to censure those who have borne the burden and heat of the day than the ploughman sitting with folded arms beside the furrow has to cast a stone at his hard working fellow who has failed to cut the furrow straight. Those of us who have opposed union have not been blameless in our opposition; and those of us who have advocated it have not discovered the time when we should have given over or intermitted our pleadings. Shall we not say again, Let there be no strife between us, for we are brethren? Will not Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Candlish, Dr. Brown, and Dr. Rainy, 483
say to Dr. Begg, Dr. Wood, Dr. Forbes, and Doctor Gibson, We have striven enough now; we have made a hard effort for a noble end, and we confess with sorrow that we have failed; to press it further is to purchase union at the price of love. For the present, therefore, we shall let it go. We are thankful for misconceptions cleared, for jealousies removed, for esteem enhanced, for bonds of love made fast between us and our brethren in the sister Church, but we leave now our labors for a calmer and a brighter day. We commit them as seed sown to the earth, with the prayer that the Lord may quickly grant them a better resurrection; that what we have sown in tears others, and we hope ourselves, may yet reap in a harvest of joy, when throughout our beloved fatherland we shall obtain a nearer approach to that blessed day when "there shall be one Lord, and His name One." (Applause.)

In supporting the motion, Dr. Begg illustrated the change which the Free Church leaders have undergone by quoting the following passage from a speech of Dr. Guthrie's at Arbroath, in 1834, in defence of Church Establishments: – And this is the blessed Voluntary system! I wonder not that the infidel and atheist should wish it established, but how these reverend gentlemen should do so is perfectly amazing. If my native land, Sir, is to be so unchristianised – if these men beside me are to persevere in their work of unchristian demolition – (laughter) – then, Sir, I will fight to my last breath for the Church of Scotland, and would hold it a better fate to perish in its defence than survive its downfall, and see the broad banner that John Knox unfurled trampled in the dust, under the heel of the Voluntary. (Laughter.) After these facts, I will not insult the understanding of this Assembly by reasoning upon them. They speak for themselves; and across the waves of the broad Atlantic they send my countrymen a voice of solemn warning to beware of these men who would seduce them from the faith of their fathers. "My soul came not thou into their secret, with them mine honor be not thou united." Their motto is "Ruin," mine is "Reform;" theirs is the Edomite cry "Rase it," mine is "Repair it." (Laughter.) They have taken us, Sir, at a disadvantage, they knew that we were repairing the breaches which patronage had made in our walls, for never did they cry "Rase it," till we cried "Reform it." They flattered themselves, perhaps, that when our hands were already engaged, in repairing our Jerusalem, we should fall an easy prey to their attack, but they shall find, Sir, that we can do as the Israelites were ready to do of old, while we build up the breach with the one hand we can smite down the enemy with the other. (Great laughter.) Dr. Begg next said that even if Established Churches were overthrown it would not make any difference to him. He would still stand by the principle of establishments. If it were lost, the result would be a revolution of the most dangerous kind. He was opposed to indiscriminate endowments, to prelacy, and to Erastianism, but he was not to be carried away by the revolutionary cry which had been raised at the present day. In conclusion, he contended that the liberty and unity of the Church cannot be maintained except along with the establishment principle. He believed that the question of the liberty of the Church would rise more than ever in a very short period. The overthrow of Establishments would not settle the question. The magistrate must either be on the side of truth or the Church had no chance. The maintenance of an Established Church was the only real ground of toleration. If they came down from their high ground and joined the Voluntaries in holding principles equally unscriptural and untenable, instead of making a greater stride towards liberty they would betray the cause of three centuries, and the Free Church, which had stood before the world such a noble beacon of truth, would become degraded in the eyes of nations.

An amendment having been moved to the effect that the overture should not be transmitted, the question of its transmission was put to the vote, when 31 voted for and 31 against transmitting it. The Moderator giving his casting vote against the transmission of it, the amendment was carried.

---

## ESTABLISHMENT PRINCIPLE.

(*Continued from page 459.*)

6. It may impress the multitude with a higher appreciation of the value and importance of the Establishment principle, to give *a faithful representation of the practical working of the opposite principle of Voluntaryism.* We cannot do this better than in the glowing language of the late Dr. McCrie. "What would be the consequence," he asks, "of rulers or their subjects, either apart or in conjunction, making the attempt to change, or actually changing, the frame of their government, and the system of their laws, so as to conform them to these (Voluntary) principles? Every constitution in Christendom must be taken to pieces and altered, in as far as any particular religion (the best reformed not excepted), obtains a legal preference and support. Public securities and privileges in behalf of Protestant Churches, obtained at vast expense, would all at once be annulled. Settled provision for maintaining religious institutions, or any mode of Christian instruction by law, would be withdrawn. Fundamental laws in particular states, the social compact, in as far as religion is comprehended in it, with coronation oaths for maintaining the religion of a nation, must be swept away as rubbish. *The great charter securing universal liberty or license of conscience would come instead of then all* . . . . Were we to speak of the ferment and combustion which this revolution would introduce into the political world, with the previous and violent conflict with the old and established principles of government on this subject, and of the disorder, discord, anarchy, and profligacy which would spring from the new order of things; the description, although justified by the reason of the thing, and the former history of mankind, might be regarded as exaggerated by those who *cannot trace principles to their native consequences,* and who are not aware of the mutual retroactive influence of religion and government . . . . It (Voluntaryism) tends to make people disaffected with, perhaps, the best and soundest part of the institutions under which they may live, and to cause them disdainfully to reject the benefit,

and throw off the restraint of salutary laws. It unduly limits civil authority in the sphere of its operation, and disables it from discharging one principal part of its official duty, which, according to the Word of God, and the doctrine of Protestants, is to 'maintain *piety*,' as well as 'justice and peace.'"

That the ultimate tendency of these (Voluntary) principles may become more apparent, Dr. McCrie goes on to say: "Let us apply them to the political system of our own country. . . All laws ratifying the Protestant religion in Britain, or even recognising Christianity and the Bible, must be set aside. The whole series of laws approving, confirming, and establishing the Presbyterian religion with the liberties and privileges of the Church in Scotland, . . . . must be given up with, and exchanged *for the visionary and undescribed liberty of all religious professions* . . . . . The public provision settled by law for maintaining divine ordinances and religious instructions must be withdrawn, wholly secularised, and applied to the more laudable and useful purposes of making roads, or constructing bridges, paying subsidies, or carrying on wars . . . . Public institutions for education, as far as they have religion for their object, and as securities respecting the religious principles of teachers are appointed by government, would also be abolished;



as implying that the promoting of religion belonged to civil authority, and impinging on the cornerstone of the new scheme, that, 'in matters purely religious, civil rulers have no right to judge for any but themselves.' . . . . However much such a scheme of government and reformation may be now cried up as sound policy, essential to the liberties of mankind, and necessary to secure the spirituality of Christ's kingdom; for our part, we do not see how it can be freed from impiety and rebellion against the Lord and his anointed. Its language is too like to that of them who said, 'Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us;' it is a refusal to obey the divine command, to 'serve the Lord, the Son,' which is addressed to nations as well as individuals. It would be an *irreligious,* an *ungodly,* an *unchristian reformation.* If adopted by Britain, instead of reviving the spirit, and prosecuting the ends of former reformations, *it would blot out her name from among the nations of Christendom,* and would expose her to the merited reprobation addressed by God to His ancient people. 'Pass over the isles of Chittim, and see and send unto Kedar, and consider diligently, and see if there be such a thing. Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? but my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit. Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord.'

The terrible consequences of the triumph of Voluntaryism, as thus pictured by Dr. McCrie, are just such as we might naturally expect, if it is a device of the great enemy, as maintained by Dr. Robert Buchanan, more than thirty years ago. Having the same original with the Man of sin, it will have a similar mission and destiny." . . . .

This opinion of Dr. Buchanan, as to the parentage of Voluntaryism, had been expressed long before by Mr. Willison, of Dundee, and the late Dr. McCrie, neither of whom can be justly charged with having any other end to serve in what they recorded but the interests of truth; and neither of them ever saw cause to alter his deliberately formed judgment regarding that system. Like the masterpiece of the great enemy, it may be expected to adapt itself to existing circumstances; but for any man, who has recorded it as his deliberate opinion *that Voluntaryism is of Satan,* to imagine that a change in its mode of expressing itself is indicative of a .change in its *essential character,* so that it may be now regarded with favor, is to manifest great, if not wilful, ignorance of the enemy's devices. Let us hear the .opinion of Dr. McCrie and Mr. Willison, which deserve to be seriously pondered by all the lovers of truth, as distinguished from the lovers of sentiment in these days. Dr. McCrie says: 'If the grand enemy of the Church cannot carry the citadel by force, he will attempt it by negotiation, will commence the herald of *toleration and liberty of conscience,* and persuade Christians to demolish those outworks by which their privileges were guarded, *to remove all external barriers and restraints, and grant the same free scope and countenance to his kingdom* in its various forms of idolatry, superstition, infidelity, damnable errors, and delusions, *that are granted to the kingdom of the Lord Jesus.* It is the masterpiece of his art to prevail upon the friends of religion, with whatever view, to promote the same design with the emissaries of antichrist and the apostles of infidelity.' How true to the present day. Again Mr. Willison says: 'What can we reckon it but another subtle stratagem of that envious enemy of our happy Reformation, who, when he sees it is not practicable to get the Beast's wound healed, by making direct attacks upon it, and the great truths thereby established, goes about to make breaches in the necessary hedges of order and government, and would throw down all the valuable fences of these truths such as *National Churches,* Confessions of Faith, covenants, formulas, *human laws in favor of religion, the magistrate's power* CIRCA SACRA , . . . And in

order to get these ramparts of our Reformation the more effectually demolished, the most taking and plausible pretexts are invented *for catching serious people* – such as, *What are all these but the inventions of men*? *There is no warrant for them in the New Testament*; *they are inconsistent with the nature of Christ's kingdom* . . . . His spiritual kingdom is not to be supported or promoted by means of earthly power . . . . The devil cannot take a shorter course to undo religion or to let in a hellish flood of Arianism, Popery, Deism, or Atheism among us than by propagating these principles. How can any heart that is zealous for God but loathe and abhor them?" Will men not ponder these weighty words of that godly man, and pause in their infatuated career in favor of Voluntaryism in any form, which is nothing less than a fatal crusade against the whole work of national Reformation?" – *Watchword.*

---

## POPERY AS IT AFFECTS THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT.

We regard it as a circumstance of no small importance, that in our parliament the aims and influence of Popery are now from time to time described in the most explicit terms. The members by whom they are thus described, and who take the lead in resisting the encroachments of the Church of Rome, merit the gratitude of the colony. Among these Mr. Parkes occupies the most conspicuous place, and our readers will perceive from the following extract from a speech delivered by Mr. John Stewart, on Wednesday the 17th instant, that in that gentleman he has a courageous and thoroughgoing fellow labourer.

"It was well known that Mr. Parkes had made some powerful enemies in this country. He had incurred the enmity of a powerful organisation which he called a conspiracy, not for the purposes of treason and assassination, although these things came out of it, but for the purpose of keeping people in the dark. (Hear, hear.) He had incurred the hatred of this organisation, because he was the first man in the colony who said that the children should be withdrawn from the grasp of the people who composed this organisation. This organisation had conspired with some members of this House to endeavour to banish this dangerous opponent from public life. The organisation to which he had alluded had managed to master, by seducing one-third of the population of this colony, but that was not sufficient to satisfy

them. In fact, they were never satisfied. This organisation endeavoured to keep men down as labourers all their lives, and women as servant girls. Their struggle, from first to last, was for dominion; they endeavoured to obtain the power to control numbers of individuals; but although they wanted to rule they did not take the trouble of government upon their shoulders. They preferred to stand behind and see some secular authority performing the disagreeable duties of the government Whenever this body were refused their demands, and they were insatiable, they began to instil sedition into the minds of the people. This body, from first to last, kept the people in the dark, made them pay their taxes, which they called by other names than taxes, and when they could not master the Government in the same way, they commenced to foment sedition against the Government. Openly, this body was always in favor of the Government so long as they got their way. All this Fenianism came out of this school. There were English Fenians, Irish Fenians, and American Fenians, but there were no Protestant Fenians; or Jew Fenians, or Mahommedan Fenians, or Hindoo Fenians. (Hear, hear.) The Fenian was always a Roman Catholic. (Hear, hear.) When it was convenient to this organisation after instilling poison into the minds of the people they left them in the lurch. They were told that this organisation had no sympathy 485
with Fenianism. What was the case in regard to this man O'Farrell when in gaol? An ordinary culprit would have been left there with the service of an ordinary priest; hut this criminal was visited by the Archbishop himself, who had a private interview with him. He was visited by the Sisters of Charity and by Father Dwyer. He was made a martyr of! This man should have been buried in the 'felons' corner,' in Haslem's Creek, and a grave was opened for him there. But the funeral was attended by Father Dwyer and Father John, and they said it would never do to bury him in unconsecrated ground! They were prepared to render the full service of the Church over him. A grave was opened in the consecrated ground, and this atrocious criminal was interred there with all the honours the Church could bestow. The priests were more particular about him than they would have been in the case of the interment of an ordinary labouring man. And yet those people told us they had no sympathy with Fenians! There was the news from Hokitika. There was also the case of a journal weekly dosing the people with poison. Week after week the *Freeman's Journal* came out with seditious poison, pretending to be the organ of the Catholic laity, while it was only the organ of the Catholic Church, for the purpose of misleading the people. When a cry of indignation was raised it was moderated, and the authorities of the Church said, 'The journal is not ours; we do not approve of those articles, and have no part in it.' But every one knew that that journal was under the control and direction of the ecclesiastical authorities, and not intended for the laity at all, except for the purpose of misleading them. When the foundation stone of the cathedral was laid, the *Freeman's Journal* was the honoured journal. It was put in the cavity of the stone, but there was not a word about the *Protestant Banner*. (Continued laughter.) The Government, headed by the hon. member for Murrumbidgee were siding with that party and getting all the assistance they could from them. They obtained private information from 'Father' this and 'Father' that – no doubt for a purpose – and for a purpose which they ought to be ashamed of, for they really had no sympathy with Fenians or with schools of Fenianism. They expected to be carried at the head of the poll at the next general election, and that was why they *professed* to sympathise for it was no less than a direct falsehood. Some were so intimidated by this powerful body, that not one in one hundred dared to say what he thought of this body or its decisions. If he offered an opinion, the cry was 'Hush! don't excite religious bigotry.' When-ever a person spoke of the Catholic Church misleading its people, the cry was raised that he was against the whole Catholic community, when at the very moment he might be in favor of it. In fact they had no defenders except the Protestants.

The following brief extract from the speech delivered by Mr. Parkes, on Tuesday, the 16th instant, describes an alarming but actually existing state of things. “There was a party in public life afraid of incurring the disapprobation of the Roman Catholic body. We knew very well that this body of the electors formed so important and compact a mass that generally they could turn the tide in an election; and we found public men continually paying court to them – men who entertained towards them feelings of hostility, and in their private lives expressed such feelings, yet courting them to obtain their support on the hustings; and thus this particular element in our electoral body was made at once an engine of mischief and the means of gratifying a weak and distempered ambition.”

---

## CONTINUATION OF MR. MACPHERSON'S LETTER – MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

But we must hurry on. In December, 1867, Mr. Rae was set-

tled in St. Andrew's, Geelong, over the congregation left without a pastor by the death of the late Rev. A. Love. In January, 1868, came off the Shakespearian exhibition. In February the testimonials were in progress, And thus we have come up to date.

No doubt the publication of the testimonials must have given a prodigious impetus to the rumours above alluded to, for by the report of Presbytery, which sat in the beginning of March, it appears that the genial, the warm hearted Rae, had been sailing under false colors. He had “been guilty of falsehood in representing himself to be a widower, while Mrs. Rae is alive; and expressed deep contrition for his sin.” This confession of Mr. Rae had been laid before the Presbytery on the 4th February. Here then appears a plain case, which may be settled very briefly, but notice that the Rev. Irving Hetherington has been requested to be present to give advice on some points of form. As the business proceeds, Rev. A. J. Campbell moves, and Rev. T. McK. Fraser seconds the motion, that “looking at the gravity of Mr. Rae's sin, and the deep injury he has inflicted upon this Church and the interests of religion resolve to suspend – as they hereby do suspend – him from all the functions of the Ministry for three months, commencing at date of the meeting of Presbytery on the 11th January last.” Thus about a month was actually over; and one would have thought that, after the expression of deep contrition, Mr. Rae would have thanked the Presbytery for their leniency. Not so, however. One member of Presbytery moved simply for an admonition. Mr. Rae himself appealed against the sentence, and, curious enough, the advertisement of his tenth lecture on the Pilgrim's Progress was in the papers on the very day that the Presbytery met.

But what of the names so closely associated with Mr. Rae in this matter? His quondam fellow reader of Shakespeare, Mr. Fraser, seconds the motion of suspension. Mr. Fraser was still in the mire of the clerical scandal which had offended the more godly and pious members of his own congregation, as well as others of the more religious amongst the general public. With what solemn earnestness, with what deep feeling Mr. Fraser must have dwelt on the statement of the injury inflicted upon the Church and the interests of religion! The mover was the Rev. A. J. Campbell – the scandal was telling lies. According to all the fitnesses of things, a scandal of this

kind ought to sit very lightly on the Church founded on systematic deception and diplomacy.

Curiously enough, about this very time, Mr. Campbell rendered himself chargeable with sailing very near the wind in a public notice which he sent to the *Government Gazette.* He gave his name as Moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly to vouch for the truth of the statement, that the Free Presbyterian Church had joined the Union. The circumstances precluded the possibility of Mr. Campbell not knowing that this statement contained just as much of what was false as of what was true, for there were two sections, one of which had joined, the other having refused to abandon its position and testimony. No doubt unscrupulous and untruthful conduct, accompanied with a rude kind of vigour, is often found to prosper in the world. It has been sometimes found, that one dishonest transaction, where much is at stake, secures a fortune. The prize is won, and people soon appear to forget how it was won. Success hides a multitude of sins. But will the cause of truth and righteousness be advanced in this way? I cannot believe so. I cannot believe that the Temple of Truth will be indebted for support at any point to the arts of deception. I believe that, however good men may fall into snares in these matters, when all the chaff and the dross are 486
cleared away, it will be found that whatsoever maketh a lie is utterly alien from the cause of God, and will be conclusively dissociated from it. If you allow me to flatter myself that I may deceive my neighbour, impose upon him, and dexterously turn him to account, under the impression that thereby I am working out the interests of the kingdom of Christ, then I know not when I am to stop. The result soon appears – the old oft tried device of setting up the kingdom of God by fire and sword. But not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord. That Spirit is eminently a Spirit of Truth. It was under his guidance that the exhortation was given – Speak the truth every man to his neighbour. I ask the question point blank – Can Mr. Campbell himself in that matter be acquitted of the charge of barefaced equivocation? With what deep feeling he must have reproved the errant Rae!

But we must return to the course of events. Mr. Rae declines to submit to the decision of the Presbytery, and to make it plain that there was no suspension of the functions of the ministry, the newspapers contain advertisements to the effect that he is to do duty on Sabbath – subjects of discourse to be "God," and "the Twilight of Life." How eloquently Mr. Rae sets forth the real character of his "deep contrition" for his sin!

In May the matter comes before the Commission of Assembly. We are told that a long and animated discussion took place, and was adjourned till another day. Rev. A. Robertson moved that the appeal be dismissed, the decision of the Presbytery affirmed, that Mr. Rae be called on to withdraw his reasons of appeal, and there upon to be rebuked by the Moderator. Rev. Geo. Mackie moved – Dismiss the appeal, confirm the judgment of the Presbytery, and suspend Mr. Rae for two month. Rev. J. Hetherington moved – Sustain the appeal, and direct that the Moderator administer a solemn rebuke to Mr. Rae. Mr. Mackie's motion was carried. We now begin to see a little daylight through the movements. The sin of telling lies in the Presbyterian Church, it appears, can be expiated by two months' rustication. Not only so, but some besides Mr. Rae evidently think even that penalty too severe. Amongst these is Mr. Hetherington, the arch-diplomat and architect of the Union. Perhaps the Presbytery of Geelong have rued the day that they called in the aid of Mr. Hetherington on points of form. Mr. Rae was dissatisfied and appealed against the decision to the Assembly, which did not meet till November. Meanwhile Mr. Rae carries on all his ministerial functions in spite of both Presbytery and Commission of Assembly, to the great scandal of all truth and religion. The General Assembly holds its annual meeting in November, but the irrepressible Rae could not wait quiet all that time. At the meeting of Presbytery in August, there was notice of a *fama* against him. This was at a meeting on the 4th. At another on the 18th, Mr. Rae was not present, but forwarded a medical certificate of illness. A course of investigation, however, appears to have been gone through, and notwithstanding his absence, the Presbytery resolved to proceed by libel against him, suspending him in the meantime from all the functions of the ministry. Mr. Rae had one friend to dissent, and resorted to his old effectual course of protesting and appealing to the General Assembly. As a qualifier to the proceedings of the Presbytery, an advertisement appeared in the newspaper, intimating that, owing to Mr. Rae's illness, and the difficulty of getting supply, there would be no service on the next Sabbath. All idea of submission to the Presbytery is thus very ingeniously set aside. Also you will notice, that by taking time by the forelock, Mr. Rae caused the whole case to be hung up before the process by libel could be entered upon. Time passes, and the earlier days of November, just immediately before the meeting of Assembly, are signalised by the public notice of a handsome present to Mr. Rae from his congregation. There is

a purse of sovereigns, buggy harness, a whip, and pair of spurs. Of course there is some speech making, and very high compliments are paid to Mr. Rae. The reverend gentleman himself made acknowledgements in ordinary course, with the serio-comical assurance that be felt his responsibility as a minister of the Gospel more than people imagined! We also find him amongst the "daughters of Temperance" giving readings. On the 18th November his case comes on, and we notice that the second charge by the Presbytery is intemperance. His grounds of appeal are, (1) the decision was against evidence; (2) his suspension would damage the interests of the congregation; (3) the Presbytery might abuse its power of suspending indefinitely. On the motion of Dr. Cairns the appeal was dismissed, the resolution of Presbytery to proceed by libel rescinded, and the Presbytery instructed to proceed *de novo.* In the case of denying that he was a married man, Dr. Cairns moved that Presbytery and Commission did their duty in suspending Mr. Rae, and therefore dismiss the appeal. Such are the two cases. The case of confessed lying passed through all three stages of gradation – Presbytery, Commission of Assembly, and the Assembly itself. For this grave offence Mr. Rae was suspended for virtually two months, and managed by skilful arrangements to push aside the operation of the sentence for eight or nine months. The Presbytery and Commission were fairly thwarted in the execution even of the slender amount of duty which they took upon themselves. The case is made, by adventitious circumstances, to present the appearance of a hard fought battle, the result of which was doubtful for a long time, instead of a most simple and yet flagrant case demanding immediate discipline. It is plain that Mr. Hetherington's policy was successful in the case. Was not that an exquisite touch? The Presbytery might abuse its power of suspending indefinitely! Who had abused the power of appealing indefinitely? Surely the hand of Joab is here! It is certainly remarkable how Mr. Hetherington has escaped so well hitherto, notwithstanding the painful consciousness which more than Dr. Cairns must have of his persevering, insidious, and astute diplomacy. He has managed so well to play off Free Churchmen against Free Churchmen, that while they were breaking each other's heads, he was let alone. He has effected the same kind office for Voluntaries towards Voluntaries. But is there to be no day of reckoning? notice that while Mr. Rae was under the

charge of lying, he celebrated marriages. One would have thought that such a result could scarcely have happened. One might have thought that such a gentleman and scholar as Mr. Rae would have had better taste to say nothing about the genuine workings of "deep contrition for his sin." Also it might have been thought that no parties could be got so regardless of propriety as to apply in such a quarter for the celebration of the marriage ceremony. And still farther, Mr. Rae's license to celebrate marriages at all during this period was in the hands of the Moderator, Rev. A. J. Campbell. Here was a point at which Mr. Rae's tactics, or rather Mr. Hetherington's, could have been checkmated. Mr. Campbell had only to send notice to the Registrar-General that Mr. Rae's license be cancelled, so far as celebrating marriages was concerned, and the unseemliness which has actually taken place would have been prevented. There are occasions on which Unionists are very sharp on these points. Time was when the lic-ense to marry, in the case of Rev. Alexander McIntyre, was stopped in this colony at the instance of such as the Rev. A. McVean!! No doubt there was a difference in the cases that materially bore upon Unionists. Mr. McIntyre's offence, and the offence of the friends with him, was unwavering attachment to the position and testimony of the Free Presbyterian Church. This is a crime not to be forgiven, when Dr. Cairns and others have found



the worldly pressure against a faithful testimony so strong, that they have been obliged to make concessions – so they mildly designate their apostasy. In such circumstances, faithfulness to testimony is an unpardonable offence. On the other hand, the offence is merely telling lies and alleged drunkenness. For telling lies Dr. Cairns considers two or three months suspension sufficient. Not so did the reverend doctor consider the offence of Messrs. Paul and others some time ago. The audacity of holding on firmly when the valorous doctor had let go, must be visited by expulsion from the body. It is easy to see in what direction the tender mercies of Unionists are to be regarded as leaning. We may witness something instructive yet if, for lack of materials, Mr. Hetherington is beginning to exert his peculiar abilities upon Unionists themselves.

The Presbytery of Geelong, according to instructions, have begun the Rae case *de novo.* Column after column appears of the evidence of witnesses pro and con as to whether Mr. Rae was drunk – whether he fell from his horse as a bad rider, or because he was drunk – whether he was talking stupidly because of concussion of the brain, or because of strong drink, &c., &c. Here is a specimen of the amenities developed by the investigation.

*The Rev. Mr. Hill.* – How far was –

*The Rev. Mr. Steele.* – She has already stated.

*Rev. Mr. Hill.* Will you allow me to ask a question, sir? Why do you interrupt me? I am a member of this Presbytery as well as you.

*Rev. Mr. Steele*. – She has answered the question.

*The Chairman.* – Address the chair.

*Rev. Mr. Hill* (to witness). – How far off was the Rev. Mr. Rae when you smelt the drink?

*The Rev. Mr. Steele* again interrupted.

*Rev. Mr. Hill.* – How dare you interrupt me, sir? I have a right to ask the question.

*The Chairman.* – Order, gentlemen, Mr. Hill's question.

I must now close. I thought at one time to have made the Rae case only an item in a brief review of the session of General Assembly, which took place last month. But Mr. Rae was not to he disposed of so easily. If the Assembly be not put out of date by some new development of Unionism, I may yet (D. V.) return to it.

I am, &c.,

PETER McPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, Dec. 10, 1868.

---

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

Manse, Meredith,

February 8th, 1869.

Sir – The following brief addendum to what remains of my letter headed "Moderatism in Victoria," will give the conclusion of the notorious "Rae" case – if you can find room for it. The appended extract will show the state of matters at the close of the Presbyterial investigation: –

"The Rev. T. McKenzie Fraser said that this enquiry had been conducted in a spirit of candour, and he must protest against the insinuations thrown out against himself and the Rev. Mr. Campbell that they were jealous of Mr. Rae and his congregation generally. These imputations were as false as the statements that they were anxious to repress and suppress evidence. They must remember, however, that this was not the first time that Mr. Rae had been similarly charged. (Interruption and hisses from those present, including many of the ladies). He had appeared in Melbourne, and that time escaped only by the casting vote, as Mr. Hetherington knew. [The Rev. Mr. Hetherington: I have no remembrance of it.] They must remember that the *fama* rise [rose?) up on every new charge, and what would not be believed of a man of unblemished reputation causes suspicion of a man who has had previous charges brought against him. He could not say that Mr. Rae had succeeded in thoroughly clearing himself of all the stigma. They must remember that the evidence of one positive witness is worth more than the evidence of a hundred other witnesses. If one man swears he felt drink on a person, and a hundred others swear they did not smell it, the evidence of the one man must be believed, and that of the others be taken for what it is worth. He considered that the defence only warranted them in saying that there was not sufficient evidence for them to proceed further upon.

After some further remarks from Mr. Brownlie the clerk, and other members, the motion was carried.

The Chairman intimated the deliverance of the Presbytery to Mr. Rae, observing that the charge must have been peculiarly distressing to him at the present time, when he is suspended for a time. To any minister having a due appreciation of his office this *fama* must always be very distressing, and suspension especially so; and he felt sure that Mr. Rae was the subject of especial supplication by every members of the Presbytery. The proceedings then terminated." – *Geelong Advertiser,*Dec. 16, 1868.

The case in behalf of Mr. Rae was conducted largely by a lay agent and an ecclesiastical agent, neither of whom were members of the Presbytery. The ecclesiastical agent was Rev. I. Hetherington. These two ably and successfully badgered and humiliated the Presbytery. Also two material witnesses who had given criminating evidence at a former stage now refused to appear. By the decision of the Assembly, the Presbytery had to proceed *de novo.* It was stated in court that a lad whose evidence was categorically falsified by witnesses in behalf of Mr. Rae had been present during part of the proceedings, but when the Presbytery wanted him for examination, it was found that his father had taken him away. This shows there were wheels within wheels in the case. The action of these inner wheels did not transpire. Meanwhile Mr. Rae has been pushed through. The remarks of Mr. Fraser, and the peculiarly soothing (?) observations of the Chairman reduce Mr. Rae to the position of Pyrrhus after a hardly won battle – "One such victory more, and I shall return into Epirus without a soldier."

I am, &c.,
PETER MACPHERSON.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 42. SYDNEY, MARCH 1869.

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. 42 MARCH. Vol. 1

**CONTENTS.**

PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Office of Ruling Elder… … … … … | 489 |
| The Running of Railway Trains on Sabbath… … … | 491 |
| The Past and Present Year … … … … | 491 |
| Heathen Origin of the Popish Worship of Saints … … | 494 |
| Gold and the Gospel … … … … … | 495 |
| Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria … … … | 496 |
| Correspondence: Parliamentary Discussions on Sabbath Trains … | 498 |
| Testimony to the Book of Psalms … … … | 499 |
| Protestant Worship in Madrid … … … … | 499 |

## THE OFFICE OF RULING ELDER.

"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Titus 1: 5.

CHRIST has appointed office-bearers to dispense the ordinances and administer the affairs of the Church. To plant and organise the Church extraordinary office bearers were necessary; and, accordingly, he appointed such office-bearers for that purpose, namely, apostles and evangelists. But, when once the Church was planted and organised, ordinary office-bearers only were required, and the services of extraordinary office-bearers were discontinued.

The first were the only apostles and evangelists. They had no successors in office, as they had no successors to their extraordinary qualifications for their peculiar official functions. And along with the offices the official designations ceased. No class of permanent office-bearers were called apostles or evangelists. Those names were given only to those who originally bore them.

The ordinary and permanent office-bearers of the Church are presbyters or bishops, and deacons. We give *presbyters* and *bishops* as different names for the same class of office-bearers, for nothing can be more evident than that it is thus those terms are used in Scripture. Scripture knows nothing of bishops as an order distinct from presbyters.

Of presbyters there are two classes, – those who teach as well as rule, and those who rule only, the former being usually called teaching, and the latter ruling presbyters or elders. It is with respect to the office of ruling elders that we wish at present to address you.

That, by Christ's institution, there are the two kinds of elders specified, is clearly intimated in the following passage – 1 Tim. 5: 17 – "let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in word and doctrine." Here elders who "rule well" are mentioned, and then, as distinguished from these, elders who "labour in word and doctrine." There is thus a clear reference to the two classes of teaching and ruling elders. To this authority nothing need be added; it is itself conclusive and satisfactory. We may, however, request attention to the conformable language of other passages – Rom. 12: 6-8: "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophesy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness." In this passage "he that teacheth" and "he that ruleth" are separately mentioned. In 1 Cor. 12: 28, we find this distinction preserved in a similar enumeration. "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."

Here we have “teachers” and “governments" separately mentioned.

Ruling elders being an order of office-bearers appointed by Christ, when we propose to have such office-bearers appointed among ourselves the question presents itself to us, What manner of persons they ought to be, or what qualifications are necessary in ruling elders.

Qualifications may be viewed in two lights, – as necessary that the office-bearer may be accepted by Christ in the discharge of his official duties, and as necessary that the Church may be warranted in investing him with his office. Viewed in the former light piety is a necessary qualification. The office-bearer who is destitute of it will not be accepted by Christ in the exercise of his office. The Church, however, is not a competent judge of the existence of piety; it is not, therefore, the actual existence of piety that is necessary that the Church may be warranted in imparting the office in question, but the outward evidence of piety. To warrant the Church to impart the office nothing can be necessary, with respect to which the Church cannot gain full satisfaction, but it cannot gain full satisfaction as to the actual existence of piety, or as to anything farther than the evidence of the existence of it.

However, in directing your consciences with respect to the exercise of the office of ruling elder, it is on what is necessary that this office may be acceptably exercised; and not on what is necessary that it may be warrantably conferred, that we must insist. And that it may be acceptably exercised piety is necessary.



Without piety the office-bearer cannot sympathise with the objects of the office. These are the glory of God, the good of souls, and the welfare of the Church; and it is evident that without piety he cannot prize and seek those objects; and, therefore, in sustaining an office and performing official acts which imply that he prizes and seeks them, he will without piety be guilty of hypocrisy. Without piety he cannot perform the duties of his office wisely. His position will be that of one that is blind performing the duties of a guide. It will be one of his duties to pray with and for those among whom his office is exercised, but how will he perform this duty without piety?

It is, further, a qualification for the office of ruling elder, that one's character be exemplary, and that he have a good report of them that are without. On exemplary character the apostle lays great stress in this context, and in the parallel passage of his 1st Epistle to Timothy, he specifies several blemishes of character, and represents freedom from them as indispensable. He requires that one chosen to be an elder be not soon angry, but patient; that he be not a brawler, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre, not covetous. We may be ready to feel surprised that the apostle carries so low his negative delineation of an elder's character, – his statement of what an elder must not be; but he does so on account of the real prevalence in the heathen communities, to which he immediately refers, of the forms of character which he condemns, and under a sense of the necessity, which arose from their prevalence, that the office-bearers of the Church should specially guard against the remotest approach to them in their own conduct. The apostle thus proceeds upon a principle of great importance and of general application, the principle that the office-bearers of the Church, and by parity of reason the members of it, should, with special care, discountenance by their example the prevalent and distinctive evil practices of those around them. Upon this principle two of the negative features of character indicated by the apostle demand our attention, no less than they demanded the attention of the believing Cretans or the believing Ephesians. By the confession of all, intemperance is exceedingly prevalent in this community, and, being thus prevalent, it must work incalculable mischief to men's temporal and eternal interests. In this community, therefore, it is peculiarly incumbent upon professing Christians that they be “not given to wine,” – that they be in no way implicated in the prevailing intemperance, that they in no way facilitate, countenance, or encourage it, and that they in no way take advantage of it for securing their own ends, or advancing their own interests. Should they not shrink with horror from being caterers to intemperance, supplying the materials for which it creates a demand, and from gratifying, more or less, the craving of the intemperate, that by this means they might conciliate their favour, or secure their support? Another most prevalent and crying sin of our community is covetousness. Professing Christians among us, therefore, should feel as if Christ, directing their attention to the prevalence of this sin, and to the various manifestations of it, said to them emphatically, “be not given to filthy lucre, be not covetous.” There are two effects of covetousness to which we should advert in warning against it. One of these is, that, while in all transactions the claims of truth and integrity should be held sacred and preserved inviolate, it produces an unscrupulous spirit with respect to them, – it leads men to trench upon them, first a very little and tremblingly, then to a greater extent and with less uneasiness, and ultimately, in some cases, to any degree that the desires of a covetous heart may dictate. Hence there is, notoriously, a fearful lack of integrity in the land, and falsehood abounds in every form from perjury downwards – in public announcements and in private represent-

ations, in broad statements and in hints and suggestions, or in deceptive silence and acquiescence. Does it not then become the professed follower of Christ in this community, – the professed followers of him who had not where to lay his head, not only to see to it that they be not covetous or given to filthy lucre, but to keep at a clear and secure distance from those fruits of covetousness – at such a distance that their conduct will reprove them in others.

The other effect of covetousness to which we deem it proper to advert is, that it leads men to encroach upon the Sabbath. Some work upon the Sabbath as they do upon any other day, and that not regretfully and from necessity, but under the influence of a profane and covetous spirit. Others do not go so far. They only read, or, perhaps, also write business letters, or only travel on business, and, perhaps,only perform the return, not the outward, journey; or, if the journey will occupy several days, they are careful that the Sabbath shall not be the first of them. But who does not see that to read or write business letters, and to travel under the miserable limitations which we have mentioned, is as really a worldly employment, and, therefore, as really a desecration of the Sabbath, as the transaction of business under any more direct and palpable form? He that thinks otherwise has reason to suspect his judgment of partiality; if it were unbribed and upright, it would scarcely permit him to practise upon himself so flimsy an imposition. In regard, again, to those fruits of covetousness, does it not become the professed followers of the Lord of the Sabbath to keep at a clear and secure distance from them, – at such a distance that their conduct will reprove them in others.

Let us now turn our attention to the apostle's positive delineation of the exemplary character required in elders. An elder, he says, must be of good behaviour, given to hospitality, a lover of good men, just, holy. It is unnecessary to illustrate those features of character, and equally unnecessary to prove that a character distinguished by them would be highly exemplary.

It is also very evident that the character of an elder should be exemplary. It is brought into close association with the Gospel,

and will be regarded by many as exemplifying the practical effects of the truth. It is thus in a position to recommend the Gospel or excite prejudices against it, – in a position to convey a correct impression or low and erroneous views of personal religion. It is thus sure to be powerfully operative for good or for evil.

Under the guidance of the apostle, we connect with the necessity of an exemplary character in an elder the necessity of his having a good report of them which are without, or of the unconverted. Without this report his usefulness will be greatly impeded, and Christ's cause will proportionally suffer. The apostle mentions as a particular ground, on which he holds a good report of those which are without to be necessary, that without it an elder may fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. The loss by an office-bearer of the respect of those around him is fitted to have a most dilapidating effect upon his character.

Another qualification necessary in a ruling elder is that he be sound in the faith, and well instructed in divine truth. This qualification the apostle distinctly specifies, requiring that an elder hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, inasmuch as he could not otherwise by sound doctrine both exhort and convince the gainsayers. It is an important part of the duty of an elder that he instruct the ignorant; and, that he may be qualified to discharge this duty, it is evident that his own views must be sound and clear. He cannot impart to others the knowledge which he does not himself possess; and he cannot be safely intrusted with the work of instruction, if his views be not decidedly and thoroughly scriptural. It is only by sound doctrine that he can comfort 491
the afflicted, direct the perplexed, confirm the wavering, arouse the lukewarm, animate the languid, and convince gainsayers; and, therefore, it is necessary that he hold sound doctrine.

The value of the truth as an instrument of good, and of the knowledge and love of it as a qualification for office, cannot be easily overrated. No spiritual good can be effected but by means of it, and every due exercise of a spiritual office is but an application of it.

The only other qualification we shall mention is prudence and aptness to rule. He must not be "self-willed," obstinately attached to his opinion, or unreasonably confident of its soundness, that, with a mind fully open to conviction, he may join in consultation with his fellow elders, and may harmoniously co-operate with them. He must be vigilant and circumspect, not rash and precipitate. He must be sober and judicious, not prone to extreme or extravagant views, or ready to substitute his own fancies or impressions for the light and the truth which God has sent forth to guide his people. He should so far prove his aptness to rule by ruling well his own house. For, if he cannot rule his own house, how can he rule the Church of God; and, if he does not rule the former, there is but little prospect that he will be faithful and diligent in ruling the latter. It is the duty of the ruling elder to assist in the government of the Church. Particularly, he is to assist in determining who shall be admitted to sealing ordinances. By the association of ruling elders with the minister in this duty, the minister will be greatly protected from the ill will which he might incur, to the prejudice of his usefulness, if the rejection of the unworthy, were his individual act; and the people will be protected from the tyranny which might be exercised if the power of admission and rejection were placed in the hands of the minister alone. Besides, so far as the faithful performance of the duty in question depends upon moral courage, it will be more faithfully performed by several than by one.

The ruling elder is also to assist in the exercise of discipline. The advantage, on all the grounds just indicated, of the union of several in performing this duty is very evident. It does not, indeed, seem that, without this union, there can be an exercise of discipline at once vigorous and not tyrannical, and in which the people shall acquiesce.

The ruling elder is to "take a careful oversight of the people's morals and religious principles, of the attendance upon public ordinances, and of the state of personal and family religion. To discharge this part of his duty he must visit the families of his district, converse with them, and, in the exercise of a friendly and Christian solicitude for their temporal and eternal welfare, acquaint himself with their spiritual condition, and the manner of life as regards the duties both of religion and of morality."

The ruling elder is to visit the sick in his district, and to engage with them in religious conversation and exercises. He is to assist in the religious instruction of the young, and in forming and conducting meetings for prayer, the reading of the Scriptures, and Christian fellowship.

You may easily see how powerful an instrument for good a Church is when it is fully supplied with its proper office-bearers, and when these are all actively discharging their various duties. Its agency, under the parochial system, pervades the whole population, and assumes every form adapted to the circumstances with which it has to deal, from public ministrations to the most affectionate and delicate offices of private intercourse and sympathy.

When you contemplate a Christian congregation, fully organised and equipped, engaged in its work of Christian philanthropy, can you fail to desire that you yourselves may in every respect be such a congregation. The proper work of a Christian congregation is a glorious work, and it is a work greatly needed in every neigh-

borhood. A Christian congregation engaged in this work, and bringing to bear upon it the whole of the agency which divine institution has supplied, is a beautiful object. Shall not we, my friends, study to maintain the attitude and bear the character of such a congregation?

Are there not some among you whose hearts make them willing to lend this aid, by undertaking the office of elders, to enable us the more thoroughly to occupy the position of such a congregation? Do not some of you feel as if, when the Lord inquires who will engage for him in the work to which we have called your attention, you would say, "Lord, send me." You may be conscious of incompetency, you may be apprehensive as to your own spiritual state. If so, apply to Christ that he may fully rectify your spiritual state, and, depending upon him for grace, come to his help against the mighty.

---

## THE RUNNING OF RAILWAY TRAINS ON THE SABBATH.

That the running of Railway Trains on the Lord's Day, in the absence of any such necessity as the divine legislation recognises, is a sin, and that, inasmuch as the railways of this colony are the property of the public and under the management of the government, the running of trains on them on that day, in the absence of such a necessity, is a national sin, no one who entertains sound views of the claims of the sabbath and national responsibility will deny. Its sinfulness, however, is wholly ignored, and, indeed, virtually denied in the following resolution, moved by Dr. Lang in the Legislative Assembly on the 9th instant. "That in the opinion of this House, the running of Sunday trains on the different railways of the colony being a service of very questionable benefit, and of great expense to the public, should be either wholly, or in great measure discontinued."

If the running of the trains in question is sinful, it cannot be of "benefit;" but all that Dr. Lang ventures to assert is, that it is "of very questionable benefit." He therefore clearly admits that it is

not sinful or at least that it may not be sinful. The same admission is still more decidedly implied in the second of the alternative courses on which he called upon the House to decide, namely, "that the running of Sunday trains," as he calls them, "on the different railways of the colony, . . . . should be in great measure discontinued." The practice, of course, cannot be held to be sinful, of which it is admitted the partial discontinuance may be sufficient.

It may be true that Dr. Lang had but little warrant to expect that the House would resolve to discontinue the running of Sabbath trains, on the ground that the running of them is sinful; but, be this as it may, he ought at the very least, to have guarded in framing his resolution, against admitting or even appearing to admit that it is not sinful. This he has egregiously, and, we must say, disgracefully failed to do. Anything more feeble, unfaithful, and, indeed, contemptible, in the shape of an attempt to deal with a subject so important, cannot well be imagined. The only gratifying circumstance in connection with it is, that it received the treatment which it merited. It was pronounced unworthy of being put to the House.

---

## THE PAST AND PRESENT YEAR.

(*From the Original Secession Magazine.*)

The year 1868 has added a memorable page to the history of Europe. Events thicken as the time draws on when the mystery of God shall be finished in the overthrow of that huge satanic system of civil and religious despotism, culminating in Popery, which has so long enthralled the nations. Like the earthquakes and volcanic eruptions which have marked the past year, there are disorganising forces at work, which that system itself has



generated, and which, by a signal display of Divine retribution, shall rend it in pieces. By a natural reaction Popery has driven many in continental lands into infidelity and atheism; by a similar reaction despotism has called forth among the nationalities it has been crushing, the spirit of communism and revolution; and among these antagonistic forces the conflict has begun, which, ending in their mutual destruction, shall leave the stage of earth clear for the establishment of the millennial kingdom of Christ. From His mediatorial throne on high He has begun "the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." As out of vast geologic changes, confusing and altering the previously existing state of things, God prepared the earth as a habitation for man, so out of the throes and overturnings of analogous changes in the moral and political world, He will call forth that "new heavens and that new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is, and I will give it Him."

To all who long and pray for the overthrow of Antichrist, the great weakening of its political ascendancy on the Continent during the past year must afford matter of gratulation and praise. For centuries Austria has lain in servile chains at the feet of Rome. Only nineteen years ago it entered into that famous concordat by which it yielded itself up, bound hand and foot, into the power of a domineering priesthood. No nation seemed to be so drunk with the wine of the great harlot's fornication. But the blow struck it by the battle of Sadowa seems to have roused it from its fatal stupor. Its people have awoke to feel that the paralysing power of an all grasping priesthood is the cause of their national weakness and humiliation. And during the past year its legislature has passed laws in favor of the freedom of education and marriage, and of the equality of all religious denominations in the eye of law, which have given the stipulations of the concordat to the winds, and broken the supremacy of the priesthood in Austria, let us hope for ever. The Pope, of course, has thundered forth his anathemas against these laws and all who comply with them, only to find, however, as in the case of Italy, that the thunders of the Vatican have lost all their power to quell the rising spirit of freedom in the bosom of an awakening people, and that in trying to wield them, he is only irritating that spirit into more angry strength, and making a pitiable display of his own weakness.

Within the put few months, also, Spain has been lost as a political ally and prop to the Papacy. Of all the kingdoms that have given their power and strength unto the beast, none has done Rome's work with such abject submission or such ungrudging self sacrifice as Spain. Philip the Second owned to his son on his deathbed that he had spent on wars undertaken for the extermination of Protestantism more than five hundred and ninety-four millions of ducats! He might have added that by such wars, by the Holy Inquisition, and by direct persecution, he and his father had been the means of slaughtering some hundreds of thousands of Protestant lives. Thus has Spain served Rome, and she has received for it Rome's usual wages national beggary, corruption, and degradation. The last gift of Popery to her was a Queen, who seems to have been raised to the throne to show how such devotion as Rome counts saintly and delights to honor may coincide with the vilest profligacy that can outrage the law of God or dishonor a throne. But, by a revolution strangely sudden and strangely calm, the Spaniards have cast off the yoke of their unworthy monarch and of the Papacy together; have expelled the Jesuits from their country and confiscated their property; have proclaimed religious liberty, the freedom of the press, the right of public assemblages, radical changes in the system of education, the right of trial by jury, the equality of all men before the law. The revolution caught the priesthood in the very act of persecuting men for reading the Bible, but now the martyrs of prison and exile are free; leave has been granted to build a Protestant church at Seville, where the Inquisition plied its secret enginery of torture and death more terribly than in any other part of Spain; and the whole country, from the Pyrenees to Gibraltar, is open to the Word of God. What Christian does not hail the change with grateful wonder and joy? And what a responsibility rests on the Christian Churches of Britain to send that Bible and that Gospel which will give the still benighted Spaniard a higher than political emancipation – the emancipation of his conscience and of his soul!

All the year through, Europe has been agitated and held in alarm by "rumours of war" between two of its mightiest military powers. France and Prussia have been eyeing each other with looks of jealousy and menace, but they have hitherto been mercifully restrained from rushing into conflict. We say mercifully; for with armies so immense, wielding such murderous weapons of destruction, the result of war between these powers must be a slaughter of human life such as one shudders to think of. Still, the possession of such vast armaments breeds the temptation to use them; it seems likely that the Providence which has permitted their construction has some purpose of righteous vengeance to serve by their use: and we fear that in the skirts of Papal France there is still to be found the blood of the Huguenots.

But both prophecy and the signs of the times seem to point to a war cloud gathering over a larger area, and charged with the elements of a mightier devastation. Russia has long been intriguing, not without success, to stir up dissension and insurrection among the rival faiths and motley nationalities of the decaying Turkish empire. Her object is to create an opportunity of subverting that empire, and so to realise the long cherished

dream of her ambition, by making a way over its ruins to uncontrolled supremacy in the East. But any overt attempt to carry out this project would bring on war with our own and other nations of Western Europe; and students of prophecy think it every way likely that the shock of such a tremendous conflict is the predeter- mined means by which not only Mahommedanism is to perish, but the foundations of the mystic Babylon are to be shaken, till it fall to rise no more.

Plain it is, at all events, that Popery is quaking as if with premonitions of its coming fall. For the last month of 1869 the Pope has summoned to Rome a council of Romish dignitaries from all parts of the world, evidently to consult how his reeling throne and infallibility are to be kept up. Doubtless the thunder of the seven hills will wax portentously loud; bulls, anathemas, infallible decrees, will sound loudly but very harmlessly and unheeded through the sky of Christendom; but what we have really to fear is, that deeply hatched plots will be laid to perfect that Popish conquest of Britain which is going on so prosperously, for let us assure ourselves that the Pope would part with the rest of Europe to gain that supremacy in Britain, which will enable him to wield Britain's power through the worldwide extent of Britain's possessions. And who shall venture to say, that, in righteous retribution for the support we have given to Popery, during the last forty years, in perjured violation of our national vows to extirpate it, it may not be allowed to gain that supremacy for a time? At all events there shall be a struggle for it, for which it becomes all Protestants to be preparing.

And while perplexity and changes have prevailed in Europe during the past year, our own country has been far from being in a state of repose. Scarcely had the unexpectedly sudden and prosperous termination of the Abyssinian war sent a sensation



of relief and gladness through the nation, when it was plunged into the tumult of the political straggle, now going forward, for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. On that great question of the past and of the opening year we cannot avoid making a few remarks, in doing which we think it right to premise that the editors alone are responsible for the sentiments they express. We think we may safely say, that, if the proposed measure involved no other or wider interests than the overthrow of the Prelatic Church in Ireland as such, all Original Seceders would gladly hail it. They have protested all along against its anti-scriptural hierarchy and worship. They have protested no less solemnly against the dishonor done to Christ by the usurped supremacy of its earthly head. They are in the habit of praying, from time to time, for its overthrow, and are prepared to employ all legitimate and scriptural means for this end. More than thirty years ago they published as one of their reasons for public fasting that, though the Reformation had been established in Ireland for nearly three hundred years, "the Irish Church, for the greater part of that time, has been employed for secular purposes, and for the support of an anti-scriptural hierarchy, rather than for rooting out Popish ignorance and superstition and the advancement of the cause of pure and undefiled religion; and it is to this cause we are to ascribe the strong hold which Popery still has upon the great mass of the population of that unhappy country." We say, then, had this been a proposal to disestablish Prelacy as such, with a view of establishing in its stead a Church invested with the pure and scriptural forms of Presbyterianism – in other words, had it been a proposal to realize the end which the nation is bound by the great oath of the Solemn League and Covenant to seek – "the *reformation* of religion in Ireland according to the Word of God and the example of the best reformed Churches" – all Seceders would have felt they were acting most consistently it giving in their heartiest support.

But we need not say that this is not the proposal. Substantially, and in design, it is a proposal to withdraw all Government countenance and support from Protestantism in Ireland. For this nation to withdraw all legal recognition of Prelacy in Ireland is one thing; for this nation, hitherto constitutionally Protestant, to withdraw all legal recognition of Protestantism in Ireland is a very different thing; and yet this is what the measure proposes, as its framer very emphatically intimated in his speech at Wigan when he said – "I look to this Protestant people to put down Protestant ascendancy." Now here very grave questions arise: Is it consistent with the duty and responsibility of a Protestant nation to cease to own Protestantism nationally in any part of its dominions? Is this consistent with the Solemn League which we have seen binds the nation, civilly considered, to endeavor the Reformation of religion in Ireland on a Protestant basis? Does it not render the outcarrying of this end of the Solemn League for ever impracticable, so far as the State is concerned; for how can the State work in its own sphere for the reformation of religion in Ireland, when it has formally and legally renounced all obligation to care for religion there in any form whatever? And how does this proposed measure look when placed alongside of what the Original Secession Testimony says as to the duty of nations to give *positive legal security* for the maintenance of the true religion, when it affirms that "in the exercise of their legislative authority, it is the duty of nations or their representatives to remove from their civil constitution whatever may be found to stand in the way of the progress of revealed religion – to have the whole of their civil laws framed, and the whole of their administration regulated, in such a manner as to be agreeable to it, and subservient to its interests – to give decided countenance and public protection

to its functionaries in the discharge of their duty, and *to provide all needful legal securities in behalf of the scriptural profession of it,* not only against turbulent individuals or factions, but also against the attempts to undermine and supplant it which may be made by the rulers to whom the administration of their affairs may be entrusted." By all means let anti-scriptural Prelacy be swept away; but the above extract shows, that to sweep it away without providing legal security in behalf of the *Scriptural* profession of religion in Ireland, is a dereliction of national duty against which Original Seceders are pledged to protest.

But the question is one of still wider reach and more serious import. Ireland is an integral part of the British empire; and if political considerations warrant the withdrawal of all national recognition of the Protestant religion there, is there no danger of political exigencies arising, or being created, which shall be held to warrant the withdrawal of all national recognition of that religion in every other part of the empire, and in every form in which it has hitherto been recognised? Papists and Voluntaries are not confined to Ireland; and if political justice demands that they be exempted from paying taxes to support Protestantism there, is there no danger that by a little extension of the principle and the precedent, political justice shall be held to demand that they be exempted from paying taxes to support Protestantism everywhere else, whether that Protestantism exist in the teaching of Churches, in the religious education of schools, in tests of admission to educational and civil offices, in the coronation oath of the Sovereign itself? If a national and governmental recognition of Protestant Christianity is an offence and a wrong to these parties anywhere, it is an offence and a wrong to them everywhere and in all things; and is it not the fact that Papists and infidels are combining to support this measure, in the faith that it is the insertion of the wedge which is destined to rend asunder the legal and constitutional bonds that unite this nation to the religion

of the Reformation, and so to open a way for the ascendancy of their own principles? And is it not, to say the least, somewhat dangerous to say "a confederacy" to such allies in a matter affecting the interests of religion and of the Church of Christ, when we think of the rebuke given to the godly King of Judah for his alliance with Ahab – "Shouldest thou help the ungodly and love them that hate the Lord? therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord?" And when their end is gained, as from their numbers and determination and growing influence it is likely to be gained, will it not be a dark and shameful and very portentous day for Britain when it stands forth before the nations of the earth without a national faith or religion knowing in its laws and administration no difference between Christ and Antichrist – no difference between the Popery which held it for ages in chains of civil and religious slavery, and drunk the blood of the best and noblest of its sons, and the Protestantism to which it owes all its freedom and enlightenment, prosperity and power? We have no political or party prejudices to gratify; we have no faith, in these matters at least, in one political party more than another; but we throw out these questions on the great topic of the time for the serious and prayerful consideration of our readers, only adding these sentences from the pen of Dr. Hodge, of America – "Since all our national institutions and blessings, yea our civilisation itself, are the fruits of our Protestant Christianity, in the name of the people, in the name of the truth, in the name of God, we have the right, and we are morally bound to recognise and honor, in our national acts, the source from which, and the channel through which they have been derived. For it is contrary to the constitution and order of nature, it is evidence of a base mind, and can never come to good, when the child for any reason, or to gain any object, refuses to own 494
its parentage. And we are bound to vindicate this right at all hazards. To yield it up is to renounce our national birthright and character; it is to dishonor our national religion and the God of our fathers; yea, it is to betray ourselves, blindfold and manacled, as our children will find to their sorrow, in the very citadel of our religious liberties."

But amidst all changes and overturnings let us encourage ourselves in the faith that "the Lord reigneth." In entering on the uncertainties of another period of time, let us put ourselves and our country and His cause everywhere, by fervent believing prayer, under the shield of His gracious omnipotence. Let us see that in heart and purpose, in profession and life, we are on the Lord's side, for then and then only shall we be kept "from the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth."

---

## HEATHEN ORIGIN OF THE POPISH WORSHIP OF SAINTS.

(*From the* "*Heathenism of Popery*," *by the Rev. William McIntyre, A.M.*)

"The point to which, in the first instance, I wish to direct attention is the corruption of worship which arises from its being offered to any other than the true God. In dealing with this point I will not insist upon the corrupting influence of erroneous views of the character of God; I will only remark with respect to it, that, under its operation, the object of worship may, and, in heathen systems, did become a mere creature of the imagination.

"But, whatever views the heathen entertained of the Supreme Being, the great bulk of their worship was rendered to inferior divinities. In the Roman Pantheon two classes of gods were presented as objects of worship. These classes were distinguished by designations derived from those applied to the two classes of senators, dii majorum gentium – gods *of the greater families*, – and dii minorum gentium, – *gods of the lesser families.* The former of these orders comprehended some twenty gods, twelve of them, – six male and six female divinities – being called dii consentes or complices, probably as forming the grand *council* of Olympus, and the remaining eight dii selecti. While these gods were all of them superior to the gods of the lesser families, only one of them, of course, could be supreme; and, viewed in relation to that one, all the others were inferior divinities. The gods of the lesser families again, while all of them were inferior to those of the greater families, were themselves distributed into several ranks and classes. Those called dii indigites, – *native gods,* that is, men who for their heroic deeds and distinguished services and merits, were, after their death, enrolled among the gods and worshipped, – formed one of these.

Here, then, we see heathenism, recognise *inferior* divinities, male and female, and among these distinguished members of the human family deified after their death; and in popery we meet with the same corruption, canonised saints occupying in the latter a position corresponding to that of the inferior divinities and, particularly, of the deified heroes in the former, with this difference, however, that the worship of the canonised saints, is far more ardent than that of the corresponding heathen gods. The Council of Trent states the doctrine of the Church of Rome on the subject of the invocation and worship of saints with the caution demanded by the circumstances under which it was held, and, evidently, with an apologetic rather than a didactic aim. In a decree from which I have already quoted repeatedly, it 'gives it in charge to bishops' and others to teach the faithful, 'that the saints, reigning together with Christ, present their prayers to God for men; that it is good and profitable to invoke them suppliantly; and, with respect to the obtaining of blessings from God through his son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour, to flee to their prayers, help and assistance,' adding that 'those, who deny that the saints

enjoying eternal felicity in heaven are to be invoked, or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that it is idolatry to call upon them to pray for us even individually, or that it is contrary to the word of God and militates against the honor of Jesus Christ, the one mediator between God and men, or that it is foolish to supplicate them, either orally or mentally, as they reign in heaven, entertain impious sentiments.' The teaching of the Catechism of the Council of Trent on this subject is to the same effect. Notwithstanding the caution that, as I have already remark- ed, characterises the passage now adduced and those referred to, they teach that the 'faithful' should 'invoke' the saints, should 'pray to them' and 'supplicate them,' and should 'flee to them for assistance.' And, surely, these are acts of worship. Is not prayer such an act? Especially, is not prayer to the saints, when the petitions addressed to them are intermixed with petitions addressed to God, an act of worship? Here is an instance of this kind. – 'Lord, have mercy upon us . . . Holy Mary, pray for us . . . St. Peter, pray for us, St. Paul, pray for us.* Be merciful to us, spare us, O Lord,' &c, It is true that the petition addressed to the saints, in this case, is, 'pray for us;' but the addressing of this petition to them is prayer; and it is intermingled with petitions addressed to God, and forms with these one continued act of worship. Besides, as we have already seen and as I will shew still further, petitions of a different character are addressed to them. In 'the Litany of Our Lady of Loretto,' already quoted, pp. 29, 30, the following petition occurs twice, – 'deliver us from all dangers;' and we shall find similar petitions addressed to the Virgin in passages to be now adduced. The following occurs in 'the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary.' – 'Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope; to thee do we cry, poor banished sons of Eve; to thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious Advocate, thy eyes of mercy towards us, and, after

this our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus.' ** The following extract is taken from what is called 'the thirty days' prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary . . . by the devout recital of which, for the above space of time, we may,' it is said, 'hope mercifully to obtain our lawful request.' – Ever glorious and blessed Mary, Queen of virgins, Mother of mercy, hope and comfort of dejected desolate souls . . . take pity, I beseech thee, on my poverty and necessities; have compassion on my anxieties and cares; assist and comfort me in all my infirmities and miseries. Thou art the mother of mercies, the sweet consolatrix and refuge of the needy and the orphan, of the desolate and the afflicted. Look, therefore, with pity on a miserable, forlorn child of Eve, and hear my prayer; for since, in just punishment of my sins, I am encompassed with evils, and oppressed with anguish of spirit, whither can I fly for more secure shelter, O amiable Mother of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ! than to thy maternal protection? Attend, therefore, I beseech thee, with pity and compassion to my humble and earnest request. I ask it through the infinite merits of thy dear Son.' *** If prayer is at all an act of worship, the Virgin Mary is worshipped when such prayers are addressed to her, and addressed to her, too, as 'the hope and comfort of dejected and desolate souls . . . . . the mother of mercies, the sweet consolatrix and refuge of the needy and the orphan, of the desolate and the afflicted,' and

---

* In the chain of petitions from which these are taken there are forty-six similar petitions addressed to angels and saints individually by name, eight addressed to sixteen saints in pairs, and eleven addressed to collective bodies of angels and saints – *The Manual of Catholic Piety,* by the Rev. William Gahan, O.S.A., p. 137-142.

** *The Manual of Catholic Piety,* p. 222.

*** *Manual of Catholic Piety,* pp. 150-151.



even as 'our life.' And not only are those divine titles bestowed upon her in the prayers addressed to her, but one of the prayers quoted is addressed to her 'through the merits' of Christ. She is thus exalted above the Saviour, who is made to occupy the position of mediator between her and those who pray to her.

"Thus in popery, as in heathenism, inferior objects of worship are recognised, and worship rendered to them. Both, so far, exhibit the same corruption, the corruption which arises from the fact that worship is offered to another or others than the true God. And this form of corruption is, from its nature, pervasive in its influence; it affects the whole of the system in which it obtains. Religion throughout its whole extent has reference to God or to gods; and, hence, as there is but one true god, polytheistic systems of religion, – systems in which a plurality of divinities or objects of worship is recognised, – are, from the fact that they are polytheistic, corrupt throughout their whole extent, and not mere-ly in some details. But the resemblance, in respect of the object of worship, which popery bears to heathenism, is not confined to the fact, that, while the one has its inferior divinities, the other has, corresponding to these, its canonised saints. It is very observable also in the intercessory functions which both assign to their infer-ior objects of worship. The petition most frequently addressed to the canonised saints of popery is 'pray for me – pray for us;' and it is especially, though not at all exclusively, by intercession, that the Virgin Mary is believed to accomplish so much for those who invoke her. But the inferior gods of heathenism also interceded with its supreme god on behalf of their favorites. Virgil represents Venus, one of those inferior divinities, as praying to Jupiter for Aeneas and the Trojans in the following terms: * – 'O thou, who in the exercise of eternal dominion rulest the affairs of both men and gods, and terrifiest with thy thunderbolt, what great offence could Aeneas and the Trojans have committed against thee, that, after they have already suffered so many deaths, the whole world is closed against them in order that they may be excluded from Italy? Thou hast, surely, promised that from these, – from the restored blood of Tenser, – the Romans would spring in some future age, in the course of revolving years, – that from them would spring leaders, who should exercise absolute rule over sea and land. What new counsel, sire, has changed thy mind? With this promise I consoled myself in my sorrow for the fall and sad desolation of Troy, weighing favorable against adverse fates. But still, already the sport of so many cal-amities, the same misfortune pursues them. Great king, what end of their toils dost thou grant?' After referring to the better fortune of Antenor, she proceeds, 'we, thine own offspring, having unutterable calamity! lost our ships, are sacrificed to the resentment of one individual and severed far from the Italian coasts. Is this the regard due to piety? Is it thus thou restorest us to our lost dominion?' The following is an instance of the same kind, but presents a more extended and complete resemblance to the popish invocation of saints and their subsequent alleged intercession. Achilles applies to the goddess Thetis to pray to Jupiter for him; ** and she intercedes for him accordingly. *** 'O Father Jupiter, if, on any occasion, I have assisted thee among the immortals, either by word or deed, perform for me this request. In answer to my prayer confer honor on my son, short lived beyond others; for Aga-memnon, king of men, has certainly now treated him with indignity, for he has taken and possessed the prize, having carried it off with his own hand. But do thou, Olympian Jupiter, first in council, very decidedly honor him; bestow victorious might upon the Trojans, ever until the Greeks duly acknowledge the merits of my son."'

---

* *Æneid I.* 229 ** *Iliad I.* 365 *** *Iliad I.* 503

## GOLD AND THE GOSPEL.
## THE JEWISH LAW OF TITHE
## A GUIDE TO CHRISTIAN LIBERALITY.

BY REV. ROBERT SPENCE, M.A.

PRIZE ESSAY.

It seems to us that a standard by which we may measure our liberality with great profit is presented in the Old Testament. From it we learn that in various periods of the Church a tenth of income was the proportion given to the Lord. At what time tithe began to be paid we have no information. The first time it is mentioned, in regard to the gift which Abraham made from the spoil taken from Chedorlaomer and the confederate kings to Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High God, it is alluded to as if the proportion were the established one, "And he gave him tithes of all." (Gen. 14: 20.) From this it would seem to have been a well known rule even at that early period. But when, or where, or by what authority, it was instituted, we do not know. Perhaps, and we think most probably, it was selected by God himself. At all events, the proportion appears to have been the recognised one in the days of the patriarchs. We find Jacob, on the morning after he had seen in a dream a ladder between heaven and earth, vowing, that if God would be with him and cause him to return to his father's house in peace, he would devote a tenth of all his property to him. (Gen. 28: 22.) We know that, whatever was the origin of tithe, it was under the Mosaic dispensation enacted by the express command of God. In this, as in several other things, the Levitical institute was simply a renewal of the patriarchal custom. It is of importance to observe this. It shows clearly that sufficient reasons for the payment of tithe existed before the Israelites left Egypt, and affords ground for inferring that others may be found after the abolition of the Judaic dispensation. The law of Moses regarding tithe occurs in Lev. 27: 30-32.

The purpose to which this tenth was devoted among the Jews was the maintenance of the ministers of religion, the priests and Levites: "The tithes I have given you from them for your inheritance." (Num. 18: 20.) In consequence of the consecration of the tribe of Levi to the service of the Lord, they did not receive any portion of the land when it was divided among the others, except the Levitical cities and their suburbs, which were scattered over the country. It was necessary that they, as ministers of religion, should be accessible to the people, and hence they were released from the burden of secular duties, and located in places some of which were near every part of Canaan. In order to recompense them for their services, and in place of their inheritance, the tithe was given to them. It was no matter of alms giving and receiving, but the requirement of strict justice. The law is very explicit in regard to this. (Num. 18: 20-24.)

This tithe was by no means the whole of the contributions which were required of the Jews. In addition, "all the first fruits, both of fruit and animals, were consecrated to God (Exod. 22: 29, Num. 18: 12, 13, &c.), and the first fruits of corn, wine, oil, and sheep's wool, were offered for the use of the Levites. (Deut. 18: 4.) The amount of this gift is not specified in the law of Moses, which leaves it entirely to the pleasure of the giver: the Talmudical writers, however, inform us, that liberal persons were accustomed to give the fortieth and even the thirtieth; while such as were covetous or penurious gave only a sixtieth part." Besides these first fruits, and the tithe for the Levites, there was another tenth, "which was carried up to Jerusalem, and eaten at the Temple at offering feasts, as a sign of rejoicing and gratitude to God. These are called second tithes." "Lastly, there were tithes allotted to the poor, for whom there was also a corner left in every field which it was not lawful to reap with the rest (Lev. 19: 9, Deut. 24: 19); and they were likewise allowed such ears of corn, 496
or grapes, as were dropped or scattered about, and the sheaves that might be accidentally forgotten in the field." (Horne's Introduction, vol. iii: pp. 296, 297, 8th ed.) Concerning this last tithe there is some dispute. Josephus (Antiq. iv. 8, 22) states expressly that it was a third tithe, but others are of opinion that it was only the special devotion of the second tithe every third year to the poor. However this may be, it is obvious that the Jew had to contribute about the fourth part of his income, at the command of God. Besides these direct gifts, there were numerous other expenses connected with his religion which had to be met. He had often to present sacrifices for ceremonial and other transgressions, and to lose a considerable portion of his time from various causes. On the whole, therefore, his religion could not cost him much less than a third of his income. And in addition to these regular charges we find at different times the most generous and noble efforts made by the Israelites in support of God's worship, as in the erection of the Tabernacle and Temple. Notwithstanding the very great cost of these buildings and their furniture, it was cheerfully met, and more than met, by the willing generosity of a grateful people. But leaving out of sight those special donations, and the contributions for ceremonial and benevolent purposes, we still have a tenth devoted by God's command to the purposes of religion. Whatever was given in support of the poor and in other benevolent ways, was in addition to this.

The great reason, however, upon which the Almighty based the duty of tithe was that of justice. This must precede generosity. If a claim be just there is little liberality in settling it. Besides, the feelings of generosity and benevolence cannot so well form the subject of legislation as that of justice, since their value depends on their spontaneity. But the demands of justice are more palpable, and it is to these that the law refers. The Levites were to devote themselves wholly to the service of the Lord, and could not consequently provide for their own temporal necessities. As the people had the land of the Levites divided among them, and enjoyed the benefit of their services – services which, from their spiritual nature, no tithe could repay – it was only simple justice for them to support the ministers of religion. They who served at the altar had a right to live by the altar, even as they who preach the Gospel have a right to live by the Gospel (1 Cor. 9: 13, 14.)

If the Israelites, notwithstanding these reasons, failed in the performance of their duty, they incurred very great guilt. At various times this sin was committed. During the reign of Ahaz, king of Judah, under the jurisdiction of Nehemiah, and while Malachi was the prophet of God, this was the case. (2 Chron. 31: 4, Neh. 13: 10, Mal. 3: 8.) In the latter case, the criminality of the course is most strongly asserted. The Most High had sent a famine upon the Jews because of their conduct, which was not to be removed until they had brought all the tithes into his storehouse. The withholding of these tenths is expressly called a robbery of God. "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say where-in have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse, for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." This very awful aspect of their sin, thus presented to them by God's messenger, must have produced a far deeper effect, and a much readier obedience, in every Israelite whose conscience was not entirely dead than any merely human terrors could have done.

Thus it appears that, under the Old Testament dispensation, liberality to the cause of God was a moral duty, as it is now, – the difference being that then a tenth was stated to be the proportion which should be given, whereas now every Christian has to determine for himself what he ought to give.

There are no peculiarities, so far as we know, in the circumstances of Christians at present, in this land, which render them un-

able to give as liberally as the Jews. During the continuance of their economy, there were very great diversities in their temporal condition, but the law of tithe continued the same. Sometimes their prosperity was almost unbounded, especially during the reign of Solomon, when such was the abundance of silver that it was nothing accounted of. (1 Kings 10: 21.) At other times they were in the deepest distress. A more oppressive and galling state of bondage is scarcely conceivable than that recorded in 1 Sam. 13, when their enemies the Philistines would not permit even the smiths necessary for the repair of agricultural implements to reside in Judea. The condition of the Jews in the age of Malachi was very far from prosperous. According to the best biblical critics, he prophesied during the time of Nehemiah, and stood in the same relation to that governor as the prophets Haggai and Zechariah had done to his predecessor Zerubbabel. We find the general condition of the Jews in that age detailed at considerable length in the fifth chapter of Nehemiah. The mass of the people were so poor that they were compelled to mortgage their lands and vineyards in order to procure food for their families, and money to pay their taxes. Nehemiah, in compassion for their miserable state, refused to take any portion of his own salary from them, which most strikingly shows his opinion of their circumstances. Indeed these were only such as might be expected among a people lately returned, after a protracted captivity, to a desolate land. But they were not held by God as any reason for not paying tithe. Those pointed questions which we have already quoted (Mal. 3: 8) were at this time addressed to the Jews. "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me in tithes and offerings." Probably in consequence of these sharp remonstrances, arrangements were speedily made for the regular payment of tithe

and other dues. (Neh. 10: 35-39.) Thus the low condition of these Jews did not exempt them from the duty of paying tithe. They were held as robbing God in withholding it, notwithstanding their depressed circumstances. Nor, except in the most extreme cases, does this seem strange even under his government who detests oppression and hates robbery for burnt offering. For there are comparatively few in any state of society who could not spare a tenth of what they have – were it necessary to give it up. Unquestionably it would be seriously missed – but many others have to live upon as little as the remainder. The Jew had only to look around him to find a number whose income was less than his would be even after deducting a tenth.

This is the conclusion we have reached from every comparison. Combining these conclusions together, what answer ought we to give to the question, "If God directed the Jew under the Mosaic dispensation to give a tithe of his income to religious purposes, does he expect the Christian to give less under the higher and better dispensation?" It seems as if the answer to this question must be, "Certainly not less." It is almost demonstratively evident that the people who have the greatest ability, the strongest and highest motives, the most imperative calls, and the worthiest results from their liberality, cannot rightly give less than the others. And if God required from the latter a tenth, he expects as much from the former. Our argument would sustain a stronger conclusion, and it does certainly show that ten per cent, is the minimum of Christian liberality. If God expects a tenth from his Church, in what position are those placing themselves who give less?"

---

## FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, VICTORIA.
## ANNUAL MEETING AND LECTURE AT ELAINE.

The Annual Meeting of the Free Presbyterian Church, Elaine, (Stony Rises) was held on Monday night, March 1st, at 7.30 p.m. Rev. P. MacPherson, pastor of the congregation, occu- 497

pied the chair, and opened the meeting with devotional exercises. Proceeding with the usual lecture on such occasions, he said: – "During the past few months there had been considerable noise about science and sermons. No doubt science was making important advances, which was matter for congratulation. Railroads now were made over mountains or through them according to order. Canals were now connecting oceans whose waters had not mingled since the deluge – perhaps not since those distant ages with which the geologists deal. The telegraph, like a nervous system, was connecting parts of the globe which not long ago knew as little of each other as if they had belonged to different planets. The world was becoming something like an organised whole. To some extent men were subduing it and bringing it under command. In the recently surveyed township of Elaine they would soon be able to see, in the morning papers, from Melbourne, Geelong, and Ballarat, the telegrams of the previous day from Pekin and San Francisco, or perhaps giving the last firman from Constantinople, or protocol from Vienna, ukase from St. Petersburgh, or bull from Rome; the last prices current for wool from London, or for hides and tallow from New York. From Berlin might come a rumor of war, and from Paris the 101st edition of the Emperor's speech on peace – that is providing all the parties concerned could keep existing arrangements together for a few years longer. But wielding power, men were getting not a little inflated, although a hurricane, an earthquake, and a volcanic outburst were significant admonitions that they had not yet completely got the reins of universal dominion in their hands. It was still more unsatisfactory to find men, while making useful advances in the physical command of the powers and resources of the world, disowning so boldly the moral government of the human race by the Almighty. Yet He had His standing proofs that His government was carried on still, and amid all changes on the same principles as from the first. The lecturer would proceed to show how God was ruling the nations according to the olden rule of the moral law; first and second tables. They had heard much of the Poles and Hungarians, he regarded their history as affording a signal illustration that God was ruling still in accordance with the first table of the law; specially that he would not hold them guiltless that took His name in vain. Although these suppressed nationalities had been reduced so low, yet their history had brought Europe and Asia – two continents face to face. He would preface his remarks by a caveat in dealing with God's judgments. So far as individuals were concerned, the tower of Siloam might fall and kill some of the excellent of the earth as well as the reverse. When a guilty nation suffers, we know that a Jeremiah, an Eze-kiel, or a Daniel may suffer, and that severely, with it. But this shows we must be discriminating in our interpretation of God's dealings. It will not do to confound the cases of Nadab and Abihu, Gehazi and Uzziah, Ananias and Sapphira with the names given before, and still further there was a grand difference between individuals and nations. For God's dealings with individuals were carried over from time to eternity. On the other hand God's moral government, as to nations, was complete here below. We might acquire more knowledge hereafter of the facts, the links in the chain of causes which led to the overthrow of the nations of the earth, but that increased knowledge would only show us all the more clearly that the nations were dealt with on the old principles. They were all familiar with the case of the Gibeonites as recorded in Joshua (chap. 9.) A treaty of peace had been confirmed with an oath between the Gibeonites and Israel, and the breach of it was severely avenged on the house of Saul more than 400 years afterwards (2 Sam. 21). In looking over the history of the Poles and the Hungarians he found something analogous. They

would bear in mind that in former times the Poles and Hungarians, holding a leading position in Europe, were amongst the foremost in opposing the Turks, who were the terror of the West. When Uladislaus VI. was king both of Poland and Hungary, a treaty of peace for ten years was made between him and Amurath II. Sultan of the Turks. The oath confirming the treaty was sworn over the Gospels and the Koran. Julian Caesarini, the Legate from Rome was pre--sent and disliked the treaty, but could not prevent it. Soon, how-ever, he got information of events adverse to the Turks, and he set himself vigorously to get the treaty broken through. He urged that the Vicar of Christ on earth "is the Roman Pontiff, without whose sanctions you can neither promise nor perform. In his name I absolve your perjury and sanctify your arms. Follow my footsteps in the path of glory and salvation, and if still ye have scruples, devolve on my head the punishment and the sin." At the diet of Szegedin in Hungary in 1443, it was resolved to take advantage of the unfavorable circumstances in which the Sultan had been placed by revolt and otherwise. The legate's advice was taken. Now, here were Europe and Asia face to face, as represented by the Poles and Hungarians on the one side, and by the Turks on the other. There was a very flagrant case in which the name of Christ was signally dishonored. The millions of Asia were now to have circulated amongst them what was the character of the Christian of Europe in the matter of keeping faith pledged in the most solemn manner, with appeal to the God of truth. Meanwhile Amurath resolved to meet his enemies. The meeting took place at Warna, on the shores of the Black Sea. At first it seemed as if the perfidy of the so called "Christians" was to be rewarded by success. The Turkish wings were broken. Amurath was about to

flee, but was nerved with indignation at the recollection of the treachery practised. The historian of the Decline and Fall, &c., already quoted, narrated as follows: – "A copy of the Treaty – the monument of Christian perfidy had been displayed in front of the battle, and it is said that the Sultan in his distress, lifting his hands and eyes to heaven, implored the protection of the God of truth, and called on the prophet Jesus himself to avenge the impious mockery of his name and religion." The tide of battle turned. Uladislaus was defeated, and both he and Julian were slain. When the ten years agreed on by the treaty expired, Europe got a terrible remembrancer of broken faith. The son of Amurath was very young at the time war was undertaken against his father. He remembered the terror of the Turks on the occasion. When he succeeded his father as Mahomet II. he resolved to carry out the intention of Amurath and establish a footing in Europe. He did so. The Greeks were terrified and urged treaties, now in vain, after what had so recently taken place. In 1453 Constantinople was besieged and taken. The Greek Empire was brought to a close. The Turk, a foreign element in Europe, became established in it, – a perpetual remembrancer of broken faith, a constant source of disturbance and alarm; a terribly appropriate woe upon the corrupted state of Christianity in Europe at the time. A poet had said, speaking of Poland –

"Sarmatia fell, unwept, without a crime."
– *Campbell.*

This was in the "Pleasures of Hope" but it would be equally if not more suitable in the "Pleasures of Imagination." At the same time, not to quarrel with the poet, there was a restricted application of the sentiment which might be accepted. When the work of dismemberment came, and unscrupulous and unprincipled pow-ers like Russia, Prussia and Austria., began to share the plunder, the victim naturally enough comes in for sympathy. But these Empires themselves, in their turn, will stand or fall on the same principles as in the case of Poland. As to the second table of the 498
law, the illustration on the large scale which he had in view brought two other continents, America and Africa, face to face. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," is the inspired summary of the second table. The American nation is not least of the nations of the earth – very certainly in the opinion of Americans themselves. In flagrant violation of the second table, a christian nation of every high profession and pretensions kept a race of millions of Africans in bondage, fully as bad, if not much worse, than that of Israel of old in Egypt. It was the darkest blot in modern civilization and christianity. But the great Ruler has dealt with the oppressor now on the same principles as of old. The oppressor has not gone unpunished, though it is to be devoutly prayed that there is a nobler future for America than there was for Egypt. The history of the world affords only one parallel to the deliverance of the enslaved Africans, and that has to be sought by going back over 3000 years of history till we come to the deliverance of the enslaved Hebrew. He believed that there were some points even more remarkable in the deliverance of the African than of the Hebrew. Israel had some organisation; the African none. Israel's escape required him to quit the country; the African was liberated in the land of his enemies, and even by the hand of his enemies. It is probable that the civil war in America did as much damage as the ten plagues to Egypt. He could not bring this great modern event to be scrutinised in the light of the Law and the Testimony, without beholding in it an illustration, on the gigantic scale of continent and continent, that the great Ruler still governs the world, and governs it on the old principle. He would digress for a moment to refer to not-ices which had been pretty numerous for some time past regarding attempts by the northern settlers – in Queensland – to introduce what was virtually a system of slavery. Some startling evidence appeared, that the villainy of kidnapping South Sea Islanders had been in operation. No more awful disaster could happen these rising colonies than the introduction of slavery at their early development. We should have over again abundant evidence that poor human nature acts on its old principles. He must close. He would not say one word against science truly so called, but it would be found the sermons were as necessary in their place. They must set forth the claims of Christ upon every individual and nation, as Prophet, Priest, and King, with all that these claims involve. It was no use to rebel. The doctrine was substantiated in history. The rebels themselves were compelled to work out the proof. It might seem a long way to go back – 400 years, as in the case of the Poles, Hungarians and Gibeonites, but the great Instructor himself went back much further. Casting his eye back across the broad waters of the Deluge, he warned the apostate Jews that the blood of the martyrs from Abel downwards, through nearly 4000 years, would be required at their hands. They would not believe it, yet they wrought out the fulfilment of the preacher's sermon. Without science and sermons both, they would be no better than black fellows. With science and without sermons they would be no better than Hindoos, verifying the old announcement – the world with all its science knew not God.

The usual annual business was then transacted. The committee of management, consisting of Messrs. Reid, Mathieson, Andrews, McInnes, and Munro were appointed for the current year. Votes of thanks were given, and the meeting terminated with the benediction.

## Correspondence.

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

Sir, – Many of the readers of the *Testimony* have, we doubt not, read less or more regarding the late discussion in the Legislative Assembly, in reference to the abolition of Sabbath trains. That discussion loudly calls for animadversion, as it furnished a sad exhibition of irreligion and ungodliness on the part of the Government and of some, at least, of the other members of Assembly.

Dr. Lang, in his reply to objections made to his resolutions, stated that his reason for excluding religious considerations in advocating the discontinuance of Sabbath trains, was, that such considerations would meet with no sympathy in that House. And certainly the discussion sadly justified that opinion.

Mr. John Stewart, in the course of his remarks, stated that "he should be glad to vote for the motion if the object was economy; but he believed it was brought forward with a view to promoting what was called 'the better observance of the Sabbath.'"

The Premier expressed himself as follows: "With regard to the question submitted, the Government did not consider the religious aspect of the matter; because it was clear that trains must run on Sunday, just as coaches or omnibuses."

On this point, Mr. Forster, the Minister for Lands, spoke out still more decidedly and fully, "He altogether repudiated the notion of the Government being guided by religious considerations in a matter of so much importance as railway travelling. He had conversed with his honorable colleague, and he knew that his opinion was that the question of railway travelling should be determined with reference to the interests and requirements of the public. Many persons objected to travel by the railways on Sundays, and on that ground there was a

diminution of the receipts as compared with other days. Some consideration was due to the public servants engaged in the running of these trains, and that without regard to the particular opinions we might entertain in reference to the Sunday, we ought to give them the benefit of a holiday on the Sunday, as far as was consistent with public interests. Whenever public opinion should reach that point, that as many persons wished to travel on the Sundays, as on other days, it would be the duty of the Government to afford the same facilities on that as on other days. That was the policy the Government were prepared to carry out in reference to the question raised by the motion."

Such avowed determination on the part of the Government of the country to disregard and set at naught the Divine authority as to the observance of the Lord's day is quite appalling. And the virtual setting of the interests of a community in opposition to the Divine will indicates deplorable ignorance. Whatever demands on the part of a community clash with that will cannot be for their true interests. And no thorough statesman could agree to such demands, and far less could he tempt a community by throwing out encouragement to require as many facilities for travelling on the Sabbath as on the other days of the week.

It is some consolation to observe, that Mr. Forster was obliged to confess that "many persons objected to travel by the railway on Sundays." No thanks to him for such a gratifying state of things. He evidently cares little or nothing though that objection were quite removed, and thus all distinction between the Lord's day and the other days of the week as to travelling by trains or otherwise were wholly set aside. It is surely high time that all the electors in the colony who have any regard to the will of God and the best interests of the community should bestir themselves and see to it that, so far as their votes and influence are concerned, no members will be returned at the next general election who are prepared to go any lengths in setting God's will at defiance in regard to Sabbath travelling and Sabbath trading. It is the interest of working men especially to take up the question, lest they very



soon find to their cost that the yoke which the Government puts round the necks of railway officials may very soon be put round their own necks by their employers. To the adoption of such a course some of the remarks made by Mr. John Stewart greatly tend. In meeting Dr. Lang's objection to the running of Sabbath trains that great expense is thereby incurred, Mr. Stewart replied to the effect that the extra expense is not so great, inasmuch as the servants on the railways would have the same wages though they were employed only on six days of the week as they have now for working seven days. That men have to do seven days' work for six days' wages is, one would think, an aggravation rather than a mitigation of the evil.

But other employers of labor also may soon begin to think it very desirable to follow the example set by the Government, of exacting seven days work for six days pay.

I am, &c.,

PRESBYTER.

19th March, 1869.

---

## TESTIMONY TO THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

The following extract from President Edwards is given in "the True Psalmody:"

"The oil that was used in anointing David was a type of the spirit of God; and the type and the antitype were given both together, as we are told, 1 Sam. 16: 13. – 'Then the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.' One way that His Spirit influenced him was by inspiring him to show forth Christ and the glorious things of His redemption in divine songs, sweetly expressing the breathings of a pious soul, full of the admiration of the glorious things of the Redeemer, inflamed with divine love and elevated praise; and therefore he is called the sweet Psalmist of Israel, 2 Sam. 23: 1. The main subjects of these songs were the glorious things of the Gospel, as is evident by the interpretation that is often put upon them, and the use that is made of them in the New Testament; for there is no one book of the Old Testament that is so often quoted in the New as the Book of Psalms. Joyfully did this holy man sing of those great things of Christ's redemption that had been the hope and expectation of God's church and people from the beginning; and joyfully did others follow him in it, as Asaph, Heman, and others. Here Christ is spoken of in multitudes of songs, speaking of His incarnation, life, death, resurrection, ascension into heaven; His satisfaction, intercession; His prophetical, kingly, and priestly office; His glorious benefits in this life and that which is to come; His union with the church, and the blessedness of the church in Him; His calling of the Gentiles; the future glory of the church near the end of the world, and Christ's coming to the final judgment. All these things, and many more concerning Christ and His redemption, are abun-dantly spoken of in the Book of Psalms.

This was a glorious advancement of the affair of redemption, as God hereby gave His church a book of divine songs for their use in that part of their public worship, namely, singing his praise throughout *all ages to the end of the world.* It is manifest *the Book of Psalms was given of God for this end.* It was used in the church of Israel *by God's appointment.* And we find that *the same* are appointed in the New Testament to be made use of in the Christian church, in their worship; Eph. 5: 19, Col. 3: 16 – in psalms, hymns, and *spiritual songs.* So they have been, and will, *to the end of the world,* be made use of in the church to celebrate the praises of God.' 'The Psalms of David were penned for the use of the Church of God in its public worship, not only in that age, but in other ages, as being fitted to express the religion of all saints, in all ages, as well as the religion of the Psalmist.'"

## PROTESTANT WORSHIP IN MADRID.

The *Siècle,* commenting on the celebration of a Protestant service in Madrid, says: – "Yesterday, the 24th January, an event unprecedented in the history of Spain took place at Madrid. A Protestant temple was inaugurated by the celebration of a religious service in public. The telegram which transmits this news adds that the ceremony took place in a most orderly manner. The sky was not obscured. There was no thunder. The population was as calm and serene as the sky itself. There was no stirring up of the population to throw stones at the followers of the dissenting worship. Thus are established, after 300 years of persecution, massacre, and torture, liberty of conscience and freedom of worship in the very land which had so obstinately repulsed them. Fumes of auto-da-fe, dungeons of the inquisition, bars, chains, wheels, gibbets – the execrable instruments of agony and death – will you not now admit that you are powerless against the irresistible progress of justice? It may be long in coming, but justice is sure to come."

---

The Rev. Mr. McCulloch, according to appointment of the Presbytery of Maitland, visited Grafton lately, where he labored for several weeks, preaching at Grafton and neighborhood on Sabbath days, and visiting the people on the weekdays. He met with a welcome and kind reception, and the services were well attended. During his visit to the Clarence, Mr. McCulloch assisted Mr. McInnes at Rocky Mouth in connection with the dispensation of the Lord's Supper at that place. At the weekday services the attendance was good, and on the Communion Sabbath there was a very large concourse of people. The

members and adherents of the Grafton congregation expressed themselves very desirous of obtaining ministrations from our Church, and it is to be hoped that this will receive due consideration from the Maitland Presbytery, as the Grafton district furnishes an important field of labor. Mr. McCulloch felt that our Church is much indebted to the Rev. Alexander McIntyre, of Victoria, for the acceptable supplies of service which he has been giving from time to time to the members and adherents of our Church on the Clarence River.

---

An Order in Council has been published in the appeal of "Martin v. Mackonochie," from the Court of Arches to the Queen in Council, which after stating that Mr. Mackonochie ought to be admonished to abstain for the future from kneeling or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements during the prayer of consecration, and also from using lighted candles on the communion table during the celebration of the Holy Communion, &c.

Her Majesty, by and with the advice of her Privy Council, approves of the same, and Mr. Mackonochie has been served with a monition to abstain from the practices condemned.

The whole ritualistic body has risen up in anger and opposition, and they demand ecclesiastical courts for the adjudication of church matters; and they also demand the separation of the Church from the State. Meetings have been held, sermons have been preached, and lectures delivered to this extent.


# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 43. SYDNEY, APRIL 1869.

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. 43 APRIL. Vol. 1


**CONTENTS**.


PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| Justification … … … … … | 502 |
| Intrusion and subsequent Doings at the North Shore … … | 504 |
| The Union Policy of Free Church Majority a Policy of Deception … | 505 |
| Heathen Origin of the Popish Worship of Saints … … | 507 |
| Correspondence: The Queen's Book … … … | 508 |
| The Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Ritualist Case, Martin v Mackonochie … … … | 509 |
| Free Presbyterian Church, Meredith … … … | 510 |
| Ecclesiastical Intelligence … … … … … | 511 |
| Waldensian Mission Work in Venice … … … | 511 |


## SUSTENTATION FUND.

As the present provincial half-year ends on the 30th instant, the Deacons' Courts and committees of management in the different congregations of the Church are hereby reminded to send in their contributions with as little delay as possible to the Treasurer, Mr. William Buyers, 69 New Pitt Street, Sydney.

## JUSTIFICATION.

"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." – Rom 6: 28.

The theme of this epistle is, that in the Gospel the righteousness of God, which is by faith, is revealed to faith. In treating of this subject, the Apostle shows that, inasmuch as by the law is the knowledge of sin only, of ungodliness and unrighteousness, against which the wrath of God is revealed from heaven, it is a thing altogether peculiar to the Gospel that it provides a perfect righteousness – the righteousness of God without the law, which is by the faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe. From these facts he draws the conclusion in our text; that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.

In some remarks upon this statement we propose, in the first place, to enquire what it is to be justified; in the second place, to state the doctrine of justification by faith; and, in the third place, we shall endeavor to remove prejudices and objections against this doctrine.

I. We inquire, therefore, in the first place, what it is to be justified?

Justification has reference to the promise of life, and to the condition on which it was made. In the covenant of works life was promised on condition of perfect obedience, the import of the promise being not that Adam should be entitled to life, *while* he continued to render a perfect obedience, but that if he continued to render a perfect obedience throughout a certain period, he should at the *close* of that period be entitled to life, and that thenceforward his title to it should *never fail.* It was not to an obedience perfect so far as it had proceeded, but to an obedience perfect during the whole of a prescribed period, that life was promised; and, accordingly, the life promised was not life contemporaneously with the obedience, to continue while the obedience continued, and to cease if at any time the

obedience should cease, but life as the eternal consequence and reward of the required obedience already rendered.

Now to justify is to declare judicially, with respect to the person justified, that in his case the required obedience has been rendered, or, in other words, that he is righteous, and that he is therefore entitled to the promised life, and shall be held to be entitled to it, and dealt with accordingly, thence forward for ever. Thus to justify is more than to free from blame, or to pardon, the justified person; it is to declare him righteous, and therefore no longer obnoxious to the punishment attached to sin, but entitled to the reward promised to righteousness. Hence justification is called "justification of life," and "where sin abounded grace did much more abound, that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so righteousness might reign unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Indeed, pardon implies such justification in all its fulness. By sin all advantages are forfeited and positive evils, or exposure to them, incurred. Accordingly, pardon, undoing the consequences of sin, not only undoes the subjection and exposure to evil, but also the forfeiture of all advantages consequent upon it. Pardon is of this extent even under earthly governments. The prevalence of a contrary opinion arises from confounding special privileges and favors with the common privileges of citizens, the only privileges which citizens possess as such. Full pardon restores all privileges of this latter class; for it undoes all the civil effects of the offence pardoned.

II. Having ascertained what it is to be justified, we now proceed to state the doctrine of justification by faith. In justification God declares, with respect to those whom he justifies, that they are righteous. They must, therefore, be so indeed; they must in point of fact possess a perfect righteousness, for God's judgment in the case is and must be a judgment according to truth. He will not declare those to be righteous who are not so in reality. But we have no righteousness wrought out by ourselves, nor can ever attain to such a righteousness; "all have 502
sinned and come short of the glory of God," hence "there is none righteous," by his own deeds, "no not one." Christ, however, as the substitute of his people, has provided a glorious righteousness, having magnified the law and made it honorable by his obedience unto death, by what he did as the "servant," and by what he suffered as "the lamb of God." This is the righteousness which the apostle, in this context and elsewhere, calls "the righteousness of God." Now sinners are called upon to believe in Christ; and, when they do so, this righteousness becomes theirs, for it "is unto all and upon all them that believe," – it is "by faith." A perfect righteousness, being thus possessed by believers, God declares that they are righteous, and that they are, therefore, entitled to the life promised to righteousness, their title being such as shall remain eternally valid. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. "He that heareth my words," says Christ himself; "and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation." Accordingly the apostle represents eternal glory as inseparably connected with justification – "whom he justified them he also glorified."

It is thus by faith, without the deeds of the law, that sinners are justified. But it is to be carefully observed, that the ground on which they are justified by faith is not, that their faith is accepted as a substitute for righteousness. Their faith is not and could not be so accepted. It is said, indeed, in the next chapter, that "to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," but the meaning is, that his faith is counted to him *in order* to righteousness, or as putting him in possession of righteousness, and not that it is counted to him as *a substitute* for righteousness. This is evident not only from the expression itself, as it is in the original, but also from the fact, that he to whom his faith is counted for righteousness is described as "working not." If this faith were looked upon as a good work and accepted in lieu of a perfect obedience, he could not be thus des-cribed; neither could it be said that, in justifying him, God justified the "ungodly."

Faith unites to Christ, and those who are united to him have fellowship with him, and are partakers of the benefits which he has procured for all the members of his body. Accordingly, they are partakers of his righteousness, and therefore justified. It is thus they are justified by faith. Uniting them to Christ it puts them in possession of righteousness, and, on this ground, they may be said to be justified by it.

III. – I. It is objected to this doctrine of justification by faith that it abolishes the necessity of good works, and relieves from the obligation to perform them. It does indeed reject good works as either wholly or in part the ground of our justification. But in thus rejecting them it only rejects them where they could not occur and would be of no avail; and it does not reject them any further. On the contrary it exerts in various ways a decidedly and powerfully beneficial practical influence.

(1.) It preserves the standard of good works. All good works spring from love to God – it is this love alone, cherished and practically expressed; that is the fulfilling of the law. But until sinners are regenerated – and when they are regenerated they are also justified – instead of loving God they are enemies to him in their minds. Hence works performed before justification, however useful they may be to society, and though they may deserve the approbation of men, are not really and in the judgment of God, good works. Accordingly, in denying them any influence in our justification, we do not at all disparage good works; we have to do with performances of a totally different character. We maintain the standard of good works by not accepting as such works not good.

(2). It opens the only possible access to the power of performing good works. Until the sinner is justified, he is without strength. While he lies under the guilt, he is under the dominion of sin. But, when he is justified, he is brought into friendly communication with heaven, and grace will now be given to him to bring forth fruit unto holiness, and he will be strong in the Lord in the power of his might.

(3). It supplies motives to perform good works. But this point will occur for consideration afterwards.

2. It is objected to justification, as conferring an eternally valid title to life, that it destroys the motives to watchfulness and diligence. The same objection is urged against the closely allied doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. To evade this objection, and in consequence of erroneous views on other points, it is held by many that justification does not confer such a title, but only a title that may be forfeited, and that often is forfeited. This is the doctrine of the Wesleyan body, and of all who hold Arminian sentiments. Having already stated the scriptural doctrine we need not now stop to prove that such a doctrine is unscriptural.

In answer to the objection under consideration, we observe that the doctrine, that in justification a title to life is conferred that will remain for ever valid, does not weaken any, and strengthens some, of the motives to diligence. We apprehend a careful inquiry would discover that it strengthens and elevates all of them. Those motives derive their power from fear, hope, or love.

(1.) In the case of the believer, though justified according to our doctrine, there is abundant room for the operation of fear.

There are many evils that may overtake a person so justified. He may fail to adorn, or to promote with due zeal, devotedness and wisdom, or he may even dishonor, and that grievously, the cause with which he is identified. He may plunge his soul into spiritual darkness, bondage, and distress. He may provoke the displeasure of his heavenly Father, forfeit for a time all communion with him, and bring upon himself much painful chastisement. And it is to be observed that the fear of such evils is more generous than the mere fear of punishment. It springs more directly and exclusively from the sympathies of a holy soul, and is less tinged with the sentient and the selfish.

Thus, as regards motives that derive their power from fear, our doctrine not only leaves them in full operation, but even imparts to them a more elevated, and, hence, a more effective character.

(2.) And it is evidently fitted to inspire and confirm hope, and therefore to secure a high measure of its appropriate fruits. It has a clear and great advantage in this respect over the opposite doctrine, the doctrine namely, – that the title to life acquired in justification is every moment liable to be cancelled. But the objection under consideration seems to imply a suspicion that hope itself is unfavourable to diligence and exertion, for it is against the feature of our doctrine, that peculiarly imparts to it a hope inspiring character, that it is wholly directed. Very different was the estimate formed by the Apostle John of the operation of hope. "We know," he says "that when he shall appear we shall be like him," and, having thus described a most assured hope, he adds, "and every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure." – 1 John 3: 2, 3.

We cannot hope for any result which we do not prize, nor hope ardently for a result which we do not prize highly. And, then, if we prize any result, and in proportion to our appreciation of it, we shall labor with diligence to secure it. Besides, hope relieves the soul from depression and enfeebling apprehensions, imparts to it a buoyant energy, and, by assuring of success, encourages exertion.

It is also to be observed, that hope would soon fail, if it were not continually maintained and established by diligence.

503

(3.) But love is the great element of power in motives to holy activity. Now, it is evident that the doctrine of irreversible justification is eminently fitted, – fitted immeasurably beyond the opposite doctrine, to awaken love. Does not God, in bestowing an eternally valid title to Heaven, display more clearly and fully his glorious character as the God of salvation, than if he only conferred a title that might any moment be forfeited? And, the more conspicuously God's character is manifested, the more powerful is the incentive to love. Besides, a title to heaven that will never fail; as it is a benefit unspeakably greater than a conditional and precarious title, must possess a proportionally greater power to awaken love. It is also to be observed, as a point of vital importance, that a permanent justification preserves the soul in that position, in which alone it can experience those influences of divine grace, by which love is awakened and matured.

3. It will not be made a ground of express objection to this doctrine, that it wholly denies to us any righteousness wrought out by ourselves, but it is a ground of strong prejudice against it. There are many, who, going about to establish their own righteousness, will not submit themselves, as this doctrine requires, to the righteousness of God. Now, surely, it is unreasonable to be offended at a doctrine, which only gives a faithful representation of our condition, and provides for it the proper remedy. We *have* no righteousness of our own, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone only recognises this fact; it does not create it. The fact is wholly independent of the doctrine. The doctrine merely deals with it, and supplies the remedy which it renders necessary. It comes to us with the righteousness of another, that we may take possession of it by faith, and stand accepted in it before God. Surely, we should hail a doctrine which thus meets one of the worst features of our fallen condition.

This doctrine places in a very strong light the necessity and advantageous operation of faith. That we may be saved we must be justified, and that we may be justified, we must possess a perfect righteousness. Now, it is only by faith that we can obtain such a righteousness. The righteousness of God is by the faith of Christ Jesus; it is unto all and upon all them that believe. Without faith, therefore, we remain without righteousness, unjustified, and condemned. Thus faith is indispensable, for it is by faith that his people are united to Christ, and become partakers of his benefits; and as regards the matter of our purification, he that believeth not is condemned already, while being justified by faith, we have peace with God.

And, when we say that faith is necessary, let it be understood what it is of which we thus assert the necessity. A cold assent to the truth of the gospel will be of no avail. Simon Magus believed after this sort. Our faith must be the due recognition by the whole soul of the facts and realities which the Gospel presents, – the due response of our whole soul to its statements with respect to them. Thus, as regards Christ, our faith must not only assent to the truth of what the gospel declares with respect to him, but must also appreciate his excellency and his benefits, and must follow up this appreciation by receiving him and his benefits on the warrant of the gospel offer. Such faith will evidently awaken love and produce activity. Spiritual blessings will, under its influence, be prized and sought, the proper means to obtain them will be diligently used, and all that is opposed to them in character and tendency will be hated and shunned. Faith establishes a connection between the life and spiritual things, as sense establishes a connection between the life and temporal things. It claims and secures for spiritual things the supreme regard of the soul, and thus exalts them to their proper place.

It is such a faith, – a faith which exerts such a power, – that is necessary. And it becomes us to desire earnestly that this faith may be in exercise in our own souls, to be careful that we do not fall short of it, for the benefits which it brings to the soul are unspeakably precious. Particularly, it clothes the soul in the perfect righteousness of the Redeemer, and thus translates it into a state of peace with God.

(2.) And while faith is thus necessary, and secures unspeakable advantages, if you do not exercise it, you cannot derive an excuse from the conditions on which Christ is offered you. He is offered to you freely, without money and without price. This is plainly declared in the Scriptures; and it is evident from the fact, that those who believe receive a perfect righteousness. They are, therefore, authorised to come to Christ without righteousness, and, accordingly, without merit or claim. They cannot be required to bring with them what they are to receive on coming; they cannot be required to bring with them any part of it, as they are to come that they may receive it all. Hence, those who come will not be rejected, however numerous their sins and however grievous.

(3.) We have already seen the great advantage immediately connected with justification. Those who are justified are clothed in the Redeemer's righteousness, and, therefore, God receives them as righteous and as having a title to eternal life. We have now to direct attention to a further privilege which flows from the occupation of this position. The condition prescribed by the law as a covenant having been satisfied, the justified are no longer under the law in that form. They are still, however, under

obligation to be conformed to it as the standard of human character and the rule of human conduct, But now their sins and shortcomings will not be visited with the punishment which it denounces as a covenant. As the law itself no longer bears to them its covenant form, they are no longer liable to the punishment which as a covenant it attaches to transgression. It is as the law of their father's house that they are now under it, and it is only to what it threatens in this form they are now liable when they offend, – to their father's displeasure and the chastisements which he administers to his children. Accordingly, notwithstanding their sins and imperfection, they do not fall again under the curse, nor forfeit their title to heaven. God deals graciously with them, dispensing to them what they need, not what they deserve. He looks upon them in the face of his anointed, and blesses them because he is worthy. They are thus not under the law but under grace; through Christ they have access by faith into this grace wherein they stand.

We have already seen that justification by faith alone promotes holiness, by bringing powerful motives into operation; and we now see that it promotes it also by keeping open the channel of communication between heaven and the soul, so that the influences of the Spirit may still descend. If their position were such that every sin brought them into a state of condemnation, believers would continue but for an instant *out* of this state, and the gracious operations of the Spirit would be consequently withheld from them. Spiritual death would thus regain its dominion over them, and they would become unfruitful. But the perfect righteousness of Christ being permanently unto them and upon them, the influences of the Spirit are still exerted in their souls, and maintain the life of which they have been made partakers. It is true that, on account of their sins, the sensible influences of the Spirit may be, and often are, withheld from them, and that they may be left to feel as if spiritual death had overtaken them; but still the Spirit maintains in their souls the life of which he himself is the author, and will in due time revive them as to the exercise of its powers and the experience 504
of its joys. God "will not suffer his faithfulness to fail; his covenant he will not break, or alter the thing that is gone out of his lips."

(4.) How wretched is the condition of the unjustified! They are without righteousness, and, therefore, have no title to the promised life; nay, they are guilty and condemned; the sentence of condemnation has already been even executed upon them in part, and they are liable to the full execution of it.

That a perfect righteousness is indispensable is evident from the fact that God sent his Son to provide such a righteousness for his people. But they are wholly without righteousness. Nor is this all; they reject the righteousness of Christ, and thus they not only remain under the guilt of their other sins, but add to them the fearful sin of this rejection.

God calls upon them to be reconciled to him, but they disobey the call; they despise the advantages of peace with him, and resolutely remain under his curse. How deplorable this infatuation and how fearful the guilt thus contracted, for they at once ruin their own souls, and dishonor and insult God.

Are any of you unjustified? Are there not some of you who at the best have *no evidence* whatever that they are justified? Will you not be persuaded then to flee from the position which you thus occupy, – to abandon it for ever? You would gladly escape from it, you say. What hinders you then? Does not God offer salvation to you freely? Does he not declare that he is not willing that any should perish? Be not incredulous; this is the actual state of the case. It is no doubt very wonderful that God should offer Salvation freely to those who have rebelled against him; but, wonderful as it is, it is the fact; he does offer it freely. Some one of you, it may be, is now individualised and singled out by his own conscience, and is debating in his own mind whether God offers salvation freely to him. To such a person – to each of you – we are authorised to say he does offer it to you freely; – he offers it to you now. Though the heavens should now open over your head and you saw the throne of God, and from that throne, and from the Eternal who occupies it, you heard the call addressed to you, "believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and you shall be saved," it would not under those solemn circumstances be addressed to you more really or earnestly than it is addressed to you as the case stands. Will you not then comply with it? Will you not accept salvation thus offered to you? What say you? Salvation is offered to you; God offers it to you. Will you not at once and with your whole soul receive it? Do not procrastinate; do not speak of the future. What you mean to do, do now.

---

## INTRUSION AND SUBSEQUENT DOINGS ON THE NORTH SHORE.

St. Leonard's, commonly called the North Shore as being situated on the north shore of Port Jackson, is an important suburb of Sydney. In this, as in the other suburbs, and indeed in outskirts of the city, the interests of Presbyterianism were long and are in some instances still sadly neglected. The policy adopted in managing, or rather mismanaging, Presbyterian affairs in the metropolis, seemed to aim for the most part at preserving the entire population as a source of supply for the congregation from which for the time and in the case it emanated. Hence, Presbyterian Church extension in Sydney has resulted, not from wise and systematic efforts directed to that object, but almost wholly from disagreements and the independent action of individuals; and, of course, Church extension movements, which had such an origin, would not always be well timed, and would seldom, if at all, be conducted under the influence of a just and comprehensive estimate of the present and prospective distribution and necessities of the population.

The North Shore supplied hearers to several congregations in Sydney, and, of course, therefore, the policy to which we have

referred was applied to it; for those hearers were not to be forfeited, the motive to retain such hearers being often all the stronger, as it probably was in this case, from the circumstance that suburban hearers are frequently among the wealthiest hearers in the city congregations which they attend. Circumstances, however, arose under which a minister might be appointed to the North Shore, and yet North Shore hearers be retained by city congregations, A minister in receipt of a Government salary was desirous to live in Sydney or its immediate neighborhood, and, that he might be in circumstances to draw his salary, it was necessary that he should be officiating somewhere in the colony. This minister was appointed to the North Shore. The people were not consulted in the the matter; he was intruded upon them, and, though they afterwards expressed their dissatisfaction to the Church Courts, and prayed that the intruded minister might be removed, he was not removed. Nor was it only before the union, and by the Synod of Australia in connection with the Established Church of Scotland, that this treatment was given to the people; it was given to them, also, and without any mitigation, after the union and by the Union Church. From the outset and throughout the case presented and preserved the character, in an aggravated form, of a case of intrusion, the object evidently being, as in all such cases, not to supply ministrations to the people, but to entitle the minister to a salary.

Under the operation of the settlement thus effected and of this unyielding maintenance of it, many of the Presbyterian inhabitants of the North Shore were dispersed among other denominations,

while some were in danger of sinking into an habitual and confirmed neglect of divine ordinances. After this state of things had been created and had existed for some time, the circumstances of the North Shore were brought under the notice of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia. That Church has hitherto carefully abstained from disturbing localities occupied by the Union Church – an avoidance of unseemly collision by no means reciprocated – but, though the Union Church had an intruded and rejected minister on the North Shore, who officiated *pro forma* to two or three individuals, it could not be regarded as occupying that locality. Accordingly, the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia sent a minister to officiate on the North Shore, and to endeavor to gather its scattered Presbyterians.

This effort has been attended with such a measure of success that it has been thought necessary to oppose it. Accordingly the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, the Union Church, while it bore with great equanimity the mischief done to Presbyterianism on the North Shore, by the disgraceful arrangement which it inherited and maintained, now bestirred itself with considerable determination, if not energy, to thwart the attempt made, certainly not too soon, to restore it to its proper position. First of all other ministers, who it was expected would be more acceptable, were sent to preach for the intruded resident minister. But this had no effect. Another expedient was to get the intruded resident minister to resign, an expedient which ought not to have been rendered necessary as it was by intruding him, and which, seeing it was necessary, ought to have been adopted sooner. At last, though not, apparently without difficulty, he was induced to resign. The ground having been thus cleared for a demonstration of respect for the rights of the people, which had so long been set at nought, such a demonstration was made. A congregational meeting, as if a congregation existed to furnish the materials of such a meeting, was summoned to receive a deputation of the Union Presbytery of Sydney, consisting of the Rev. Mr. Thomson, the Rev. Dr. Steel, and Dr. Moon. Four grown-up persons, three lads and one young girl, eight in all, attended. After some delay, Mr. Allan addressed the meeting, condemning in faithful and therefore emphatic terms 505
the treatment given the North Shore by the Union Church, and ascribing, as he was fully justified in doing, the present display of concern for the spiritual interests of that locality to sectarian hostility to the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and to a desire to thwart the effort in which it was most legitimately engaged to redress a grievous wrong, and to supply ministrations where they were most urgently needed. Another gentleman spoke somewhat to the same effect, but added some remarks dictated apparently by the gratification with which he might naturally enough regard the abandonment so far, although too late, of its intrusionist doings by the Union Church.

It now became evident that the meeting could not be made to serve the purposes for which it was convened, and a member of the deputation (we believe Dr. Steel) deeming it best, we presume, that it should not be prolonged, adroitly proposed that the entire case of the North Shore should be left in the hands of the Presbytery. This suggestion was no sooner made than Mr. George, who, though, if we mistake not, he has been known to perform himself, single handed, all the functions of a Congregational meeting, might naturally enough have experienced, under the circumstances, a repressing or even depressing influence, sprang to his feet, and expressed his approval of the course which the reverend gentleman had just proposed. Whether it was thought that Mr. George had, from his antecedents, acquired a right to be considered as constituting in his own person a congregational meeting, and that his approval was therefore equivalent to the affirmative vote of such a meeting, we do not profess to determine; but, though no motion was made, no vote taken, and the meeting was at once closed, it was reported in the *Herald,* on whose authority we know not, that the meeting unanimously referred the matter submitted to it to the Presbytery. This report, we need not now inform our readers, was untrue and deceptive; and the cause must be a wretched one that lies, or is felt by its supporters to lie, under a necessity of employing such means of presenting itself in a favorable light before the public.

We have no sympathy with the nonsense often uttered against what is called Sectarianism, and uttered frequently by those who are themselves sectarian in the worst sense, their object almost always being to deter others from maintaining their distinctive views, that they may be the better able to advocate their own. There is no Sectarianism in the faithful and vigorous maintenance of the truth, or in the opposition that, in maintaining it, it may be necessary to offer to others; there is no Sectarianism in condemning and exposing error, or in refusing to countenance or promote it in any way whatever. But, when a Church first lays waste a neighborhood by intrusionist proceedings and otherwise, and then, observing that another Church, at least equally sound in faith and with the same form of government with itself, has engaged, with some prospect of success, in an effort to undo the mischief, bestirs itself to oppose that Church, and to recover the monopoly it has so much abused – this is Sectarianism; for it is fighting for a sect and not contending for the truth, and fighting for a sect to the prejudice of men's spiritual and eternal interests. It is not without regret and even more painful feelings, that we find our friend, Dr. Moon, sustaining the character of an instrument and agent of such Sectarianism.

And a circumstance to which we must refer, if nothing else, would lead us to expect that Dr. Steel would not sustain the character of an agent of it. Soon after Mr. Stuart went to the North Shore, Dr. Steel, meeting him at the house of a common friend, expressed his gratification at his having "come over to help" the Presbyterians of that locality; and subsequently, on the same evening and in the same place, having had occasion to engage in prayer, he presented a petition to the effect that, through the Divine blessing his labors might be attended with abundant success. In the face of

this profession and prayer, surely no one would suspect – at least no one that gave Dr. Steel any credit for sincerity – that he would, and that soon, become a party to an effort to prevent the success, and even to necessitate the discontinuance of Mr. Stuart's labors on the North Shore. He became, however, as our readers are now aware, a party to such an effort.

But whatever part we might expect certain individuals would act, we need not in the least wonder at any of the manifestations of the Unionist spirit, to which we have directed attention as presented on the North Shore. What can be more natural than that a body, which approves of the position occupied by the Established Church of Scotland, in which ministers may be intruded on reclaiming congregations, should itself practice intrusion? What can be more natural than that a Church, which originated in defection, should regard with hostility and seek to exterminate a Church, occupying the same territory, which refused to be a party to the defection, and whose very existence as a separate body is a standing protest against it? And, if men deliberately compromise important principles which they profess to hold, and enter into a compact based on such a compromise by each of the parties to it, and thus not one compromise but on several, – and all this Unionists have done, – can we reasonably expect that, in maintaining the position which they thus assume and in following up their assumption of it, they will display a lofty and unswerving regard to principle? The truth is, that

however unwilling we may be to admit that certain individuals appeared in their true character, as, most certainly they did not appear to advantage in the North Shore business, the Unionist spirit and the Unionist Church appeared in it in *their* true character. They are not a particle better than it exhibits them.

Nor is it we and the North Shore people alone that have made this discovery. It has been made by not a few who entered into the Union, and who now cannot well, or think they cannot, retrace their steps. We meet continually with persons in this position. They are dissatisfied, as the judicious and observant cannot fail to be, with the *working* of the Union; and, their minds being thus better able to disengage themselves from prepossessions, they perceive, or perceive more clearly, that, while the Union does not work well, it is open to grave and fatal objections on grounds of principle. But still, from a sentimental unwillingness to separate from congregations with which they have long been connected, or from the impossibility, arising from, their local circumstances, of obtaining Presbyterian ministrations beyond the Union Church, they continue in that Church. Thus they occupy a position at once painful to their feelings and prejudicial to their spiritual interests, and fail to comply with the requirement, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." What mischief the Union has done them!

---

## THE UNION POLICY OF THE FREE CHURCH MAJORITY A POLICY OF DEFECTION.

In June last, in an article on "The Unions effected in Australia and that contemplated in Scotland," we quoted from a speech delivered by Professor Gibson, in the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, on the 23rd March, 1868. The speech, as subsequently published by Dr. Gibson in a pamphlet form with an appendix, is now before us, the author having kindly sent us a copy, and it certainly furnishes conclusive and melancholy evidence that the policy of the present leaders of the Free Church is a policy of compromise and defection, the spectacle presented being, as the reverend speaker remarks, not that of a church renouncing in one generation the testimony for which in a former generation it contended and suffered, but that of a church doing both in one and the same generation, 506
some at least of those who led it in doing the former, leading it openly and zealously in doing the latter. That this is the actual state of the case the following extract leaves no room to doubt: –

"It will be observed that I have struck out [in the overture moved by him] the words employed in Mr. Isdale's Overture, viz., 'non-Established Churches,' and have used the following language: 'That whereas Union on the basis of adherence to the Westminster Standards in their integrity, as hitherto understood and professed by this Church, is most earnestly to be desired.' Of course this includes 'non-Established Presbyterian Churches.' But I wish to remind the Presbytery that it unanimously overtured the Assembly, 1863 – Dr. Buchanan and others consenting – 'that in dealing with any proposals for this most desirable and important end, viz., Union with all Presbyterians holding our Standards, due care shall be taken to have respect to the maintenance, in their integrity, of the principles of the authorised Standards of this Church, and especially to those distinctive principles for which this Church has been honored to contend and to suffer.' None who agreed to this Overture in 1863 can consistently object to my having substituted 'Presbyterian Churches' for 'non-Established Churches' in Scotland. I knew perfectly that Dr. Buchanan was not the man to stand upon words, if he got what he wanted. He proposed, in the Assembly, instead of the words, 'to have respect to the maintenance, *in their integrity,* of the principles of the authorized standards of this Church,' etc., the words, 'due regard being had,' etc. I did not withdraw the motion I made in the Assembly, 1863, except on the express understanding and assurance that they meant the same thing – an assurance repeated in 1864. I knew they were not the same thing, but was pressed publicly and by private letter to yield, as it was declared they meant the same thing, and yet Dr. Buchanan refused the words he previously supported. I did not believe they meant the same thing, but could not refuse to receive men's assurances that they were the same thing. The event has now very fully justified my incredulity, and shown that 'due regard' only means such regard as will not hinder the proposed Union – to effect which our principles must go to the wall. I am told that in a pamphlet which I have not seen, by a new Member – and, of course, a zealous one of our Union Committee, the assurances were given in a different sense from mine. Be it so. Then it was deception, for they knew well enough what I meant when I put the question. Now, I am willing to unite, with all who will unite with us on the Basis of the Westminster Standards, in their integrity, as hitherto understood and professed by this Church. I am so willing –1st, Because these principles are *not sectarian*, – and neither voluntary nor Erastian, nor United Presbyterian, nor Cameronian, nor even Free Church in any sectarian sense; but the principles of the true Catholic Church, and of the ancient Church of Scotland, reformed and so universally acknowledged by all Presbyterians in this nation, till the rise of Voluntaryism in the Secession, and the Free Church professing hitherto to hold them in their integrity. I will not be a party to any sectarian movement, by which, by owning Voluntaryism, or Erastianism, or any other 'ism,' I shall be precluded from uniting with any party, established or non-established, which shall unite with us on these principles, as professed by us in our Standards, in our Protest and Deed of Demission and Claim of Right.

I am now forced to ask why did Dr. Buchanan refuse, in the General Assembly, the terms of the Overture of the Glasgow Presbytery, and substitute more elastic terms? His subsequent course has given the answer. Had the leaders, or Dr. Buchanan himself, declared that they were willing to make our differences of opinion open questions, a very different response would have been given. I was not ignorant that Dr. Buchanan held very accommodating views on such questions. I had occasion, as early as 1845, to quote and to remark on these views, as reported in the Proceedings of the Liverpool Conference of the Evangelical Alliance of that year. I find it recorded that Dr. Buchanan objected to the designation Protestant Alliance – 'Because,' he said, 'it was rather a negative than a positive term. It limited, moreover, the range of the Alliance to members of those churches that sprang out of the Lutheran Reformation; whereas it was hoped that the Alliance might gather adherents out of the Eastern as well as out of the Western Churches; might, in short, become a bond to unite Christians together from the four winds of heaven; and, in particular, he thought it of great importance that the Union should have a name, that might bring within the range of its influence that noble and most interesting movement now going on in Germany. The leaders of the movement had not adopted the name of Protestants; and even the name might have kept them apart from the proposed meeting in London; that would be a serious evil, as he strongly felt that, under God, much of the Christian character and success of that new revolt from Romanism might depend on those who where guiding it, being brought early and personally into contact with the enlightened and matured Evangelism of this country.'

Now, Sir, I say that the course of proceeding now being followed by our leaders is a violation of the principles on which the Disruption was effected. What was the fifth resolution of the Convocation of November, 1842? I know well enough that there

are some men now zealous for Union who were not the first to consent to come out of the Established Church, or even to join the Convocation. But is that a reason for now turning their backs on the principles involved in the said resolution?

I have before me the Memorial addressed to the Government in 1843 by the Convocationists, signed in their name by 'Thomas Chalmers, D.D., chairman of the meeting.' A list of their names, according to their Synods, follows; and then a statement explanatory of certain points of difficulty, by a committee appointed for the purpose 'by the Convocation,' and signed 'Charles J. Brown, convener.' The following is Resolution V: – 'That it is the duty of the ministers now assembled, and of all who adhere to their views, to make a solemn representation to Her Majesty's Government, and to both Houses of Parliament, setting forth the imminent and extreme peril of the Establishment, the inestimable value of the benefits which it confers on the country, and the pain and reluctance with which they are forced to contemplate the possibility of the Church's separation, for conscience sake, from the State; respectfully calling upon the rulers of the nation to maintain the constitution of the kingdom inviolate, and to uphold a pure establishment of religion in the land; and finally intimating, that as the endowments of the Church are undoubtedly at the disposal of the supreme power of the State, with whom it rests either to continue to the Church her possession of them free from any limitation of her spiritual jurisdiction and freedom, or to withdraw them altogether. So it must be the duty of the Church,' it goes on to say, to surrender them if no relief is granted, 'maintaining still uncompromised the principle of a right scriptural connection between the Church and the State, and solemnly entering their protest against the judgment of which they complain,' etc. The 'Memorial' then goes on to say that if compelled to 'relinquish their position,' it is not the result of disappointment, or irritation, or any want of a due regard to the important benefits which the present Establishment of the Church confers upon the people of Scotland. On the contrary, such is their sense of the value of that Establishment such their apprehension of the many evils likely to result from its disruption or overthrow, and such their 507
anxiety to remain in the discharge of their spiritual duties, in the preaching of the gospel, and the oversight of their parishes, under the shade of that national protection and favour, which was the happy fruit of the prayers, the labours, and the sufferings of their fathers, that they have been willing to make the utmost possible concessions, with a view to the restoration of harmony,' etc. I cannot help quoting a portion of the 'Engagement' entered into at a crowded meeting of ministers and elders, held in the West Church, Edinburgh, August 1840. It says: 4, And 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, holding sacred the principle of Establishments, as sanctioned both by reason and by the Word of God, – recognising the obligation of civil rulers to support and endow the Church, and the lawfulness and expediency of the Church receiving countenance from the State, we at the same time,' etc. It goes on to declare, the doctrine of the spiritual freedom of the Church, and that it is the 'sacred duty,' as it is the 'interest,' of the civil magistrate, 'to give positive encouragement and support to the Church in the exercise of all her spiritual functions – for thus only can God be fully glorified, or the prosperity or greatness of any people be effectually promoted,' concludes in the following awful words: –

"We the undersigned Ministers and Elders, do solemnly, as in a holy covenant with God, and with one another, engage to stand by one another, and by the Church which God's right hand has planted amongst us, promising that by the grace and help of Almighty God, we will adhere to the two great principles which we have avowed,' etc., and more to the same purpose. When I trace these solemn transactions, in which some of us still living had a part, and witness what is taking place among us, to use the words of the document – 'we have our minds filled with solemn awe when we contemplate the crisis to which God in His holy providence has brought this Church,' and we tremble for ourselves, lest we may be permitted to place ourselves in opposition to the 'holy covenant' into which we then entered.

I cannot help adding, that for a number of men to prove openly unfaithful in their own lifetime to such solemn vows and obligations, cannot but be injurious to the public cause of religion and morality; and, without judging others, I must ask myself, should I be so guilty, what right could I have to declaim against the shameful violation of contracts and engagements so fearfully prevalent in many departments of our trade and commerce? A thousand times rather be subjected to the world's – say, even Christian ministers' – cry of bigotry and narrow-mindedness, than to give it just cause to say we tampered with our solemn professions. I have read of sad declensions – yea, sudden declension in the Church – but I do not remember such a forgetfulness of public professions, by a numerous body of men in their own lifetime, as some now propose."

---

## HEATHEN ORIGIN OF THE POPISH WORSHIP OF SAINTS.

(*From the Heathenism of Popery, by the Rev. William Mclntyre, A.M.*)

*Continued from last Number.*

"It was a necessary consequence of the heathen multiplication of divinities that the sphere of influence allotted to each of them should be limited. Thus Jupiter himself, in the Roman form of heathenism, ruled specially over the air and the upper regions, while the sea was subject to Neptune and the infernal regions to Pluto; and, of course, in the case of divinities of less note and inferior power, the local limitation of authority and influence was still greater. The control and interference of individual gods and goddesses were also restricted to certain operations and interests. Thus Minerva presided over learning, science, and art, and particularly over spinning and weaving; Ceres was the goddess of corn and husbandry; Vulcan of fire, and particularly of the forge, and Bacchus of wine. There were also, on behalf of certain localities and communities, in accordance with the local limitation to which I have referred, special confidence reposed in particular divinities and special worship rendered to them as guardians. Even each family had its special gods, its *lares* and its *penates,* and each individual his genius. Places also were under the guardianship of genii. This localising, distribution, and selection of objects of worship, inseparable from the multiplication of them, obtains also in the popish system. The Virgin Mary, from the exalted position assigned to her, – for she is, practically, very much the first and highest among the objects of popish worship, – is but little subjected to the limitations which result from these processes. She is not, however, wholly exempt from them. The heathen title, which she has inherited, – that of Queen of Heaven, – borne before her by Juno, the wife of Jupiter, and also as stated in the extract I have given from the Edinburgh Review, by a Buddhist female divinity, while a title of honor and a designation of the most exalted rank, seems at the same time to indicate a limitation of sphere. The distinctive territory of Juno's husband consisted of the heavens and the upper regions, and he was so closely associated with these in the popular mind, that in certain phrases his name is employed to denote the sky, the visible heavens, the air; and, accordingly,

when his wife was called the Queen of heaven, as Proserpine was regarded as the Queen of the infernal regions, the title, while it proclaimed her pre-eminent rank, may have also implied the limitation of her dominion. But, be this as it may, the title under consideration, as regards both its origin and its import, is unmistakeably heathen. It could have originated only in a polytheistic system, of which the gods and goddesses, formed throughout on the model of humanity, were subject to some at least of its earthly conditions, and thus "married and were given in marriage," so that, as there was among them a king of heaven, and this king of heaven was married, his wife as a matter of course, was the "queen of heaven," for their marriage was not a morganatic one, little as the husband regarded its obligations. Thus, "queen of heaven" is a title furnished by one of the grossest elements of the conception which the heathen formed of their gods; and, yet, popery finds use for it and retains it, – a convincing proof not only of the fact but also of the intensity of the heathenism of that system. It is, further, worthy of notice in this connection, that the Greeks called Juno Hera, a name equivalent to *Lady,* and that the Church of Rome, as if determined to constitute the Virgin Mary the successor of the chief female divinity of heathenism, gives her the title of "Lady." There is, however, in the bestowal of this title, something still worse, if possible, than an imitation and reproduction of heathenism. Juno, naturally enough, bore titles expressive of her rank and dignity as the wife of Jupiter. The very name *Juno, a* contraction of Juvino, indicates her relation to Jupiter or Jove. And the Church of Rome, adopting the same mode of designation, regardless of the blasphemy involved in doing so, bestows upon the Virgin Mary the title of "Lady," corresponding to that of "Lord" which is borne by God. It calls her "our Lady" as, it calls God "our Lord." Could anything be more revolting than to bring thus into contact with Jehovah a title which originated in the conjugal relation of Jupiter and Juno?

Relics are the great means of localising the popish objects of worship. Wheresoever relics of a saint are enshrined, there his power is especially exerted and his favors more successfully sought. The



Virgin Mary, notwithstanding the ubiquitous influence ascribed to her, has been thus brought into special connection with certain localities. Among these Loretto occupies a conspicuous place. Saints of less extended power are more fully subjected to this local limitation. To such saints, accordingly, exactly defined territorial spheres are sometimes allotted; and the exertion of their power emanates mainly, if not wholly, from particular shrines. Some saints, too, are invested with the special office of promoting certain interests and conferring certain benefits. Thus St. Blaise is the patron of woolcombers and heals sore throats. Particular saints have also been chosen by communities and individuals as patrons. Thus popery in its objects of worship and in its mode of dealing with them maintains a close resemblance to heathenism.

When objects of worship are multiplied, inferior objects of worship are, of course, admitted; and such divinities, from the fact that they are such, and are, at the same time, numerous, cannot well be worshipped always and everywhere. It becomes necessary to resort, to a great extent if not throughout, to the plan of distributing time and territory among them, giving a portion to each; and this arrangement will sufficiently satisfy any claim that can be preferred for them. We have already seen that, so far as regards the distribution of territory or the assigning of local spheres to particular gods or canonised saints, such a plan has been pursued by heathenism and popery alike; and both systems have pursued it also with respect to time, assigning certain days and seasons, the one to certain gods and the other to certain saints. That popery has set apart and distributed among its canonised saints a great number of days to be observed in honour of them is notorious; and under the older system days were similarly set apart. Thus the festival of Janus was celebrated on the 1st January; and the Quirinalia, or festival of Quirinus, on the 17th February. The first of each month was sacred to Juno, who was specially worshipped on the Matronalia celebrated on the first of March. On the 18th of that month the festival of Bacchus, or the Liberalia, was held, and the festival of Minerva began on the 19th, and was held for five days. The festival called Hilaria was celebrated on the 25th, in honor of the mother of the gods. Among the festivals of April were the Robigalia, celebrated on the 25th, to propitiate Robigus the god of mildew, and the festival of Flora, celebrated on the 28th. On the 15th May, the festival of Mercury was held, and on the 9th June that of Vesta. The festival of Neptune was celebrated on the 23rd of July, the festival of Vulcan on the 23rd August, and, to omit many others, that of Saturn, characterised by feasting and unrestrained mirth, on the 17th December.

Thus the canonised saints of popery occupy throughout a position corresponding to that of the gods, particularly the inferior gods, of heathenism. They bear a closer resemblance, however, to the dii indigites or deified heroes, and to the *lares* or the spirits of deceased persons acting the part of tutelary deities. Such gods the Greeks called *demons*. Thus, when Paul "preached Jesus and the resurrection" to the Athenians, and some of them, regarding the resurrection as a female divinity, said "he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods," the word which they used for "gods" was *daimonia,* demons. This, accordingly, is the proper Greek designation of canonised saints viewed as objects of worship and inferior divinities."

# Correspondence.

## THE QUEEN'S BOOK.

*To the Editor of "The Testimony."*

Sir, – The Word of God enjoins us to "render to all their dues . . . . honor to whom honor," and to "honor the king."

Those who make that Word the rule of their conduct, feel it to be their duty to yield to those earthly sovereigns, who, in the wise providence of God are placed over them, all due loyalty. What follows in this letter is, we apprehend, in no way inconsistent with such loyalty. Whatever is published to the world, whosoever the author may be, is public property. Hence those who read are fully at liberty to form their own judgment regarding such publications, and to give public expression to the same, provided the expression they give to it contains nothing treasonable, libellous, or abusive.

Loyalty to the King of Kings requires that notice shall be taken of productions, from whomsoever they emanate, which contain things contrary to his laws; and such loyalty is never incompatible with due loyalty to earthly rulers. Cherishing, as we believe we do, due loyalty to the Sovereign of the British Empire, and, at the same time, desirous of showing loyalty to the laws of heaven, we now proceed to offer some remarks on some of the contents of the book bearing the title, "Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands." At the outset we have no hesitation in stating our conviction, that the author of this book will bear very favorable comparison with most of the previous occupants of the British throne, and that in many of her acts, whether viewed as an individual, a parent, or a ruler, she is worthy of commendation and imitation. She is much to be commended for the kindly, genial, and condescending dispositions manifested by her as

recorded in her Journal. The Journal contains a good deal that is interesting especially to natives of the Highlands of Scotland. The laudation bestowed on Highland scenery and Highland people cannot fail to gratify Highland readers. The production shows a great capa- bility of appreciating the beautiful and the grand in the works of creation, for which there was ample scope in the districts visited by Her Majesty. It also shows a great power of observation both of men and of manners. But we regret that we are constrained to add that the book records a good deal that is highly objectionable and calculated to damage the interests of true religion. We refer partly to what seems to be excessive devotion to sightseeing and other worldly pleasures therewith connected, as also the great lack, almost utter absence, of such references to the Author of the beautiful and the grand in nature and to the display of his adorable perfections therein, as might justly be expected from one under the influence of religious feeling. This is the more to be wondered at, as the royal author highly praises a sermon she heard in Scotland, for this among other reasons, because it showed that religion ought to pervade every action of our lives. But what struck us most painfully in reading the Journal is the account in various places of the manner in which the Lord's day was spent. Were it not that the word "Sunday" is prefixed to those parts of the book, and that allusion is made to prayers being read and sermon preached at a certain hour, it would never strike the reader that they relate to the Lord's day, as with the exception of the allusion to the prayers and sermon, there is no perceptible difference between that and the other days of the week. This applies to all the seven or eight entries in the book regarding what transpired on "Sundays." That sacred portion of time, from the accounts given, seems to have been a good deal spent in the following manner: – driving in pleasure grounds, seeing scenery and writing accounts of travelling and sightseeing, sketching scenery, and voyaging, and, in one case at least, reading the "Lay of the Last Minstrel." Farther, others were led to violate the sanctity of the Sabbath through the passing or arrival of the royal party. As a specimen of this we give the following extract, – it is taken from the entry dated "Sunday, August 15th," page 46: "We passed the famous Swilly Rocks, and saw the works they were making for 509
the tube for the rail road, and then went under the Menai Bridge and stopped immediately on the other side. There were crowds of loyal people in steamers and boats playing 'God save the Queen,' and cheering tremendously." This so-called loyalty to an earthly ruler involved glaring disloyalty to the King of Heaven. Again, we extract from page 200, dated "In Guernsey Bay, off St. Pierre, Guernsey, Sunday, August 23rd." . . . "While dressing I kept thinking whether we could not manage to see Falmouth, or something or other. Albert thought we might manage to see one of the Channel Islands, and, accordingly, he sent for Lord Adolphus Fitzclarence, and it was settled we should go to Guernsey, which delighted me, as I had so long wished to see it . . . . About half-past nine we set off, &c. . . . As we approached we were struck by the beauty of the Guernsey coast, in which there are several rocky bays, and the town of St. Pierre is very picturesquely built, down to the water's edge. You see Sark as you enter the harbor to the right, and farther on, close opposite St, Pierre, two islands close together – Herm and Lethon. The bay with these five islands is really most curious. We anchored at seven, immediately opposite St. Pierre, and with the two islands on the other side of us. We dined at eight, and found on going on deck the whole town illuminated, which had a very pretty effect, and must have been done very quickly, for they had no idea of our coming." Circumstances do not permit my giving more extracts at present. The whole thing is very shocking, presenting as it does a line of conduct involving a glaring disregard of the revealed will of the Great lawgiver concerning the observance of that day which he claims as his own. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath; from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord," &c. How grievous to think that one, whose example is in many things so praiseworthy, and whose high position involves such a prodigious amount of influence, should exhibit to her numerous subjects such an example of Sabbath desecration. It is as much as to say to them you may indulge as much as you like in recreations, on land or water, on the Lord's day, provided you join in certain religious observances during part of the day. And those who hate the directions laid down by the Great Lawgiver concerning the observance of his own day, and insisted on by all who faithfully adhere to these directions, are ready enough to quote the Queen's example, when advocating Sabbath recreations, and denouncing what they call puritanical views of Sabbath observance. What a pity that Her Majesty was not brought up under the influence of a high standard of Sabbath observance! What a pity, also, that she had not the opportunity of observing how a very considerable portion of the inhabitants of what she called the "dear Highlands" revere the Lord's day. We had intended to refer to the accounts given of Her Majesty's patronising and participating in balls on the occasions of her visits to the Highlands; but we are at present prevented from want of time. We would only remark that such accounts are far from being consistent with the laudatory estimate of Mr. Caird's sermon. It would be hard to show how real religion pervades the actions of the ball room, and that those actions can be performed in a "christian spirit." It is to be feared that through such performances, as well as the lax observance of the Lord's Day referred to, the Highlands of Scotland have sustained no small injury.

Yours, &c.,

PRESBYTER.

16th April, 1869.

---

## THE JUDGMENT OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN THE RITUALIST CASE, MARTIN v. MACKONOCHIE.

The following statement of the effect of this judgment is given by the *Daily Telegraph*: –

"It decides that the practices which characterise the extreme Ritualistic clergy are inconsistent with the canons of the Church. A considerable time ago, it will be remembered, a prosecution was instituted against Mr. Mackonochie in the Court of Arches, on four grounds – first, that during divine service he was in the habit of elevating the paten and of kneeling and prostrating himself before the Eucharistic elements; secondly that he placed lighted candles on the altar when no light was required for the purpose of seeing; thirdly, that he employed incense; and, fourthly, that he mixed water with the sacramental wine. The decision of the Court was, that the first practice was not contrary to law; that the evidence did not prove Mr. Mackonochie to have been guilty of the second; and that the third and fourth were illegal. Against that Judgment the incumbent of St. Albans did not appeal, and has since left off the practices condemned by the Court. But against the decision on the first and second counts the prosecutor appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and on Wednesday that highest of Ecclesiastical Courts reversed the judgment pronounced in the Court of Arches with respect to those changes. Hence, by one or other of the tribunals, all the four practices cited in the original indictment are declared

to be condemned by the Articles or Formularies of the Anglican Church. The decision on the subject of elevating the paten, and of kneeling, is especially important, since these signs of adoration are taken to signify a belief in the Real Presence – a dogma to which all the ceremonies of Ritualism point. Even more important is the ground on which the condemnation is based. That the practices in question receive a direct warrant from the Prayer Book, Mr. Mackonochie and his party have never alleged; but they have argued that the Prayer Book utters no word of prohibition, and that what it does not expressly forbid it by implication allows. Lord Cairns and his colleagues emphatically condemn that doctrine. Whatever practice, they say, is not expressly retained by the words of the Prayer Book must be regarded as abandoned; what-ever is not authorised must be held to be forbidden. With much emphasis Lord Cairns added, that to the Prayer Book and the Rubric there must be no addition, and that from those standards there must be no omission. A more sweeping judgment could hardly be imagined, and it may produce the most important practical consequences."

At a meeting of leading Ritualists, presided over by Archdeacon Denison, a brother, we believe, of Sir William Denison, formerly Governor of this colony, a memorial, "addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, and *mutatis mutandis,* to the two Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York," was adopted. In the memorial it was alleged "that the judgment, by laying down that the Rubric of 1652 is the sole and exhaustive directory for public worship in the Church of England, has, by implication, (*a.*) made several long established usages illegal; has (*b.*) revived and made compulsory several neglected usages; and finally, has (*c.*) left the clergy totally without guidance in many cases;" and several instances are adduced under each of these heads. After adducing those instances, the memorial proceeds as follows: – "Your memorialists respectfully point out to your lordships that, inasmuch as the judgment declares that 'the directions contained in' the Prayer Book 'must be strictly observed; that no omission and no addition can be permitted;' and also states that 'the bishop has no jurisdiction to modify 510
or dispense with the rubrical provisions;' it necessarily follows that compliance with the law clearly involves a strict application by the ordinaries of the entire prescriptions of the Prayer Book in every case and under all circumstances. Yet it is obvious that, on the one hand, a partial or one-sided enforcement of the principle of the judgment would be a grievous injustice; and that, on the other hand, the exaction of a rigid uniformity must be productive of great vexation and mischief. In sum, it would appear that their lordships have found themselves able to condemn the altar lights only by laying down a rule for the application of the Rubric, which goes a long way towards dissociating the practice of the Church of England from the Church Primitive and Catholic; which not only narrows the liberty of Churchmen, but imposes on them, under new penal conditions, a law which, as stated by the Dean of Arches, 'has never at any period been duly and universally obeyed since the Reformation;' and which, as has now been shown by many examples, involves great contradictions and practical difficulties."

According to these representations, and, though we have no sympathy with the object in the interest of which they are made, we fear they are to a great extent well founded, the position of the Church of England is that of a body whose authoritative regulations are of such a character that it has been deemed, at the least, expedient to treat many of them as a dead letter. This is evidently a most unsatisfactory state of things. The government of a Church in which it obtains cannot but be paralysed; and under its influence, especially when taken in connection with the principle of comprehension, on which it is alleged the Church of England was organised, relaxed views of the obligation contracted by official subscription cannot fail to prevail.

But to whatever extent it may be impracticable or inexpedient to observe the whole of the directory for public worship that is *legally* in force in the Church of England, the non-observance of certain regulations or rubrics cannot afford the Ritualists any authority, as they seem to think it does, for adopting usages which no regulation prescribes or sanctions, and still less for adopting, as they do, usages which have been expressly or by implication abolished. At the same time the right *unprotestantly* claimed by the Church of England to institute ceremonies, without Scripture authority, under the guidance of "antiquity," that is, the ascription by it to the usage of "antiquity" of an authority in matters of ceremony, co-ordinate with that of the Scriptures and independent of it, opens a door which cannot well be shut in the face of the Ritualist, when he seeks to gain access by it to ceremonies as fully recommended by the usage of antiquity as those which have been retained on the authority or under the sanction of that usage. He may reasonably urge that he cannot, at one and the same time, be required to respect and to disregard the authority of antiquity; that if it imposes an obligation or affords a warrant to introduce or retain some of the ceremonies on behalf of which it may be pleaded, it equally imposes an obligation or affords a warrant to introduce or retain all of them; and from this ground he cannot well be dislodged. He may, no doubt, be told that the rubrics indicate and determine the extent of his adherence to antiquity; but he is fully justified, and, in logical consistency, constrained to reply that, if the usage of antiquity is an authority in matters of ceremonial, it is an authority such matters; and that, if it ought to be followed at all, it ought to be followed through-out. What should we think of a Church that would say to its people follow the guidance of the scriptures in such and such things, but no further? But there is precisely the same logical contradiction in saying to them follow the usage of antiquity in this and in the other instance, but in these alone.

The memorial concludes with the following prayer "your memorialists humbly pray that your lordship will vindicate the Primitive and Catholic character of the church of England, disparaged by the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council now under review; will claim for Churchmen the lawful liberty now invaded and denied; and will, so far as in you lies, relieve them from the contradictions, the difficulties, and the dangers in which they are placed by the late interpretation of the law."

The following resolution indicates the course which, in the judgment of a large majority of the meeting, the ritualists ought to adopt with respect to the adverse judgment: – "That this meeting does not recognise the existing Court of Final Appeal as a Court competent to declare the law of the Church of England upon either doctrine or ceremonial; that, with respect to this particular judgment of the of the said Court in Martin v. Mackonochie, the meeting finds, among other things, that that judgment disregards the Church of England's fundamental principle of connection with and reference to the practice to the Church Primitive and Catholic. Nevertheless, it acknowledges the duty of submitting, under protest, to the law of the land, upon that law being put in force, so far as such law is expressed in the decree of the said judgment, and until such law shall be further declared or amended."

For the last clause of this resolution, the minority sought to substitute the following amendment: "And therefore it is unable to reconcile submission to the present decree with its paramount

and primary duty of obedience to the Church, and can only wait in patience and Providence of God."

---

## FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MEREDITH.
## ANNUAL MEETING AND LECTURE.

The annual meeting of the Free Presbyterian Church, at Meredith, was held on Wednesday evening, the 24th of March. The Rev. P. McPherson, pastor of the congregation, presided and opened the meeting with devotional exercises. Thereafter he gave a brief lecture in connection with the political and ecclesiastical movements taking place in Italy. He referred to the purpose of the present Pope of Rome to hold a general council of the Church, to which Protestants were invited. As yet the invitation was somewhat promiscuous, but if the Pope got encouragement he might forward a parcel of blank tickets from the Vatican, to the heads of different Protestant denominations for distribution to those who might be inclined to go. As the Pope was anxious that those whose "ancestors" had deserted the Church should return to the "bosom of our Holy Mother," it might be well in the meantime to form some estimate of the advantages to be gained by accepting his invitation. At first sight it must be confessed the impression produced by the report of the state of things in Italy generally, and specially in Rome, was anything but encouraging. The upper classes were accused of Atheism, and the lower of infidelity and beggary. Brigandage prevailed to a very inconvenient extent, and gambling at the State Lottery was presided over weekly by dignitaries of the Church. But precise statistics were accessible, and what conclusions could be drawn from those? The population of Rome had been distributed as follows: – 48,000 ecclesiastics in the pay of the Church from the Pope downwards; 10,000 monks and nuns. Of beggars there were three classes, 1000 holding first class licenses to beg at the doors of St. Peter's; 5000 holding second class licenses to beg at the doors of the other Churches and theatres, and 20,000 vagrants. There were 30,00 servants and 50,000 "citizens" described as in a condition bordering on absolute poverty. Here were 164,000, while the entire population was 511

perhaps between 170,000 and 180,000. It must be admitted that this did not present a comfortable prospect in the "bosom of the Holy Mother" Church. However, they could go a step farther with statistics. There are calculations setting forth the amount of immorality and crime existing in one country, as compared with another. Thus, it was found (making allowance for difference of population as to actual members) that for every illegitimate birth in London; there were 12 in Paris, 29 in Naples, and 60 in Rome! London was thought to be bad enough, but Paris was 12 times as bad, and Rome was 5 times worse than Paris! If vice was a mere worldly fashion in Paris; it seemed to be a religion in Rome. Then as to murderers, striking an average again according to numbers, for every one murderer in England, there were about 45 in Spain, 65 in Naples and 237 in Rome. Or otherwise, there was at the rate of one murderer in 178,000 of the population of England, while in Rome one in every 750 was a murderer! These were not encouraging elements to draw men back. After some further remarks bearing on the possible future of Italy, the ordinary annual business was transacted.

The committee of management for the current year were appointed – Messrs. Reid, Cumming, James MacPherson, Malcolm MacPherson, D. Kelly, and D. Hamilton. Votes of thanks were accorded to Messrs. Hamilton and McDonald, for conducting the Sabbath School, and to Mr. Reid, for a supply of Sabbath School books. The meeting closed with the benediction.

---

## ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

The Presbytery of Maitland met at East Maitland on Thursday, the 8th instant. There were present – Rev. Jas. McCulloch, Moderator; Rev. Duncan McInnes, Clerk *pro. tem;* and Mr. Samuel Porter: The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved of. An application from the people of the Hastings and surrounding district for a continuance of the labours of the Rev. John McLeod was under the consideration of the Court. Mr. McLeod was appointed to continue his labors in said districts. As the Rev. W. S. Donald was expected to return soon to the Hunter district, he was appointed to give services at Clarence Town, after his arrival, and up to next meeting of Presbytery. The Moderator, who had been lately, by appointment of Presbyters, giving supplies to the Grafton congregation, brought forward its claims and necessities, whereupon the Rev. D. McInnes was appointed to preach at Grafton either on the first or second Sabbath of May. The appointment of further supplies for vacant places was deferred until next meeting of Presbytery, which shall take place on Wednesday, the 28th instant, at twelve o'clock, at East Maitland. The diet was closed with prayer.

---

## WALDENSIAN MISSION WORK IN VENICE.

A remarkable work of evangelisation has been going forward in Venice during the past two years. The mission there in the hands of the Waldensian brethren has been eminently successful, and has now assumed proportions which far exceed the anticipations of even the most sanguine of its promoters. Dr. Revel, of Florence, under date Nov. 9, writes as follows: – "This station at Venice, which has not yet been two years in existence, if not the most flourishing, is one of the most flourishing we occupy. The spiritual work at Venice is most encourag- ing. I spent six weeks there during the autumn. I was present at evening meetings, the Sabbath school, and public worship. I was particularly edified on Sabbath morning by the administration of the Lord's Supper. There was at least 300 persons pres- ent. The attention was remarkable; the preaching clear, vigorous, faithful, impressive. (All who know my beloved friend Signor

Comba, the pastor of the congregation, will at once acknowledge that this eulogy does not go beyond the bounds of the strictest justice.)

The Sabbath evening meeting was attended by more than 350 persons. The preachers theme was moderately controversial, and full of dignity and seriousness.

Such, then, is the *present 8tate of matters* according to the testimony of the man above all others most competent to speak on the subject.

In the early summer of 1867, amid the bitter opposition of the priests, a house was obtained on a lease for two years, in which the whole work of the mission could be carried on. And let me say, that no one who has not had a personal encounter with the priests of Rome, when their Church interests were at stake, can have any idea of the difficulties which had to be overcome before what seems so simple a piece of business could be done. This opposition has been untiring during the whole progress of the work; and the lease of the building cannot be renewed as the priestly party have influenced the mind of the proprietor against us. What was to be done? Was a work, so evidently owned of God, to be suffered thus to be extinguished? Let Dr. Revel tell what now took place: – "When we were almost in despair, the Lord raised up friends, and we discovered a palace for sale, which, by its size, situation, and cheapness, was in every way admirable. It seemed, in fact, to have been built on purpose for the different requirements of the mission; for it contains a large and very beautiful hall for worship, roomy and convenient apartments for our schools, and for the residences of our pastors

and teachers."

This old palazzo was purchased for 83,000 francs, a sum which, when it was built, would scarcely have paid for laying the foundation amid the waters of the Adriatic. After a few alterations, the palazzo was formally opened for divine worship on Christmas Day. All the friends of the work looked forward to this event with the deepest interest.

The palace was opened on Christmas Day under the most favourable auspices, and everything connected with that occasion passed off smoothly. Pons conducted the preliminary devotional exercises, and Comba followed with his masterly inaugural discourse, which, as it was intended as a kind of manifesto expository of the aims and position of the Evangelici in Venice, was ready printed for that morning, and exposed for sale at the close of the meeting. Many English friends were present, and encouraged us by the kind interest they showed in the mission work.

Nothing can exceed the joy of all connected with the mission at the auspicious event; and it is confidently believed that the work will go forward with redoubled energy and success.

---

The following Agents are authorised to receive subscriptions and the names of new subscribers: –

| | |
|---|---|
| Barrington River … | Mr. John McInnes |
| Glen Innes … ... | |
| Grafton … … | John McPherson |
| Hinton and Morpeth … | Robert Phillips |
| lnverell … … … | |
| Largs and Maitland … | Samuel Porter |
| Lawrence, Clarence River | Angus Munro |
| Rocky Mouth … … | Francis McKenzie |
| Raymond Terrace … | |
| Tinonee, Manning River … | Thomas Renwick. |

The *Testimony,* from the beginning to the end of last year, will be supplied bound in cloth at 10s. 6d.


# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 44. SYDNEY, MAY 1869.

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. 44 MAY.


**CONTENTS**.


| | PAGE. |
|---|---|
| The Token of the Covenant: or, the Subjects, the Mode, and the Nature and Design of Baptism … … … | 513 |
| "Primitive Times" … … … … … | 516 |
| National Recognition of the Church of Christ … … | 516 |
| Correspondence: Episcopacy veering towards Presbyterianism … | 520 |
| Synod of the Free Church of Victoria … … … | 521 |
| Spain, Anti-Papal Demonstrations … … … | 522 |
| Assassination of the Governor of Burgos – Horrible Details … | 522 |
| Romanism a Civil Polity … … … … | 523 |


## THE TOKEN OF THE COVENANT OR THE SUBJECTS, THE MODE, AND THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

1. In this and a few subsequent articles, we shall endeavour to present and vindicate, with as much brevity as possible, what the Scriptures teach with respect to the subjects, the mode, and the nature and design of baptism. It will, indeed, be impossible, within the limits which we must prescribe to our-selves, to bestow anything like a full and exhaustive treatment on these topics. We hope, however, that, by a careful selection of materials, and a strict economy of space in using them, we shall be able to furnish the intelligent reader with the means of attaining to a scriptural belief, or of justifying and defending such belief already adopted.

### I. SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

We are first, then, to inquire who are the proper subjects of baptism. Some hold that certain adults only, – adults who make a credible profession of faith in Christ, – are to be baptised; and others maintain that such adults, and also the infant children of baptised parents, who make a credible profession of faith in Christ, are to be baptised. These latter are called "*pedo*baptists," – *pedo* denoting child or infant, – because they hold and practise infant baptism; and the former "*anti-pedo- baptists*," because they reject the baptism of infants; or "*anabaptists*," because they baptise *again, – ana* means again, – persons who were baptised in infancy; but more commonly, however, "*baptists*," a name which cannot be conceded to them, if it is meant to imply that they alone baptise and are baptised with a legitimate and valid baptism. In this sense it must be classed and repudiated with such designations as catholic, unitarian, churchman. Pedobaptists and anti-pedo- baptists, it will be seen from the statement just given of the positions they respectively maintain, hold in common that certain adults are to be baptised. On this point they are at one. Pedobaptists, however, hold further, and anti-pedobaptists deny, that certain infants also are to be baptized. Thus the point at issue, – the only point at issue, – in the controversy between them with respect to the subjects of

baptism is, whether the infant children of baptised parents, who make a credible profession of religion, are to be baptised.

3. Accordingly, arguments to prove that adults are to be baptised are wholly irrelevant. That adults are to be baptised does not need to be proved in this controversy, for it is held in common by both parties. Still the opponents of infant baptism deal largely in arguments of this class. They adduce passage after passage, to show that adults, such adults as have already been described as proper subjects of baptism, are to be baptised. For this purpose they quote Mark 16: 16, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved;" Acts 2: 41, "They that gladly received the word were baptised;" Acts 8: 36, 37, "The eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptised?" Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest;" and similar passages. Such passages, no doubt, prove that certain adults are to be baptised, but then this is nothing to the purpose. The maintainers of infant baptism, as well as the opponents of it, hold that such adults as are intended in passages of this class are to be baptised; and, surely, it is a strange mode of refuting their views on one point, to adduce proof that they are scriptural on another. The point to be proved is that infants are *not* to be baptised, and that infants are *not* to be baptised in no way follows from the doctrine, that certain adults *are* to be baptised. If one maintained that the Chinese ought to be excluded from this colony, it would surely be no valid argument in support of this position, that Europeans ought to be admitted into it. The duty of excluding the former in no way follows from the duty of admitting the latter; and as little does the duty of excluding infants from baptism follow from the duty of admitting certain adults to it. Those who resort to such reasoning, if they perceive that it is thus irrelevant, having really no bearing upon the point at issue, are guilty in resorting to it of great disingenuousness; and, if they do not perceive its irrelevancy, they betray a strange want of logical discernment and discrimination.

4. Leaving, then, the baptism of adults unchallenged, we direct and confine our attention to the only question which at present claims it, the question whether certain infants, – the infant children of baptised parents who make a creditable pro-



fession of religion, – are to be baptised. It is admitted, and can easily be proved, that under the present dispensation, baptism is the ordinance of admission into the visible Church, or to the position of members of it. It was by baptism that those who were converted on the day of pentecost were admitted to that position. "They that gladly received the word were baptised, and the same day there were added unto them," – that is, unto the visible Church by being thus baptised, – "about three thousand souls." Accordingly, to hold that baptism is not to be administered to any infants, is to hold that no infants are to be admitted to Church membership. Is it, then, the doctrine of Scripture that no infants are to be so admitted?

5. To prepare the way for answering this question as referring to the present dispensation, it will be proper to inquire whether under the preceding dispensations infants were admitted to Church membership. In prosecuting this inquiry it is sufficient to ascend to the time of Abraham; and to that patriarch we find the following language addressed by God, – it occurs in Genesis 17: 7-14. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

6. The covenant intended in this passage is the covenant of grace, for it is only in that covenant that God promises, as he does here, to be a God to any of our fallen race. This, indeed, is the great crowning promise of the covenant of grace, to which all its other promises may be regarded as tributary, and in the consummated fulfilment of which the fulfilment of them all is comprehended. It is of course the covenant of grace that God makes with his people under the Gospel dispensation, and that covenant as it is described in the Epistle to the Hebrews 8: 10, a passage quoted from Jeremiah 31: 33, is identical with the Abrahamic covenant now under consideration. "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." Here we have the same promise, only in an expanded form, – "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people," and, therefore, the same covenant. The other promise – "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts," included in the description, served only to secure the necessary qualifications on their part for being "a people" to God, and is not, therefore, to be regarded as a distinct and separate promise. In the Epistle

to the Galatians, the Apostle Paul distinctly identifies the coven-

ant under consideration as the covenant of grace. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds as of many, but, as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And, this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Gal. 3: 16, 17. Here he describes the covenant made with Abraham as the covenant confirmed of God in Christ, which of course was the covenant of grace, in which light we are also required to view it, from the fact, that the "seed" of Abraham, to which the promise of it was made, "is Christ," that is, Christ mystical or Christ and believers as united to him. The covenant made with Abraham being thus the covenant of grace, the blessing promised in the covenant of grace, and bestowed, in fulfilment of its promise, on all that believe, is called "the blessing of Abraham," – "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." Gal. 3: 14.

7. Of the covenant made with Abraham, which, we have

now seen, was the covenant of grace, and, therefore, of the covenant of grace under the patriarchal dispensation, God constituted circumcision "a token" and "a sign." "It shall be a token," he said to Abraham, in a passage already quoted, "of the covenant betwixt me and thee." We read also, Rom. 4: 11, that Abraham "received the sign of circumcision." Accordingly, when God, by instituting circumcision, caused it to be applied to Abraham and to his seed, he, as it were, inscribed his covenant upon them, so that it was "in their flesh." He, therefore, said to Abraham, when enjoining circumcision, "my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." Thus, when they were circumcised, they were brought, outwardly, within the bonds of the covenant, of which circumcision was the "token," – into the position of persons in covenant with God, that is, of members of his visible Church.

8. It will not be denied that God had a Church on earth in the time of Abraham, and his visible Church in all ages is composed of those with whom he has outwardly entered into covenant, and whom he has thus brought outwardly into such a relation to himself that he "is a God unto them." Now circumcision was the "token" by the application of which Abraham and his seed were outwardly received within the bonds of the covenant which God made with them, that is of the covenant of grace, and thus constituted members of the visible Church, as then organised.

9. Under the Mosaic economy, circumcision continued to occupy the same place as the rite of admission to Church membership.

10. An attempt has been made to divest circumcision, as far as possible, of this character, partly by presenting a low view of its own nature and import, and partly by presenting a low view of the Church to the membership of which it was the ordinance of admission. With this aim circumcision has been described as "a sign of carnal descent, a mark of national distinction, and a token of interest in those temporal blessings that were promised to Abraham." We have already seen that, according to God's institution, it was "a token of the covenant," which he made with Abraham and his seed, and that that covenant was the covenant of grace; and, though we did not possess this information with respect to it, we could not regard it as being, according to this depreciating estimate of it, "a sign of carnal descent;" for it was to be applied not only to the natural descendants of Abraham, but, also, to every other member of his household, whether "born



in his house, or bought with his money of any stranger, which was not of his seed." Neither could it be considered as a mere "mark of national distinction." Such a view of it is forbidden by the relation in which we have seen it stood to the covenant of grace; and, besides, the use of it was not confined to the descendants of Abraham in the line of Isaac. As regards the remaining particular of the description, to say that circumcision was "a token of interest in those temporal blessings that were promised to Abraham," is only to say, in a very partial manner, however, and with an unseemly want of thoroughness and cordiality, that it was a token of the covenant which God made with Abraham, and which, in addition to its great promise, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed," contained what may be called a supplementary promise of temporary blessings. That it is "a token of the covenant" is God's own description of it; and it is, surely, wiser and more becoming to accept his description of it, than to cast about for another to get rid of the argument which the application of it to infants, as the sign of the covenant, affords in favour of the baptism of infants.

11. With the same design of invalidating the claim of circumcision to rank with baptism, as having been, during the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, the initiatory rite of the visible Church, a low view has been presented also of the Church, particularly as it existed under the latter of those dispensations. "It was," it has been said, "an ecclesiastico-political institution." Without stopping to inquire, what, exactly, this strange language means, we must peremptorily refuse to have anything to do with the hybrid sort of thing which it is evidently intended to denote. The Church in question either was a Church, the visible Church of God, or it was not. If it is held that it was not, let this be said without boggling or half utterances; and if, on the other hand, it is held that it was, let this be admitted ungrudgingly and in its totality. And this admission cannot be evaded. The Church of which we speak *was* the visible Church of God, the only Church he had on earth from the time of Abraham to that of Christ, and circumcision was the rite of admission to its membership.

12. We have already, by vindicating the claim of circumcision to be regarded as the "token" and "sign" of the covenant of grace, by which all to whom it was applied were admitted outwardly to the privileges and brought under the obligations of that covenant, sufficiently defended its spiritual character and significance. It may be proper, however, still further to unfold and, confirm the view of it thus presented. Let it be observed then that, in a passage already partly quoted, – Rom. 4: 11, – the Apostle Paul describes circumcision as the "seal of the righteousness of faith." As a "seal" it confirmed the covenant in which this "righteousness" was provided, and thus gave assurance of the "righteousness" itself to all who by "faith" accepted the covenant. It thus bore a most decided spiritual character and served a most important spiritual purpose. And its spiritual significance is asserted and explained by the same Apostle, when he says – Rom. 2: 28, 29, – "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God." It is here emphatically taught that the outward rite of circumcision is the symbol of an inward circumcision – circumcision "of the heart, in the spirit, whose praise is of God." There could not be a more decided testimony to the spiritual significance of the ordinance.

13. Let, then, the view of circumcision which the Scriptures thus present be freely and fully embraced. Let there be no exercise of argumentative precaution – no influence allowed to the apprehension that by an unqualified and irrevocable admission of

that view you may surrender the power of maintaining a favorite position. Leave logical consequences to be afterwards determined, and do now what is now to be done – adopt the estimate of the ordinance under consideration to which the Scriptures conduct you, without reserve or modification. We ask, then, was not the covenant that God made with Abraham, and which contained the most glorious promise that can be made to human beings, "I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed," and which the Apostle Paul describes as the "better covenant, of which Christ is the mediator," – (Heb. 8: 6 and 10,) – and as "confirmed of God in Christ," – (Gal. 3: 17,) – was not this covenant the covenant of grace? Were not those on whom the "sign of circumcision" was impressed admitted, outwardly, to the privileges of this covenant, or, in other words, to the position of persons in covenant with God, or of members of the visible Church? And, while circumcision was thus the rite of admission to Church membership, was it not rich in spiritual significance?

We will suppose that the answers are given to these questions which the Scriptures supply, – that it is distinctly recognised and held that, under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, circumcision was the divinely appointed sign and token of the covenant of grace, a seal of the righteousness which that covenant provides, and the rite of admission to the position of members of the visible Church. And, in giving these answers, it is important that we, as it were, mark down and record that they are our answers, and that they embody the scriptural view of circumcision, so that, with the full recognition that we have reached this point, we shall, in the further prosecution of the enquiry in which we are engaged, proceed from it as a point we have reached.

14. Viewing circumcision, then, as the initiatory rite of the visible Church, the rite of admission to its membership, – under the two preceding dispensations, we have now to observe further with respect to it, that it was applied to infants. It is very true that obvious and plausible objections to this application of it might have been urged. It might have been objected, for example, that, as circumcision was the sign of the covenant, an infant, being incapable of entering into covenant with God; was not a proper subject of it; or it might have been urged that, according to the express testimony of the apostle, (Gal. 5: 3,) circumcision imposes an obligation "to do the whole law," and that it ought not, therefore, to be applied to infants, inasmuch as they are incapable of incurring and of discharging this obligation. Plausible, how-ever, as these objections are, – and they are plausible, and others equally plausible might be framed, – it is clear they are all devoid of validity; for, in instituting the ordinance, God expressly and authoritatively required that it should be applied to infants; and in this, as in every case, "the foolishness of God is wiser than men." (1 Cor. 1: 29.)

15. As the bringing of objections has been thus foreclosed at this point, they have been brought at another, or a course equivalent to the bringing of them at that other point has been adopted. To that course we have already directed attention, pointing out that, in pursuing it, the mode of procedure is, first to disparage circumcision itself as much as possible, and then to disparage as much as possible the Church, to the membership of which it gave admission, that thus the ordinance might appear under such a character, that the application of it to infants might involve no violation of a theory, that would be seriously violated by the application to infants of such an ordinance as it really was. This is a desperate expedient, and the cause must be desperate that is felt by its advocates to impose a necessity of resorting to it.

16. But whatever objections might have been urged against the circumcision of infants, and whatever efforts may have been



made to get rid of the precedent which it furnishes, and of the practice which it established as divinely prescribed, it was appointed by God that infants should be circumcised. In instituting circumcision he especially requires, "every, man-child among you shall be circumcised; he that is eight days old among you shall be circumcised; every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money off any stranger, which is not of thy seed." And, as circumcision was the token of the covenant of grace and the rite of admission into the visible Church, infants, when circumcised, were admitted to the outward privileges of the former, and to the membership of the latter. Such, as regards this admission, was the manner of dealing with infants from the time of Abraham to that of Christ – a period of some two thousand years. Such, as regards this admission, was the manner of dealing with them during Christ's personal ministry, and to the very close of the Mosaic dispensation.

(*To be continued*.)

---

## "PRIMITIVE TIMES."

The Bishop of Newcastle, in the address with which he opened the proceedings of the recent meeting of the Synod of his Diocese, appealed to the practice of "primitive times" in supporting the views which he advocated on the subject, if we remember aright, of the appointment of bishops; and similar appeals are continually made by Episcopalians, both protestant and popish. Now those appeals are open to the preliminary objection that the language in which they are made, though, of course, not intentionally, is really deceptive; for the times intended are not "primitive times." The times that witnessed the introduction of Christianity and the formation of the Christian Church, and these alone, are primitive times. They form an era by themselves – a distinctly marked era, the per-iod occupied by the ministry of the Apostles and other inspired teachers; and, as the era which they form, while it is thus a distinct era, is the first era of the Church's history, the designation of "primitive times" is fitly applied to them. But it is fitly applied to them alone. No subsequent period can with propriety or in accordance with the actual facts be designated "primitive times." The second century, for example, has no claim to be so designated, and still less, if possible, has any later period.

But, while the designation of "primitive times" is thus applicable only to the Apostolic age, prelatists appeal to the practice of later periods as the practice of "primitive times." Accordingly, they represent that practice as being what it is not; and thus the language they employ is calculated, while of course, not designed, to deceive.

But their appeal to "primitive times" is open to the still more fundamental objection, that it proceeds on the principle that the practice of certain times affords to the Church authoritative guidance in matters of worship, government, and discipline, while the only sound principle is that the Scriptures alone afford it guidance in any instance or direction. The answer to the question "What is written in the law, – how readest thou?" determines in every particular the creed and constitution of the Church, its mode of worship, the form and administration of its government, and its exercise of discipline. Christ commanded the Apostles to form the Christian Church, and to teach its office-bearers and members to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them, Mat. 28: 19-20; and the Apostles in the scriptures teach the Church in all ages, as they were thus commissioned to do. The Scriptures accordingly afford the Church all the authoritative instruction and guidance which Christ, as its lawgiver and head, has provided for it, – the only instruction and guidance to which it is at liberty to have recourse or to submit in ascertaining his mind and its own duty. No practice or usage, therefore, has any claim to be continued or adopted by the

Church if we do not possess with respect to it the inspired testimony of the Scriptures that it was introduced, or, having existed under the former dispensation, was retained under the direction of the Apostles: that is, in other words, if it does not come to us certified by inspiration as an authoritative revelation of the mind and will of Christ.

---

## NATIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

At a meeting of the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh, held on the 10th March, the Rev. Mr. Balfour, of Holyrood, moved the following overture: –

"Whereas the Presbytery, at its meeting on the 24th February, overtured the General Assembly to adopt means for keeping in due prominence the doctrine of Christ's Headship over the Church; and whereas the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the nations is also clearly revealed in the Word of God, and faithfully embodied

in the Westminster Standards. Whereas the Ten Years' Conflict was a struggle, not merely for the spiritual independence of the Church as an abstract principle, but for this independence in connection with the full benefits of a National Establishment, as is expressly affirmed in the Claim, Declaration, and Protest, adopted by the General Assembly in 1842. Whereas, in the protest read in presence of the Lord High Commissioner in 1843, when this Church renounced her connection with the State, the whole principles involved in the struggle preceding the Disruption are expressly reaffirmed as her distinctive testimony. Whereas the same principles have been again and again strongly and explicitly asserted in various ways by the Free Church – as, *e.g*., in 1846, Act 12; in 1847, Act 19; in 1851, Act 9; in 1853, Act 7. Whereas, by Act 8, 1850, all Presbyteries are enjoined to ascertain that ministers applying for admission to the Free Church from other denominations understand and maintain these principles. Whereas, by Act 9, 1860, all Professors of Theology are required to read to their students said Act every year, by which, *inter alia,* all Presbyteries are strictly prohibited from timing any student on trial – unless satisfied 'that he holds the principles of this Church, as to the independence of the Church, and the duties of nations and their rulers in reference to true religion and the Church of Christ; and, further, by a resolution of the Assembly, May 26, 1859, on a fixed Sabbath every year, all our ministers are required to expound these principles to their people. Whereas these principles are not only closely connected with the honor of Christ in general, but have direct practical bearing on such matters as national Sabbath observance and scriptural education; and whereas there is no adequate security for the liberties of the Church, without the full recognition of her existence, divine authority, creed, and jurisdiction by the civil magistrate. And whereas unscriptural views in regard to the nature, vital importance, and full scope and bearing of these principles exist and are being advocated by men of influence both in Church and State, so as to imperil the glorious work of national reformation for which this Church has always faithfully contended. It is humbly overtured by the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh to the ensuing General Ass- embly to take this whole subject into its earnest consideration, and to adopt such measures as to its wisdom may seem best to secure the maintenance and promulgation, in all their integrity, of the whole distinctive principles of the Disruption Struggle."

From his speech, which evidently is very imperfectly reported, we make the following extract: –

" He contended that the articles of agreement were vague, and covered a great deal more than most men suspected; and, in the course of his other remarks, observed that the testimony of the Free Church was a testimony against Erastianism on the one hand and Voluntaryism on the other; and when they desisted from testifying



against either, they ceased to be the Free Protesting Church of Scotland. It was not possible for any man to set lightly by any one doctrine which he believed to be in the Word of God and not to be drawn imperceptibly to set lightly by others, and therefore be greatly feared for the treatment which the fundamental doctrine of the atonement might meet with in the Union Committee. If they were virtually to concede an important principle, and to lay down the Disruption testimony with the view of accomplishing a union with those who held Voluntary principles, he saw no reason why they should not lay down their testimony against Erastianism with a view of accomplishing a union with the Establishment. In either case, "Ichabod" might be written on the portals of the Free Church, for her glory would be departed. He referred to the views presently held by Mr. Murray Dunlop in favor of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and contrasted them with the opinions of that eminent gentleman upon Church Establishments as expressed by him at the time of the Disruption. Proceeding to speak on the eighth clause of his overture, Mr. Balfour said – I do not think that any one can reasonably question the truth of the statement in the eighth clause of my overture, which specially calls for action on the part of the Free Church. I am disposed to flatter myself that the firing of my cannon on the 24th roused our friends from their lethargy, so that they came forward on the 26th to tell us there was need for action in the defence of the truth that Christ is King of nations, for they now saw it was in danger both practically and theoretically. The danger to this principle is, in their opinion, even greater than to that of spiritual independence. The danger to the latter was theoretical; the danger to the other is practical and theoretical, so as to call, I presume, for prompt and decided action. Now, all that is so far gratifying, and renders it unnecessary for me to prove that there is danger. We all agree upon this. But I must say I am a little curious to know whence, in the judgment of our friends, the danger arises. I shall leave them to tell us this themselves. Meanwhile, I must say that I see dangers from quarters which I fear they will be disposed to overlook. It is not the mere utterance of an astute statesman, nor the leading articles of a secular and it may be a godless press, that alarms me, and yet these are the sources of danger to the spiritual independence of the Church which our friends alleged as having made them buckle on their armor in its defence; while they were profoundly indifferent to the danger to the honor of Christ, as King of nations, which threatened it from the active measures to sap the foundations of national religion in Ireland. Let me just say here that my remarks are meant to bear exclusively on the question before us, or the danger to the Headship of Christ over the nations, and therefore it is only in so far as the measure affects the Irish Church as it is Protestant that they bear upon it. It is the great measure of spoliation and confiscation of property devoted to Protestantism which the British Parliament are asked to sanction that I consider fraught with the most disastrous consequences to the cause of Protestant truth in Ireland, and the inauguration of a movement which is destined to undo the whole work of our national reformation by effecting an entire separation between the State and the Church within these realms, and all national recognition of religion and the true Church. For Mr. Gladstone to set himself to put God's truth on an equality with Satan's lie in deference to the cry of Papists and Voluntaries, and call it by the name of justice to Ireland, is as if a father should withhold wholesome food from two of his children because five of them preferred having slow poison. It seems it is justice if a magistrate, instead of being a terror to evil-doers and a praise and protection to those that do well, encourages the evil-doers by making no distinction between the well-doers and them. You can-

not put truth on an equality with error. The thing is a delusion. Truth has a paramount claim on the acceptance and countenance of every individual and State. And if either refuse to yield this claim, they become abettors of error. A nation cannot occupy a neutral position in this matter any more than an individual. The truth of the remark of Dr. McCrie is being realised in our day. 'If,' he said, 'the grand enemy of the Church cannot carry the citadel by force, he will attempt it by negotiation, will commence the herald of toleration and liberty of conscience, and persuade Christians to demolish those outworks by which their privileges were guarded, to remove all external barriers and restraints, and grant the same free scope and countenance to his kingdom in its various forms of infidelity, idolatry, superstition; damnable errors and delusions that are granted to the kingdom of the Lord Jesus. It is the masterpiece of his art to prevail upon the friends of religion, with whatever views, to promote the same design with

the emissaries of Antichrist and the apostles of infidelity.' These words seem almost prophetic in the days in which we live. The man who could introduce such a sweeping revolutionary measure as that now before Parliament is a man who could have pressed a thorough reform in Church matters in Ireland had he had a heart to it, or had he not seen that the way to place and power was by playing into the hands of Voluntaries on the one hand and Papists on the other – sweeping away the existing Establishment to please the one, and permanently endowing the institutions of the other with the proceeds of the spoil. So gratified are the Voluntaries and blinded Free Churchmen with the work of disestablishment, that they seem to be indifferent as to what is done with the spoil. Is there no danger to our principles in all this? It is the triumph of Voluntaryism, and that will only pave the way for the ultimate and final triumph of the Man of Sin. And men will then learn the value of national religion when crushed under the hoof of a cruel and bloody superstition. If all religions are to be regarded alike, then the State cannot interfere to preserve a man's civil rights which may have been directly infringed by the discipline of the Man of Sin. If the State does not respect their discipline equally with that of Protestant Churches, no matter how deeply and palpably it may effect a man's civil interests, then you do not grant them the equality you profess. It is a most infatuated and headlong career on which our rulers are entering, and they cannot and will not stop until they have handed the nation over to the tender mercies of the Man of Sin. Another source of danger to our principles is from the very men who were once their noble and honored advocates. I shall not attempt to fix it on them. If they will believe me, it is no inviting theme to me. My heart bleeds when I see the men to whom I was wont to look up with reverence and respect, so changed in their language – so changed in their whole character. At least they appear so to me. The last five years may have been drawing closer the bonds of union between some of our brethren and the United Presbyterians, but, in the same proportion, they have been widening the breach among us as Free Churchmen, and spreading estrangement and alienation among our ranks. Whence does all this arise? We are holding by the old and well known principles of the Free Church, which we have learned to believe are the principles of the Word of God. But it seems we are holding too tenaciously by them for the times in which we live. But there are others who are disposed, it may be unconsciously, to surrender their principles, by accommodating them to the principles of men who have hitherto contrived, somehow, by the vagueness and ambiguity of their language, to cast a bone of contention into our camp, and then to sit silently by and express great sympathy with our distracted Church, while their plainly and intelligibly declaring their opin- 518
ions would go far to heal the distraction in our Zion. Let them only speak out their minds honestly, and some of our men would from that day be silent. But as things are now, our principles are in very great danger of being betrayed into the hands of the voluntaries. The whole current of events in this country is strong in the direction of Latitudinarian and Voluntary principles, and how our friends should have failed to see that the real danger to spiritual independence arises from this quarter, they know best. The danger to Church and State in these days is imminent, because of the prevalence of Voluntary views which are adverse to our principles and destructive of all national religion. Dr. McCrie says of them 'how-ever much such a scheme of government and reformation (as that which Voluntaryism would introduce) may now be cried up, if adopted by Britain, as is now begun to be done, instead of reviving the spirit and prosecuting the ends of former reformations, it would blot her name out from among the nations of Christendom.' The negotiations for union with a body whose immediate ancestors set themselves against the nationality of religion, and whose principles they inherit are, as at present conducted, the source of greatest danger, in my opinion, to the glorious work of national reformation in this country that work for which our fathers bled and died, and which they were honored of God so successfully to achieve. In referring to the overture of Dr. Rainy, he went on to say that, in the first place, it did not look very well; in the second place, it looked very suspicious; in the third place, it looked very ill – (laughter) – and, lastly, it was humiliating in the extreme. It was humiliating in the extreme for any Professor of Theology to go by the express to Glasgow to borrow any overture on the subject of Christ's Headship over the nations. It looked as if it were a doctrine with which they were not familiar. (Hisses.) How otherwise could it be accounted for? Mr. Balfour, after some other remarks, concluded by moving the transmission of his overture."

Dr. Begg, who supported the transmission of Mr. Balfour's overture, spoke to the following effect in reply to observations made by a previous speaker: –

"It was a delusion to say that prelacy and Erastianism were of the essence either of the Church of England or the Church of Ireland. They were accidents, objectionable accompaniments of these Churches, but they were not of their essence; and if any one had proposed a scheme, as our ancestors did, for reforming these institutions, he (Dr. Begg) would have co-operated with them. But the proposal here made was that they should overthrow these Churches, on the ground that the State should see no difference between truth and falsehood. (Cries of "no, no.") He held that that was the real ground – that the State should recognise neither Protestantism nor Romanism. The argument was that the State was shut up to that alternative – to recognise none and endow none, or to recognise all and endow all. That was the parrot cry in the Commission, which was repeated *ad nauseam.* Now, he held that no Government had any right to take any such ground as that. It was inconsistent with their solemn duty in the sight of God, and inconsistent with the position which a Christian minister should occupy, to connive at such a state of things on the part of any Government. His (Dr. Begg's) general defence was, that the ground he had taken up was the very ground that all his friends had formerly maintained. He had quoted from Dr. Candlish, Dr. Brown, Dr. Buch-anan, and Sir Henry Moncrieff, every one of whom approved of the Church of England in the same sense and to the same extent as he (Dr. Begg) did, as one of the Churches of the Reformation – corrupt, no doubt, to a certain extent, and needing reform, yet one of the Churches of the Reformation. And these brethren had given no account whatever of the reason of the change that had taken place in their opinions. Dr. Begg then proceeded to refer to the pro-

posals made in connection with the scheme for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and referred more particularly to the compensation to be given to Maynooth. This establishment had cost the country about a million of money, and now, under the pretence of giving compensation, it was to get half a million more. This was the religious equality that it was pretended to introduce into Ireland. Then there were eight millions of a reserved fund, which was to be devoted to all sorts of hospitals. £15,000 was for nurses, which they all knew just meant for nuns, and he was sure that they would find, by one process or other, that Rome would absorb a great mass of that money. It was a great delusion to think that the great stream of public opinion was to sweep away all establishments. He believed, on the contrary, it was running in the way of putting down the Protestant Establishment, and that statesmen were running in the direction of setting up Popish institutions. He did not care although not another man in the kingdom should have taken the same ground as himself in

reference to this matter – knowing as he did that the result would be to hand over Ireland to the tender mercies of Popery, and, by and by, out of Ireland, it was very probable they would have their punishment for deserting their principles and conniving at this enormous evil – the very overthrow of the Reformation itself (Applause.) Dr. Rainy endeavoured to explain the statements embodied in Mr. Balfour's motion with reference to these Acts of Assembly, but he would like if an overture on the subject had been tabled, manfully declaring that these Acts were obsolete. He maintained that the ministers of the Free Church were bound to call the attention of their congregations to the principal Acts as they stood in the year 1843, and observed that Dr. Rainy was bound, by an Act passed eight years ago, to read every year to the students the Act of Assembly to the effect that no student was to be taken on trial unless satisfied that he held the principles of the Church as to the independence of the Church, and the duties of nations and their rulers in reference to the true religion and the Church of Christ. These laws were not obsolete, but were the existing laws of the Church. But another part of the argument was – Did the United Presbyterians hold with us even on the general question, apart altogether from the question of endowment? A great deal had been said, but they did not know what the United Presbyterians really held. They had not been told what their friends thought on the subject, and they were entitled to have from the United Presbyterians themselves what they did hold. His own opinion was, that these Articles of Agreement were extremely ambiguous, and that their friends in the United Presbyterian Church would put a totally different construction on them from what they in the Free Church would put. Any one who read Dr. Harper's pamphlet would see that he objected to the sanction of the creed and jurisdiction of the Church by the magistrate as being an introduction to something like coercion in the Church, and Mr. Kerr, in his pamphlet, drew the clear line between what the magistrate might do and what he might not do – that the magistrate's province was between man and man, and not between man and God – and until these things were explained, it was out of the question to be told what was held by our friends."

Referring to the allegation "it is for the endowment you fight," he said: –

"They were fighting for the very liberty of the Church – for the Sabbath of the Lord, and for the scriptural education of the people – matters of great importance. It was a fact that in the new Education Bill there was not a word about religion, no acknowledgment, directly or indirectly, to have children trained in the fear of the Lord. Talk of setting aside that principle and the application of that principle, and the duty of nations as a thing that was obsolete, so that they might combine with men who do not acknowledge in the 519
sense that we acknowledge it! If ever there was a time in the history of the world when that was the present truth, the very truth for which the Church of Christ was called upon to lift up her testimony, it was the present moment. Pass to the Continent of Europe, and look around the world, and look into our own Parliament and see whether there was anything like a recognition of Christ's authority. The whole tendency of society was just – 'Let us break his bands asunder and cast his cords from us.' Therefore, if there ever was a time for us to say, it was now, 'be wise, ye rulers of the earth.' He believed that our nation was on the brink of a great crisis, and if the Church of Christ, which should stand in the breach, and be the living witness for a living Saviour, dropped her testimony, or any part of her testimony, for the sake of union, or any object, however important in itself, it seemed to him, and he believed it would be found, that our Church's glory should disappear. He earnestly invoked his brethren to consider what they were doing. If this matter were driven on, instead of union they would have interminable division. They could not have union on a false basis, as we think it to be, without tearing asunder the link by which we are bound to you – that very link which was consecrated by so many prayers and so many sacrifices, at the period of the Disruption." (Applause.)

Dr. Rainy moved as an amendment the transmission of an overture which differs from Mr. Balfour's mainly, in its presenting the doctrine of the headship of Christ over the nations in the vaguest and most general manner possible, and in its avoiding all indication of the proper practical application of it. The following extract, which indeed presents the whole of it, except an introductory reference to an overture, adopted at a former meeting, on the subject of Christ's sole headship over the Church, will be regarded by the intelligent reader as fully justifying this description of it.

"And further, whereas another and co-relative truth is also an express doctrine of the Word of God, viz., that the powers that be, which are ordained of God, have been put under Christ, that he might be head over all things to the Church which is his body – a doctrine ever maintained by the Church as a principle essential to the honor of her only head, the Lord Jesus, as king of nations as well as King of Zion:

And whereas at this time, in these lands, this principle is in imminent danger of being practically lost sight of and even of being theoretically ignored:

It is hereby overtured by the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh to the ensuing meeting of the General Assembly to adopt such means as to its wisdom may seem best for keeping prominently in the view of all people the duty which, as under Christ, the nations owe to the Church and to the truth of the living God."

This overture it is evident does not commit the Church to anything. It speaks, indeed, of "keeping prominently in the view of all people" – how faithful! "the duty which, as under Christ, the nations owe to the Church and to the truth of the living God;" and the phraseology employed is evidently intended to convey the impression that something very decided is said, while in reality nothing is said, certainly nothing to which the rankest Voluntary could object; for the duty of nations in the matter referred to, for anything the overture indicates to the contrary, for it indicates nothing at all on the point, may be to leave "the Church" and "the truth" alone.

Dr. Rainy's speech exhibits one of the most marked peculiarities of Unionist advocacy of defection, – a peculiarity not easily reconciled with straightforwardness and honesty. The peculiarity to which we refer consists in disparaging as much as possible the claims of any doctrine, of which the full uncompromising maintenance would be "a bar to union," but which those who disparage its claims cannot afford to deny. The obstructive doctrine they will endeavour to impress upon you is less important than some other

doctrine, which they prove their faithfulness by maintaining; or it does not admit in present circumstances of being practically applied, et cetera, et cetera; and the inference which they wish you to draw is, though probably they will scarcely venture to enunciate it, that you need not insist on any express assertion of it, on any assertion of it at all, in the testimony of the Church. This is precisely the treatment that Dr. Rainy gives to the doctrine of the Free Church with respect to the duty of the civil magistrate towards religion. After admitting, as he could not but admit, that before, at, and after the disruption, Free Churchmen "stated that they held the headship of Christ over the nations, the duty of the magistrate to own Christ's institution, to establish his Church and to endow it," he adds "but it did not follow that they had come to the conclusion that a part of what they regarded as their complete position on the

subject – a part that came last in order of statement – would, if it came to stand by itself, be a ground of permanent separation. The Free Church never came to that conclusion, and never pledged themselves to that view." The doctrine, which he wishes to expunge from the Church's testimony, was, he alleges, but "a *part* of what Free Churchmen regarded as their complete position on the subject" to which it refers, and "a part that came *last* in the order of statement;" and, then, from their having "stated that they held" it, it did not follow "that they had come to the conclusion," – how could they, its claims being subject to such abatements? – that, "if it came to stand by itself," the insinuation being that it had come to do so, – "it would be a ground of permanent separation." Thus the doctrine in question is admitted, but great pains are taken to lower its claims. It is but a *part* of the Church's creed on the point to which it refers, – it is the part of it that comes *last* in the order of statement, – it has come to stand by itself, – and the Church never came to the conclusion that, standing by itself, it would be a ground of permanent separation. The answer to all this is obvious. That a doctrine is a part and not the whole of the branch of truth in which it is comprehended, and that its proper place, in a just arrangement of the doctrines which compose that branch of truth, is the last and not any earlier place, is no reason why it should be dropped from the Church's testimony. And if the Church stated that it held it, the statement clearly implied that it regarded it as its duty to hold it; and, in standing before the world as a Church that regarded it as its duty to hold it, did it not in effect pledge itself that it would continue to hold it; and would not therefore unite with a Church that did not hold it; for, of course, it could not continue to hold it if it united with such a Church? It is not however with the answer to Dr. Rainy's remarks that we are at present concerned, but with their drift and character as made for the purpose of disparaging a doctrine which he admits to be held by the Church with which he is connected, and thus in the interest of defection, – as a sort of logical emetic which he seeks to administer to the Free Church, that he may relieve it of the part of its testimony against which they are directed, and thus prepare it for swallowing the Union of which he is an advocate.

In other parts of his speech he labours to accomplish this object by means equally objectionable. The following passage affords an illustration: –

"The question is, whether you are going on to impress upon the mind of the public the view that unless you maintain Establishments – unless you maintain institutions which an increasing number of men are coming to regard as indefensible, and impracticable, and as conflicting with the first and direct ends of the State – you must give up maintaining national religion, and give up maintaining the duty of the State to be pervaded by, and to operate under, the influence of Christian principles."

Here he makes the alleged or supposed fact that "an increasing



number of men are coming to regard" establishments "as indefensible," &c., &c., a sufficient reason, or insinuates that it is a sufficient reason, – for he does not venture to assert so much, – why the Church should not teach and maintain that it is a part of the duty of the State to confer upon the Church of Christ the benefit of civil establishment; or, in other words, he insinuates that the Church is to be guided in the matter by public opinion and the spirit of the age which that opinion expresses or indicates, and not by the Word of God and the mind of Christ as revealed in it. This is new ground to be taken in the Free Church; it is ground that till lately no man would dare to take in any of its high places. But Dr. Rainy takes it in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and in a speech which elicited "great applause" from a majority of that court.

The result of the division was as follows: –

*For Dr. Rainy's Motion –*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ministers | … | … | ... | ... | 18 |
| Elders | … | … | … | … | 13 |
| | | | | | 31 |

*For Mr. Balfour's Motion –*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ministers | … | … | … | … | 15 |
| Elders | … | … | … | … | 7 |
| | | | | | 22 |

Majority for Dr. Rainy's motion ... 9

# Correspondence.

## EPISCOPACY VEERING TOWARDS PRESBYTERIANISM.

*To the Editor of "The Testimony."*

It is very observable that, in the Australian colonies, the Episcopal Church is tending towards Presbyterianism. This is much more the case than many of the clergy and laity of that Church seem willing to admit or imagine. Of this the instituting of diocesan synods is a very obvious example, these being assemblies in which all the clergy of the diocese have a voice, and in which also the laity are represented. And it is to be noticed also, that in these assemblies there is to be found a great amount of free discussion. But there is one great drawback in which the unfavorable contrast of such an assembly to a Presbyterian Church Court appears very marked. We refer to the right of veto possessed by the President, the Bishop of the diocese. An illustration of this is contained in the following statement, "the President (as the Metropolitan Bishop of Sydney) signified his assent to the several resolutions carried by the Synod the previous evening. In giving this formal assent to the resolutions, he desired to say a few words to the Synod, and especially the clerical members of it, respecting the seventh episcopal minute, and discussion to which it had given occasion on the previous evening. He had not interfered in that debate, and had purposely abstained from so doing, but he now desired to express the satisfaction he had felt at finding that the amendment was carried instead of the resolutions moved by the Rev. Mr. Corlette. That gentleman had disclaimed any discourtesy to the bishops, and he accepted that disclaimer, but he took leave to say that he should have felt it his duty not to give effect to any such resolution had it been passed." How degrading to the members of a Synod to be engaged in discussion on important matters, the issue of which, though proceeding from a majority, can be upset by the veto of one man! Another thing which shows how Episcopacy is coming towards Presbyterianism is the ordinance for the presentation of ministers to vacant charges. So far as we can gather from the Bishop's opening speech, together with the proceedings on this subject, the ordinance is, to a certain extent, to the following effect, – that in those parishes or ecclesiastical districts in which provision is made for securing to the clergyman, a stipend at least of £300 per annum

and a suitable residence, when a charge becomes vacant, a board of nominators, consisting of two members appointed by the Synod, and other two appointed by the members of the congregation, be authorised to present a clergyman that he may be appointed by the Bishop to that incumbency. But, if the Bishop see fit, he may, for just reasons, decline to act on the presentation, in which case an appeal might lie to the Provincial Synod. This is a portion of the people's right to have a voice in the appointment of their ministers, but a portion very inadequate, and very different from the scriptural principle, that the members of a Christian congregation have the right of choosing their pastor.

Hence it is not surprising to find that the granting of that amount of privilege to the people is not based on any scriptural principle, and, in the pleadings on behalf of that privilege, there is no allusion

to the Scriptures. The privilege is not given as a scriptural right, but as a matter of mere expediency, occasioned by the abolition of State aid, and the maintenance of the clergy coming from the people. On this point, several members of Synod spoke very explicitly. Mr. M. H. Stephen is reported to have thus expressed himself. "They were about to initiate a new state of things – to inaugurate the voluntary system, and it was of the greatest importance that they should hold out to parishes some real, some substantial advantages." Again, Mr. R. Jones spoke thus: "He might say that, for his own part, be was not much discontented with matters as they stood at present, for he believed that in nineteen cases out of twenty, the Bishop would make a better selection than the people would do. But there was now a strong and growing feeling, that those who provided the means of maintaining a minister, should have the power of determining who their clergy should be." Mr. Shepherd Smith speaks not less strongly when he says, "Granting those powers (the powers of the Bishop) in their fullest extent, it did not follow that it would not be most wise and most expedient on their part openly to recognise what was called the power of the purse. They must recognise that power, and if they did so recognise it, it certainly did appear to him that it was most advisable to regulate that power by some regular ordinance." Hence, it is not surprising to find a very glaring departure from the Scripture arrangements in the plan of giving to the people a voice in the appointment of their ministers through one-half of a board of nominators. In a case in which a wealthy individual builds and endows a church, he is to have the right of presenting the first incumbent for appointment to that charge. In this case the people are to be deprived of their privilege – for right it cannot be called according to the view of the Synod – which others enjoy, and that for the mere expediency consideration of inducing wealthy parties to give of their substance largely to Church purposes.

Yours, &c.,
PRESBYTER

18th May, 1869.

---

## SYNOD OF THE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF VICTORIA.

[We request the special attention of our readers to the statement of the duty of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church, which forms the concluding portion of the following report. It presents, with great fulness, without any modification or curtailment to serve a purpose or to please men, the teaching of Scripture on a subject of which the importance cannot well be exaggerated; and, from the prevalence of loose and erroneous views on that subject – a prevalence to which the compromising and (as we must characterise it), treacherous diplomacy of Unionists and Union negotiations has largely contributed – the emission of such a statement is at present peculiarly seasonable and urgently called for. – ED. T.]

521

The annual meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria was held at St. Kilda on the 20th and 21st ult., Rev. P. MacPherson, the Moderator, opening the proceedings with an able and interesting discourse from John 9: 34 – "And they cast him out" The Synod being constituted, commissions in favor of W. J. Reid, Esq., of Woodbourne, and Joseph Thomson, Esq., as representative elders for the congregations and sessions of Meredith and of St. Kilda respectively were successively presented, and read and sustained. The following members of Synod were present at various stages of the proceedings. Rev. P. MacPherson (the Moderator), and A. McIntyre and A. Paul, Ministers; and W. J. Reid and Joseph Thomson, Esqrs., Elders.

It was agreed unanimously that the Moderator's term of office be prolonged for another year, and also that the thanks of the Synod be tendered for the able, interesting, and suggestive discourse with which he had opened the proceedings.

The copy of a letter from Rev. I. Hetherington to Rev. A. Paul having been read, the Synod agreed that the Moderator did right in not entering into correspondence with Mr. Hetherington.

Mr. Paul was appointed representative of the Synod to correspond with the Government on all business between the Free Presbyterian denomination and the departments, and the Moderator was instructed to notify the same. The building grant for the year was allocated.

A letter from the adherents of the Church at Hamilton was read, and afterwards considered and fully discussed. Ultimately it was agreed, "That in the present position of the Church, it is exceedingly difficult for the Synod to give effectual help to its adherents in the different parts of the colony: that this difficulty is mainly due to the unfriendly action of the General Assemblies and leading men of the Free Church of Scotland: and that much of the spiritual destitution of the Free Presbyterian Church adherents in this colony must be charged on the unfaithfulness of the Home Church. In the circumstances, the Synod can only hope that some change may take place speedily in the attitude of the Free Church of Scotland towards this colony or that supply may be obtained from the friendly Church in New South Wales without weakening the hands of the brethren there; and the Synod will co-operate with the adherents at Hamilton if supply be obtainable from that quarter. Meanwhile, without pressing the arrangement on the Rev. A. McIntyre in his present state of health, the Synod request him to visit Ham-ilton if possible; and also they recommend to the people of Ham-ilton to deal liberally with Mr. McIntyre's expenses in the event of his doing so." It was remitted to the Moderator to answer the letter, the Clerk to forward extract of the foregoing finding.

Certain propositions intended to embody the views of the Synod on the subject of the magistrate's duty to religion, in compliance with the instructions of a former meeting, were laid on the table in writing by Mr. Paul, and read. It was agreed, after deliberating, that the propositions be discussed at a future meeting, and a committee was appointed to print them for the use of members. The Synod then adjourned till the third Friday of October next, the Moderator to have power to convene a meeting in the interval. Closed with prayer. The propositions above referred to were as follows: –

1. Civil government being a dictate of the light of nature is recognised and sustained by Scripture as the ordinance of God and has the power of the Sword for administration as a terror to evildoers, but not the power of the Keys, which is a fruit of Christ's mediation, and is assigned in Scripture to spiritual officers only. And these two powers cannot be combined in the same person, nor in their administration is either of them subject to the other.

2. Civil rulers being expressly admonished and warned in the Word of God to exercise their powers wisely and in the fear of God, are therefore called, and being called, have capacity to hear God speaking to them in the Scripture, and are under obligation to submit to his commands contained therein, and publicly to avow such submission. And whereas the end contemplated in these admonitions is the complete conforming of civil administration to the revealed will of God, the duties required lie first and eminently on such as frame the constitution of government for any community, and thereafter on the ordinary legislators, administrators, and electors in proportion to the influence which they severally exert upon the public policy. And whereas, for the right discharge of his office, the civil ruler is to receive instruction from the Word of God, it lies especially on him, as having the power of the sword, to assert and maintain the right of free access thereto both for himself and his subjects, and to coerce and restrain any person or persons assuming to withhold the Scriptures from men under whatever pretence of being the exclusive depositories, interpreters, or dispensers of the Word of God.

3. Power over all flesh, and all power in heaven and on earth are committed by God the Father to Jesus Christ our Lord, the one Mediator between God and men, who was manifested in the flesh and died and rose again as the Scriptures declare. And this universal power is given to him as

Mediator, being originally and inalienably inherent in his person as the only begotten and eternal Son of God, by whom also the Father made the world. Wherefore the civil ruler's office, though founded on the natural dominion of the Creator, and not on the work of redemption, is nevertheless subjected by God to the will and purposes of the Mediator, and it is the duty of civil rulers publicly to acknowledge the divine character and mediatorial supremacy of Jesus, and to hold their office in confessed subordination to him as God over all, to refuse also to any idol the honor which they pay to him. And whereas Jesus Christ has not delegated to any of mankind his mediatorial dominion over civil rulers and nations, it in so far from being required of states or magistrates to acknowledge or submit to any mortal man assuming to be vicar, and to act as vicegerent of Christ on the earth, that it is on the contrary a high act of duty and reverence to Christ when the ruler vigilantly represses such usurpations, whether attempted on himself or on his subjects, and with his power of the Sword effectually restrain the promoters.

4. That special wisdom which Scripture requires of civil rulers is largely exercised in the distinguishing of matters that are in subjection to the power of the Sword from such as fall under the power of the Keys, and in observing the manner in which these powers mutually approximate and bound each other. The ruler instructed as Scripture requires of him with reference to the appointments of Christ in his Church is not to assume to himself the power of the Keys, but he is nevertheless to use his own power of the Sword so as the office-bearers appointed by Christ may be free from external restraint and violence, and may enjoy the ruler's protection, countenance, and support in preaching the Gospel, gathering Churches, exercising discipline, celebrating the sacraments, and ordaining office-bearers and holding synods, all which functions are proper to the power of the Keys alone, and are committed by Christ to officers authorised from himself originally. Wherefore these functions neither may the civil ruler exercise himself, nor is the right to exercise them duly resolvable into any authority inherent in him or derived from him, nor yet is the manner of performing them subject to his review or censure. So likewise on behalf of Church members, the ruler is to provide that they shall have the like liberty, and protection, and countenance in hearing the word, assembling in congregation, and observing the ordinances which Christ has commanded them.

5. That the protection, countenance, and support which the civil ruler owes to the ordinances of Christ may be the more effectually and certainly rendered, it in indispensable that the ruler define for himself and cause to be legislatively affirmed as agreeable to the Scriptures that profession of faith, and frame of worship, and order of discipline and government which Christ has appointed for his Church: which doctrine, worship, and discipline, when duly set up by the ministers of the word, not only may the ruler on suitable occasions rightly recognise by legislative enactment as the vehicle of Christ's spiritual authority, but ought also constantly to seek and, finding, to use opportunity both of recognising and of providing sufficient temporal sustentation to the same. And for assistance to himself herein the ruler may command and receive the counsel and information of ministers of the word, and for such end specifically may convene synods, be present in them, and prescribe the subjects and order of their deliberations, yet so as such synods, so specifically convened for assistance and counsel to the ruler, are not authoritative in their decision even as respects the ruler convening them, and much less as respects the Churches, but are consultative and advisory only, so as the responsibility of correctly defining the scriptural model of Christ's Church, and recognising it in a legislative way, always and wholly lies on the civil ruler himself, it being a necessary step in order to the due protection and countenancing of Christ's ordinances required of him. And the civil ruler ought to be so far from seeking to avoid the responsibility by devolving it on any professed religious guide claiming to be infallible, or submitting to the decrees of any such guide claiming to be the sole interpreter of Scripture and authoritative director of the consciences of men, that, on the 522
contrary, he is bound by his own duty to Christ to mark the maintainers of such a claim as impostors and plotters against the natural liberties, rights, reason, and conscience of mankind.

6. The ruler's authority in civil matters is not invalidated by difference of religion between him and any of his subjects. Such also of his subjects as profess and practice a religion different from the public profession, yet are quiet and peaceable therein, are entitled to liberty and protection at the hands of the ruler without respect to their diverse religions, in consideration of the peaceableness of their practice solely. And the holding of a different religious profession and practice ought not to disqualify the holders from exercising the functions of government if duly called thereto, provided that such differences do not naturally impugn the divine character of Christ or the public profession of subjection to him, or the obligation of rulers and communities to hear and obey God speaking to them in the Scriptures. But no plea of a different religious persuasion is to be sustained by the civil ruler to the effect of gaining his protection or sufferance to practices professedly religion, but in their own nature contravening public morality or dissolving civil government or infringing the natural liberties of mankind, or introducing a foreign temporal jurisdiction into the ruler's dominions, or usurping public sanction in favor of idols, the maintenance of such practices, though pleading religious obligations for them, being proper objects for magisterial restraint and coercion. Neither is the ruler's duty towards the ordinances of Christ subverted by differences of religion among his subjects, as though in sanctioning a Scripturally ordered Church he were chargeable with persecution and intolerance in respect of some of his subjects disapproving the same. And while for legislatively defining, recognising, and endowing such a model, though Scriptural, he ought to seek and embrace suitable opportunity when religions divisions do not seriously or extensively prevail in the community; yet when by such dissensions in religion a legislative recognition of Christ 's ordinances is precluded, the responsibility of the ruler and the community to Christ are, so far from being terminated or dissolved by such a posture of public opinion, that while it continues it shuts up both ruler and ruled in the guilt of publicly withholding an act of obedience to Christ. And for churches or persons to make an advantage of such division in order to promote indiscriminate sanction and endowment of various conflicting religions by the ruler, or to justify a policy of indiscriminate disregard to and disseverance from all professions and forms of religion is a grave sin, as well against Christ as against the community.

7. Such intimations of Christ with relation to the conduct and direction of men in the affairs of the present life as are found in Scripture it is the duty of the civil ruler professing subjection to Christ duly to consider and publicly comply with. In accordance with which obligation he may and ought to legislate for the due outward observance of the Sabbath, the regulating of marriage and divorce, the appointing of special days of public humiliation and thanksgiving, and the framing of national engagements in defence of religious liberty. [But such engagements must both be grounded on and limited by the antecedent obligations of communities and rulers to Christ, and are properly an exercise of the power of the Sword, not of the Keys. Wherefore, they can neither be framed nor executed nor revised by members of Churches in a Church capacity. Yet if the community originally framing such engagements lapse from them, the Church ought to testify the guilt incurred thereby, that the community may return to Scriptural duties formerly acknowledged."]

*The words in brackets were *not read* in Synod, but only verbally substance expressed, with a view to insertion and discussion afterwards.

---

## PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND.

The Presbytery of Maitland met on the 17th instant at Raymond Terrace. Sederunt: Rev. J. McCulloch, Moderator; Rev. W. S. Donald, Clerk; and Mr. Malcolm Gillies, Ruling Elder.

After the meeting was constituted in the usual way, a call from the Grafton congregation to the Moderator, signed by about eighty male members and adherents, was laid on the table and read. The Clerk was appointed to preach at Morpeth and Raymond Terrace on Sabbath the 23rd instant, to intimate regarding the call, and to cite the session and congregation to appear for their interests before the next ordinary meeting. The Clerk was also instructed to inform the Grafton congregation that the call would be taken into consideration at that meeting. A letter from the Rev. John McLeod, respecting his operations on the Hastings and in other districts, was laid on the table and read. Mr. McLeod was appointed to continue his labours in said districts.

The Presbytery adjourned to meet at Raymond Terrace on Friday, the 11th June, at 11 o'clock a.m. The meeting was closed with prayer.

The Rev. Mr. McInnes was appointed at a previous meeting to preach at Grafton on the first Sabbath of June next.

The Rev. W. S. Donald continues to labour for the most part in Clarence Town and neighborhood.

---

## SPAIN. – ANTI-PAPAL DEMONSTRATIONS.

Madrid, January 26.

Great sensation has been caused by the intelligence of the murder of the Civil Governor of Burgos while proceeding to take an

inventory of the artistic treasures in the Cathedral. He was assassinated by a mob of priests in the cloisters on consecrated ground. Arrests have been made, and troops sent to Burgos. Upwards of fifty individuals have been arrested on suspicion of complicity in the crime.

A monster indignation meeting against the Papal Nuncio took place in the evening. The people were excited beyond measure by the news of the assassination at Burgos; and treating the refusal of the Roman Court to recognise the Spanish envoy as an insult offered to Spain, assembled in a dense crowd in front of the palace of the Nuncio, and tore down and burned the Papal arms. The crowd went afterwards to the official residence of the Minister of Public Worship, and demanded the immediate removal of the Nuncio. The Under-Secretary of the Ministry appeared, and declared that the Government had already suppressed the salary paid by Spain to the Papal Nuncio, and withdrawn the powers granted to him by former governments. Accounts from Burgos are full of horrible details of the assassination. The Dean and several Canons of the Chapter are among the prisoners. The crowd shouted "Down with the Nuncio!" "Freedom of worship for ever!" The Nuncio, warned of the demonstration, had previously taken refuge at the French Embassy. The body of the Civil Governor was dragged along the ground, and horribly mutilated, the members of the Chapter present taking no steps whatever to prevent the murder or the barbarous treatment to which the body was subjected.

The *Gazette* also publishes a decree by which the Government takes possession of the archives, libraries, and collections of art appertaining to the cathedral churches and monasteries of the country, which will be considered henceforth as national property.

---

## ASSASSINATION OF THE GOVERNOR OF BURGOS. – HORRIBLE DETAILS.

Accounts received at Madrid of the assassination of the Civil Governor of Burgos show that crime to have been accompanied by the most disgusting details. On the morning of Saturday the 23rd it was known that the governor had received orders to take an inventory of the various art treasures and articles of vertu collected in the cathedral, and that the ecclesiastical bodies regarded this step as a gross infringement of their rights as well as a sacrilegious act on the part of the National Government. At four o'clock in the afternoon, Senor Gutierrez de Castro, the Governor, proceeded to the cathedral accompanied by a notary, a goldsmith, and an agent of police. He was coldly received by the Archbishop, and the other members of the clergy who were present. After a slight altercation, the Governor commenced taking the inventory, whereupon the Archbishop, in great rage, shouted out "Thieves," and this cry was taken up by the priests who were within. In a few moments the unfortunate Governor was surrounded by the mob, who had been admitted by the priests and seminarists. The Governor was insulted and beaten, as well as the persons by whom he was accompanied.



One of the mob felled him to the ground by a blow on the head with a hatchet, whereupon the assassins threw themselves upon the body and dragged it to the foot of the staircase at the principal gate of the church, thence into the streets, where they stopped for a moment to cut off the nose, tear out the eyes, and mutilate it in a horribly hideous manner. The unfortunate man was still alive, but was at last killed by his head being severed from his body. It is stated that this murder was witnessed by the gendarmes, who made no attempt either to prevent it or arrest the perpetrators. A cavalry officer – who arrived on the spot immediately after the murder, as the mob were about to drag the corpse through the town, shouting cries of exultation – drew his sword and threw himself upon the wretches, striking to the right and left with his sabre, whereupon the cowardly murderers fled before a single man. Some troops arrived and quickly captured those persons who were attempting to escape, and they were locked up. Large bodies of soldiers, summoned by telegraph, soon arrived from the neighboring towns, it having been deemed expedient to summon them, as it was not known to what excesses the murder might lead on the part of the populace who might desire to avenge the unfortunate Governor. The same evening and the following day large numbers of priests left Burgos, but they were arrested at the various railway stations. The Archbishop has been confined to his palace, and has not been permitted to see or communicate with anyone. In Madrid – and, indeed, throughout Spain – the agitation which has been produced by this murder is very great. Everywhere the most absolute abhorrence of the crime is expressed, and addresses to the Government arrive from all quarters. The Provincial Council, the Municipalities, and the Volunteers, all write assuring the Government of their support against the enemies of the revolution, and begging the Ministers to punish the authors of the crime, without respect of persons. In short, a universal cry of reprobation and anger at the murder has been raised throughout the country.

---

## ROMANISM A CIVIL POLITY.

The principle that Rome is not a Church but a civil polity – in other words, that her jurisdiction is not only foreign but *civil* – is the only ground on which we can fight the battle against Popery. The controversy with Rome is fast passing into a new phase, and it were well to consider how we are to meet that phase of the conflict, and on what ground we shall be able to resist the claims of Rome without doing injury to the principles of toleration and liberty? The ground that Popery is a false religion will not do; for, be a man's religion true or false, that is no ground for admitting him to civil rights or excluding him. But if it can be shown that Romanism is simply a claim of foreign civil jurisdiction, then not only may we resist that claim without violence to toleration and liberty, but our very homage to toleration and liberty compel us to resistance. This appears to us the only safe ground of action at this hour. It would be easy furnishing at this moment a demonstration, which would be perfectly incontrovertible in logic, that Rome is not a *church* but a *polity;* not a *religion* but a *government*; but I question whether the public mind is yet prepared to receive this; it is not a *written* but *a practical* demonstration of this fact that awaits us. And that demonstration will be furnished by Rome herself. There are several *lets* and *hindrances* in her way meanwhile. These will be taken out of her path ere long; and then she will display herself in her true character as a civil jurisdiction, founded on a pretended divine right, and claiming obedience from all in the realm in temporals as in spirituals. Then a huge cloud of misconception at present enveloping the minds of many will break up and clear away, and the friends of toleration

and liberty will see better than they do now where to strike. Meanwhile, I will yield to no man in my reverence for the sacred rights of conscience, but I have come to the clear conviction, neither hastily nor on narrow grounds, that while Popery is a soul destroying error, which ought to lead every Christian man strenuously to fight against it with the only weapon that can combat it, which is the Word of God, it is at the same time a temporal jurisdiction, which by efforts, both open and secret, is attempting to seize, not so much upon our Church as upon our State. We can go back and recover liberty, or forward and meet revolution. I have humbly made my choice. I go in for toleration against this attempted foreign jurisdiction; for the Queen against this foreign potentate.

DR. WYLIE.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 45. SYDNEY, JUNE 1869.

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. 45 JUNE.

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Token of the Covenant: or, the Subjects, the Mode, and the Nature and Design of Baptism | … | … | … | 525 |
| The Church taking a Leaf out of the World's Book… | … | … | | 528 |
| Episcopacy veering towards Presbyterianism | … | … | | 529 |
| The Presbytery of Maitland | … | … | … | 529 |
| Meeting of the Congregation of St. George's Church | … | … | | 530 |
| Correspondence – Moderatism in Otago | … | … | … | 531 |
| The First Protestant Service in Madrid | … | … | … | 534 |
| The Value of Knowledge | … | … | … | 535 |

## THE TOKEN OF THE COVENANT; OR THE SUBJECTS, THE MODE, AND THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

*(Continued from page 516.)*

17. Suppose, then, that we lived at the close of that dispensation, that the last hours of it were passing over us, and that, fully aware of the transition character of the period, we were waiting for the introduction of the new and more advanced dispensation that was to succeed it; and suppose that, while we were in this attitude of intelligent expectation, we heard their commission issued to those who were to conduct the operations of the new dispensation, and in the commission observed these words, "go ye therefore and disciple," for so the word is literally rendered, "all nations, *circumcising* them;" – should we, knowing that circumcision had all along hitherto been applied to infants, and that the application of it to them had always been, and was still, and that most justly, regarded as a privilege, – should we in those circumstances, and in the absence of all intimation authorising, not to say requiring, us to do so, understand that the application of it was no longer to be extended to them? Impossible. The facts and influences operative in the case, the circumcision of infants all along hitherto under the authoritative requirement of God, their circumcision leaving but little room for the circumcision of adults, the high value

justly attached to the privilege of enrolling infants by circumcision among the members of the visible Church, the character of the new dispensation as distinguished not more or less, or in any respect, by a curtailment of privilege, but uniformly, so far as it would affect privilege at all, by a great enlargement of it, and, in consequence of all this, our own associations derived from the past, and our anticipations with respect to the future, would all conspire to preserve us, and could not fail to preserve us effectually, from understanding or rather misunderstanding the injunction, "Go and disciple all nations, *circumcising* them," as requiring the withholding of circumcision from infants, and would infallibly shut us in to understand it as requiring that it should be applied to them, nay, would so mould and determine our ideas and views that to understand it otherwise would not so much as occur to us. If you fully, in imagination, place yourselves in the position we have supposed, the position of believing Jews, who, knowing that a new dispensation was immediately to be introduced, and understanding and appreciating its distinctive character, and if for the time you make their views, associations, impressions, and anticipations, your own, you cannot but feel this.

18. And, then, there was nothing, as we have already remarked, in the injunction itself which we have supposed, that in any way announced or even intimated that infants were now to be deprived of the divinely conferred and long enjoyed privilege of admission to the membership of the visible Church; and, clearly, it would require a very distinct intimation of the of the Church's lawgiver to induce those who had been always accustomed to such admission of infants, and who valued it, to withhold from them the rite of admission. A Roman poet said tauntingly, with respect to something that he regarded as incredible, "let a circumcised Jew believe it;" but a believing Jew might well say, with respect to the withholding of the initiatory rite from infants, without a distinct intimation of the divine will to that effect, "The uncircumcised Gentile may believe it; I cannot and will not." Nothing but a divine enactment could bring a Jew to entertain for a moment the idea of such a treatment of infants.

19. It might no doubt be argued that the injunction was "*disciple* all nations, circumcising them," and that it was thus implied that none were to be circumcised but such as were first discipled, and that infants, therefore, as they could not be discipled, ought not to be circumcised; but this reasoning would have no weight with an intelligent Jew. If he condescended to reply to it, he would remind the opponent of infant circumcision, at whose strange misdirected zeal he would feel no little surprise; that, when Gentiles were admitted to Church membership under the Mosaic dispensation, it was necessary first to "disciple" them, but that, at the same time, when parents were admitted their infant children, notwithstanding the alleged incapability of infants to be discipled, were admitted along with them, the males by circumcision, baptism, and sac- 526
rifice, and the females by baptism and sacrifice. And, following his antagonist to the language of the injunction, he might ask him, "are not infants a part, and a very large part, of the whole which we call a nation, and, therefore, how can this whole be discipled, if a large part of it, that which infants compose, is left, and inevitably left, undiscipled? But, when a nation is discipled, it is discipled – not a part of it, but the whole, infants and all; otherwise the nation would not be discipled, for the adults of a nation are not the nation, but only a part of it; but it is the whole, and not a part, that we call the nation. Therefore, when a discipled nation is circumcised, its infants as well as its adults, none are circumcised but those who were first discipled; for the nation was discipled, and the infants are comprehended in the nation no less than its adults" And, he might add, addressing his Gentile opponent, for none could oppose infant circumcision but a Gentile, "You have much reason, friend, to suspect that your ideas of discipling, according to which infants cannot be discipled, must be erroneous, for, if infants cannot be discipled, neither can a nation, for infants form a component part of a nation, and yet the injunction is, Disciple all nations. According to your views, what is thus enjoined is impracticable, for, according to them, nations cannot be discipled. Would it not be wise to reconsider them? For is it not more likely you have fallen into error in adopting them, than that the commission which they exhibit as impracticable is really impracticable?" Thus the argument against infant circumcision that it might be attempted to derive from the words of the supposed injunction, "Disciple all nations, circumcising them," would be wholly worthless. Treating it as worthless, if it should be used, an intelligent believing Jew would, as we have seen, as a matter of course and inevitably, understand that injunction as prescribing the circumcision of infants no less than that of adults.

20. Let us now substitute for the case which we have supposed the case that actually occurred. To believing Jews, who were aware that a new dispensation, of which the introduction would be attended not with any diminution or curtailment, but with a great extension and enlargement of privilege, was on the eve of being introduced, and who understood that baptism was to take the place of circumcision, – for, doubtless, they were put in a position to execute their commission intelligently, – to such Jews our Lord said, "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptising them." Now, what difference would it make as to the application of the rite to infants, that the rite to be applied was baptism, and not circumcision, as in the case we supposed? If, in the case supposed, those to whom the commission "Disciple all nations, circumcising them," was given, would conclude inevitably and justly, that as infants were all along circumcised, and thus admitted to the membership of the visible Church, under the former dispensation, and as there was no intimation in the commission of any new restriction of the application of circumcision, infants were still to be circumcised, and thus admitted to the membership of the visible Church, – equally, in the actual case, those to whom the commission "Disciple all nations, baptising them," was given, would conclude, inevitably and justly, that as infants were all along circumcised, and thus admitted to the membership of the visible Church under the former dispensation, and as baptism was to be substituted for circumcision, while there was no intimation in the commission of any new restriction of the application of the initiatory rite, infants were now to be baptised, and thus admitted to visible Church membership under the new dispensation.

21. Anti-pedobaptists call upon us to produce an express precept enjoining the baptism of infants; but those to whom our

Lord said "Disciple all nations, baptising them," received, when these words were addressed to them, an express command to baptise infants. They knew that circumcision, as the initiatory rite of the former dispensation, was applied to infants, and now, when they were commanded to administer baptism as the initiatory rite substituted for circumcision under the new dispensation, they were clearly commanded to baptise infants. It was virtually said

to them, "Circumcision is now to be superseded as the rite of admission to the membership of the visible Church, and baptism to be substituted for it; go ye and disciple all nations, admitting them to the membership of the visible Church by administering baptism to them in place of circumcision." Such, as was formerly shown, was the sense in which they would inevitably understand the part of their commission now under consideration, the sense which it really bore, and in which, therefore, it was intended they should understand it; and it thus conveyed to them an express command to baptise infants as well as adults.

22. Their commission changed one clause, so to speak, of the law respecting the initiatory rite – the clause which determined the form of the rite. This clause it changed by substituting baptism for circumcision, leaving the law otherwise as it was. Accordingly, the only deviation from the existing practice which it prescribed or authorised was this substitution; and, therefore, in acting under it, they were to adhere to the existing practice, except only that they were to baptise instead of circumcising. The law formerly required, and it required still, – for as regarded this requirement it was not changed, – that the initiatory rite should be applied to infants as well as adults, and, therefore, they were to apply it to infants as well as to adults; and the law as now changed, substituted baptism for circumcision, as the initiatory rite, and, therefore, they were to baptise and not to circumcise. * This was, clearly, the meaning of their commission; and in this sense, – brought up as they had been as Jews, with the views and associations of Jews with respect to the application of the initiatory rite to infants, and possessing now the intelligence with res-pect to the character of the new dispensation as bringing along with it a great enlargement of privilege, which the personal teaching of Christ and the grace and inspiration of the Spirit imparted, – they would inevitably understand it.

23. Anti-pedobaptists, however, contend that they could not and did not understand it in this sense; that they understood it as so restricting the application of the initiatory rite that it was not to be applied to infants. But where is this restriction enacted or announced? We have already seen that there is not a trace of it in the commission. There is there, indeed, a change of the rite, – the substitution of baptism for circumcision, but no other change, no restriction of the application, no limitation of the subjects of the rite. The puerile attempt to find such a restriction and limitation in the fact that the nations were to be first discipled and only then baptised, has been already sufficiently exposed. But there is nothing better that can be substituted for it. There is not a shadow of evidence that the limitation of the subjects of the initiatory rite, for which our opponents contend, was ever enacted by Christ. If it was enacted, where is the enactment, or any record of it? Nowhere. They constantly enunciate and reiterate that, in the case of positive institutions, of which baptism is one, we must at every step have the authority of an express precept or a plain example; and, in accordance with this dictum, let them produce either pre-

* As regards the application of baptism to females, it followed, even from the spirit and effect of circumcision, that, the initiatory rite admitting of such application, it should be applied to them. Accordingly, the commission under consideration did not expressly pres-cribe this application of it.



cept or example for the limitation of the subjects of the initiatory rite for which they contend. The initiatory rite was applied to infants under the former dispensation – and if, as they maintain, it is not to be applied to them under the present dispensation, where is this restriction of the application of it commanded? – And, if it is nowhere commanded, as it certainly is not, where is it exemplified? It is nowhere exemplified either. What evidence is there, then, that it was ever enacted? Oh! *we* have no precept or example for applying the initiatory rite to infants, and that is evidence enough in the case. What! demand fresh authority for continuing a practice once appointed by God, and never abolished! God once enacted that the initiatory rite should be applied to infants, and this enactment he has never repealed. There is nothing in the legislation of the New Testament by which it is repealed. That legislation, indeed, substitutes baptism for circumcision, but it does no more. The law with respect to the subjects of the initiatory rite it leaves as it was. That law has thus descended to us unchanged from the time of Abraham. This being our position, it is really absurd to call upon us, as our opponents are in the habit of doing, to produce precept or example from the New Testament for applying baptism to infants. It is upon them it devolves to produce precept or example from the New Testament and not upon us. They hold that the initiatory rite is not to be applied to infants under the present dispensation, but it was applied to them under the former dispensation, and it is for them to produce precept or example for the change.

24. Instead, however, of producing either, they maintain that circumcision was not an initiatory rite, and that baptism has not come into its place, We have already vindicated the claim of circumcision to be regarded as the initiatory rite of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations. Those to whom it was applied were outwardly received under that covenant in which God had promised to be a God to Abraham and to his seed, and a covenant that contained that promise could be no other than the covenant of grace; they were thus admitted outwardly into the relation to God of his covenant people, and, if he had a Church on earth during the patriarchal period, or at any time, it was composed of those who sustained that relation to him. The Church that he has now on earth is composed of them. Thus, then, circumcision, inasmuch as those to whom it was applied were admitted, outwardly, to the relation to God of his covenant people, and therefore of members of his visible Church, was clearly an initiatory ordinance.

25. We have also shewn that circumcision exhibited spiritual truths and sealed spiritual blessings. It is therefore unnecessary for us to take notice in detail of the offensively disparaging statements that are made with respect to it by opponents of infant baptism. All such statements are repelled by the fact that it served important spiritual purposes. To one of them, however, we may advert in passing. Circumcision is represented as "requiring neither intelligence, faith, nor any moral qualification." This is a most extraordinary representation, or rather misrepresentation. When Abraham received the sign of circumcision and thus accepted the covenant, of which it was the divinely appointed token, was it not required of him, from the very nature of the transaction, that he should lay hold on the promise contained in that covenant, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." And how can it be said that circumcision required no moral qualification, when the Apostle expressly testifies, "If thou be a breaker of the law thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." (Rom. 2: 25.) This is surely a very emphatic requirement of moral qualification. That the Jews themselves held that circumcision required intelligence, faith, and moral qualifications is evident, from the fact that they held it to be necessary that a proselyte, be-

fore they received him by circumcision, should have a competent knowledge of the true God, should profess faith in him, and should promise to worship him, and to abstain from idolatry.

26. Our opponents further deny that baptism came into the place of circumcision, and endeavour thus to get rid of our argument that, as circumcision, the initiatory rite under the

former dispensation, was applied to infants, baptism, which has been substituted for circumcision as the initiatory rite under the present dispensation, is also to be applied to them. But we have already proved that circumcision was the initiatory rite under the former dispensation, and it is admitted and has been shown, that baptism is the initiatory rite under the present dispensation. It therefore follows that baptism has come into the place of circumcision.

27. And with this conclusion the representation of Scripture harmonises. "In whom," says the Apostle Paul referring to Christ, Col. 2: 11, 12, "in whom ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him." Here he sets forth the spiritual import of circumcision. The outward circumcision in the flesh symbolised an inward spiritual "circumcision made without hands," which consists in the "putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh." And the believing Colossians he represents as having experienced this circumcision in their having been buried with Christ in baptism, that is, in their having undergone an inward spiritual baptism. In other words, he represents them as having been circumcised in having been baptised. He thus exhibits baptism as occupying the place and accomplishing the design of circumcision. That he thus represents baptism as the substitute, and in a manner continuative, of circumcision, will appear with increased clearness, if we examine more narrowly the train of thought in the passage. The apostle, then, teaches that believers "put off the body of the sins of the flesh;" or, according to the more approved reading, "put off the body of the flesh," called elsewhere "the old man." This "putting off the body of the flesh" is the following up of the crucifying of the flesh. There is, first, the crucifying and death of the flesh, and then the putting off of "the body" of it, and a consequent entrance on a new life. This, according to the apostle, is spiritual circumcision; – what the outward circumcision symbolised. Or it may be viewed as a spiritual baptism, for in such baptism the subjects of it are buried with Christ and also risen with him; and thus in spiritual baptism or what the outward baptism symbolises, as in spiritual circumcision or what outward circumcision symbolised, there is first the death of the flesh proved to be real by its being followed by burial; and then there is the putting off of the body of the flesh, the leaving of it in the grave, and a consequent resurrection to, and entrance upon, a new life. According to this representation, baptism symbolises exactly what circumcision symbolised, and thus the for-mer ordinance occupies precisely the same place which the latter ordinance occupied. We may observe here, in passing, how utterly unscriptural the views are, which the disparaging statements with respect to circumcision, to which we have already adverted, embody and imply. According to the apostle's theology, – the scriptural theology – circumcision bore a lofty spiritual character and symbolised the richest spiritual blessings.

28. Baptism, then, occupies the same place as circumcision occupied; and, therefore, we again call upon those who maintain that it is not to be applied to infants as circumcision was, to adduce, according to their own dictum, a precept or an example in support of their doctrine. But no; they cannot adduce either. They undertake, however, to prove otherwise, that infants are not to be baptised. According to their own dictum it is necessary for them 528
to adduce a prohibitory precept or example for this purpose. We shall not, however, insist upon this, for we do not subscribe to their dictum; we are, therefore, ready to hear the different proof which they offer to lead. This is it, then: "Faith and repentance are necessary qualifications for baptism, and infants are incapable of these." This is very plausible; but let us have the passages on which the argument is founded. The following are two of them, and may suffice: – Mark 16: 16, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved;" and Acts 2: 38, "Repent and be baptised, every one of you." According to the first of these passages, the order is, to believe first and then to be baptised; and according to the second, to repent first and then to be baptised, Thus faith and repentance should precede baptism. Yes, in the case of adults; for it is to adults only that these passages refer. They prove nothing, therefore, with respect to infants. They prove that, in the case of adults, faith and repentance are necessary qualifications for baptism; but they do not prove that they are necessary qualifications for it in the case of all; and, therefore, they do not prove that infants, because they are incapable of faith and repentance, are not to be baptised. If these passages applied to infants, the first of them, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved," would prove that infants cannot be saved. It makes believing necessary in order to salvation; but infants are incapable of believing, and, therefore, according to the logic of our opponents, they cannot be saved. Our opponents, however, do not draw this conclusion, and will not accept it; but they must accept it, or else abandon their interpretation of the passage. If the passage teaches, as, according to their interpretation, it does, that none but such as believe are to be baptised, it teaches also, and, indeed, still more clearly, that none but such as believe shall be saved. Thus, if it teaches that infants, because they are incapable of faith, are not to be baptised, it teaches, also, that infants, because they are incapable of faith, shall not be saved. Strange, that Anti-pedobaptists will not see this! What a striking illustration is afforded by the fact that they do not see it, of the partiality and one-sidedness of view which an erroneous doctrine produces!

(*To be continued*.)

---

## THE CHURCH TAKING A LEAF OUT OF THE WORLD'S BOOK.

An active demand for pleasure and the steady supply of it form a very marked characteristic of the world. The statistics of the world place before us multitudes who make a living and some who acquire wealth as dealers in this very saleable commodity, and the church, observing the account to which the supply of pleasure is thus turned within the sphere of the world, and finding, as a church demoralised by a compromise union and its inevitable consequences must find, that the use of its own proper means of raising funds does not at all yield satisfactory results, adopts, with some hesitation it may be and under some restrictions, but still adopts, the expedients of the world and becomes for the nonce a vendor of pleasure. This clearly enough is the character under which the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales is presented in the following advertisement, which appeared in the *Lachlan Reporter* of the 5th instant. The church's method of influencing the people to contribute funds and to do all else that is incumbent on them, is to instruct them, to apply the truth to their hearts, to urge the motives from which they ought to act as it is desired they should, and by a proper organisation and agency to afford them every facility for acting thus; but, evidently, those who issued the advertisement to which we refer have no confidence in this method, or at least have more confidence in one of the world's expedients, which is greatly relied on and con-

stantly employed by those who operate on their neighbours by means of the public house and the theatre.

But, when such methods are adopted, we are not to suppose that the church borrows them from the world, continuing itself all

the while all that as the church it ought to be. The adoption of them brings it so far into conformity to the world; but this is not all, the adoption of them implies the antecedent existence of conformity to it. It is when the church loses so far its proper distinctive character and becomes assimilated to the world, that it adopts the ways of the world. "By their fruits ye shall know them." If the fruit is such as the world bears, the tree to the same extent is such as the world is. The Union Church was greatly assimilated to the world by the compromise in which it originated. The world does not value divine truth, the church does. Accordingly when divine truth is compromised or surrendered, those by whom it is thus treated act the part of the world towards it, not the part of the church. To its assimilation to the world the shameless setting at nought of the claims of discipline, to which its founders resorted for the purpose of ushering it into existence, contributed largely, – to a greater extent, indeed, than will be readily recognised. A church on the very foundation of which is inscribed, as it is on that of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, that even those who have been judicially declared to be unfit for office in the church may, at least to serve a purpose, be admitted to office in it, practically disclaims the distinctive character of a church, or refuses to be restricted to it. And the moment such a church steps beyond its more definitely prescribed and distinctive operations, in conducting which it cannot but present the appearance of a church, it may be expected, and can scarcely fail, to exhibit its conformity to the world, as such a church did at Forbes on the 11th. And it is very observable that this conformity to the world is reached by the imitation on the part of the church, or the importation by it into its own sphere, not of what is most to be esteemed, but of what must be wholly condemned, in the character of the world. The industrial occupations of the world and its vigorous and honourable prosecution of them are highly commendable, the only but grievous cause of regret being the atheistical spirit in which it prosecutes them. But it is not in this direction that the conformity of the church to the world develops itself, but in the direction, as in the Forbes affair, of its love of pleasure and its plying of temptation, the worst elements of its character.

The following is the advertisement to which we have referred: –

GRAND AMATEUR
MUSICAL ENTERTAINMENT
IN AID OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, FORBES,
ON FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1869,
AT MESSRS. THOMAS BROTHERS' STORE.
PROGRAMME:

Sacred: Pianoforte solo – Sonata in B flat, Beethoven; song – Angels ever bright and fair, Handel; song – Consider the lilies, Glover; chorale – by the school children. Secular: Pianoforte solo – Jessie's Dream, Blockley; glee – See our oars, Stevenson; song – Captive Greek Girl, Hobbs; duet – The Cousins, Glover; song – The Bonnie Hills of Scotland; trio – The Bells of St. Michael's Tower; song – The Young Recruit, Kucken; duet —; song – Standard Bearer, Abt; pianoforte duet – La Traviata, Verdi. (Interval.) Pianoforte solo, overture – Lucrezia Borgia, Donizetti; chorus, Gipsy chorus – Preciosa, Weber; song – Comic Medley; duet – Home to our Mountains, Verdi; song – Tomorrow, Blockley; pianoforte and flute duet – Satanella, Balfe; song —; duet – Oh! wert thou in the cauld blast, Mendelssohn; song – Janet's Choice, Claribel; song – Her bright smile haunts me still, Wrighton; chorus – Auld Lang Syne.

Admission, 2s. 6d.; children under 12, half-price. To commence at 8 o'clock, p.m.

529

## EPISCOPACY VERGING TOWARDS I'RESBYTERIANISM.

We think our correspondent is fully justified by facts in alleging that episcopacy is modifying and attempting to improve itself by adopting presbyterian peculiarities. Unhappily, however, it is under the guidance of expediency and not of divine institution that it adopts them, and attempts the re-construction of itself which it finds to be urgently necessary. A Church engaged in such work and never referring to the Scriptures for guidance is a strange and melancholy spectacle, and, yet, this is precisely the spectacle that recent episcopal synods have presented.

This is not the only instance in which the inquiry what is best and most expedient in ecclesiastical arrangements has resulted in the adoption of presbyterian views and modes of action. The form of Church government adopted by Wesleyans is a striking instance of such inquiry conducting to this result; for, while it seems to have been adopted as the best that could be devised and not as having been divinely instituted, in its main features it is presbyterian. And the modifications of congregationalism which have been resorted to, and wisely resorted to, for conferring on congregational churches the benefit practically of a union which they theoretically reject, are simply so far the adoption of presbyterianism.

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

Dear Sir, – Such as read with due care the signs of the times cannot fail to observe that the Episcopal Church in this colony (as well as other Protestant Churches) is becoming presbyterian with respect to its polity. The more men are allowed to discuss civil or ecclesiastical subjects, the more they feel and are convinced that they have a right not only to discuss, but also to judge for themselves. To fancy it could be otherwise would betray sad ignorance of human nature and of the teaching of history. Educated and independent men will not always submit to be treated, either in civil or in religious matters, as if they were serfs.

The right to deliberate upon and to discuss the affairs of their Church in synods, and in the presence of their bishops, being now granted to the members of the Episcopal Church in this colony, the right to *vote* and to decide will soon be demanded by them and must be granted to them. The one is the natural result of the other.

The process now begun will go on, it is to be hoped, from one degree of reformation to another, till every vestige of erastianism, of ritualism, and of man's inventions shall disappear from the Episcopal Church in this and in every land. When this glorious event will take place, episcopacy shall be numbered among the things that were.

Yours truly,
A SUBSCRIBER.

---

## THE PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND.

The Presbytery of Maitland met on the 11th inst. at Raymond Terrace. Sederunt: Rev. James McCulloch, Moderator; Rev. W. S. Donald, Ministers; and Messrs. Samuel Porter and Malcolm Gillies, Elders. After the meeting was constituted, the call to the Moderator from the Grafton congregation was taken up and considered. It was reported by the clerk, that the necessary intimation to the parties interested had been duly made. There appeared as commissioners from the Ahalton and Raymond Terrace congregation Messrs. Hugh McDonald, John McPhee, Roderick McDonald, William McQueen, Thomas Dunn, senr., Donald Gillies, and James Cameron; and from Maitland congregation Messrs. Robert Philip and Donald Campbell. As no commissioner. appeared from the Grafton congregation, the clerk, by direction of the Presbytery, read the reasons which had been forwarded by them in

support of their call to Mr. McCulloch. (Those reasons were the same as were read in the Presbytery on 2nd May, 1868, and

published in the *Testimony* for that month.) The commissioners from the Ahalton and Raymond Terrace congregation were then heard. They stated unanimously their deep and continued attachment to the Rev. Mr. McCulloch as their pastor, and while they expressed sympathy with the Grafton congregation, they nevertheless, for many reasons which they adduced, opposed the translation, and craved the Presbytery to refuse to grant it. The commissioners from the Maitland congregation then addressed the Presbytery to the same effect. Among the reasons which were assigned for refusing the translation, the same reasons were given in in writing and read by the clerk as were so submitted on the 2nd May, 1868. (See them in *Testimony* for that month.) Mr. McCulloch having been asked at this stage if he had any statement to make in reference to the call, addressed the Presbytery. He stated that he had felt great difficulty as to how he should deal with this call, which had been presented to him, in consequence of the reasons on both sides being so weighty. He observed that, having been on the Clarence, he knew the importance of the district as a field of ministerial labor, and that he had seen on his visits the urgent necessity which existed for a minister being permanently settled there. The adherents of our Church, Mr. McCulloch stated, were num-erous in the district, and likely to continue so, as they for the most part resided on their own properties. Mr. McCulloch, in course of his remarks, adverted to the fact that this call which had been sent to him was the second which had come from that congregation, and that it was much more numerously signed than the first, and this he conceived was something which ought to be taken into consideration in coming to a decision. Mr. McCulloch then proceeded to speak of his present sphere of labor, and stated that although he was sensible of the importance of the Grafton district, he was also well aware of the great importance of the Hunter district as a field for ministerial usefulness. In particular, he adverted to a proposal made by some of the commissioners as most likely to be conducive to a minister's usefulness in that district. The proposal in question was to the effect, that there should be service regularly every Sabbath at Maitland instead of alternately at Morpeth and Maitland as at present. In course of his remarks concerning his present sphere of labor, Mr. McCulloch stated, that considering he had been settled in it on a unanimous call, and that those under his charge were still very desirous of retaining him amongst them, he felt that it would be a serious matter to break the connection. Mr. McCulloch stated farther, that he had also some fears as to whether the climate of Grafton might not be unfavorable to his constitution, and so impair his usefulness. Mr. McCulloch, in conclusion, stated that he had been most desirous to make up his mind, and take his full share of the responsibility in deciding the case. He stated, however, that he had not as yet been able to make up his mind, and he craved delay in order that he might have time for farther consideration, and to come to a clear understanding, – if it were the Lord's will, – what the path of duty was in connection with this call. The Presbytery, after deliberation, unanimously agreed, that as Mr. McCulloch had craved further time in order to enable him to make up his mind, he should be allowed till next meeting of Presbytery. The Presbytery took up the subject of supplies, and agreed that the present arrangements for the Hastings district and Clarence Town should continue till next meeting. Mr. McInnes was appointed to preach at Grafton on the second Sabbath of July next. The Presbytery adjourned to meet 1st July next, at 11 o'clock a.m., in the Presbyterian Schoolhouse, East Maitland.

---



## MEETING OF THE CONGREGATION OF ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH.

A meeting of the congregation of St. George's Church was held in that church on Wednesday, the 16th instant, at half-past seven in the evening. The Rev. William McIntyre, minister of the congregation, presided, and opened the meeting with prayer, after which he spoke to the following effect: –

The efforts to reduce and ultimately extinguish the debt on the church, in which we have been engaged for some years, have been conducted under circumstances from which they have derived higher significance and importance than they would otherwise possess. If they were merely efforts to extinguish the debt and nothing whatever more than this, some might think, as indeed some have thought, that they ought not to have been made; that the wiser course would have been to have allowed the church to be sold. To the adoption of this course there were two objections. In the first place, it was not in the least likely that, supposing the church were sold, the proceeds would cover the debt, and whatever balance remained those who were personally liable would have to pay it. But, even supposing the proceeds of a sale would be sufficient to pay the debt, there was still the objection to the adoption of this mode of paying it, that the sale of the church would involve no small disgrace to the body to which it belonged, the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, It would exhibit that Church as unable to maintain, in the very capital of the colony, the position it had assumed; a position, probably, which a more just estimate of resources and more sober and judicious counsels would have preserved it from assuming, but from which, when once it had assumed it, it could not retire without disgrace, especially as it would retire from it, if it retired at all, very much as a bankrupt. This was the view of the case which induced me to connect myself with the financial difficulties of this congregation. I was anxious, in the first instance at least, not so much for the interests of the congregation as for the character of the church of which it forms a part.

Subsequently circumstances arose which to me, and I have no doubt to at least many of you imparted to the efforts in which I became associated with you still greater interest and importance. A large portion of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern. Australia went into the union, and we as a congregation refused to abandon the position which we formerly occupied, being the only congregation in Sydney that adhered to the principles and testimony of our church. It thus became still more important that we should maintain our ground. If the church were sold, under the altered circumstances in which we were thus placed our testimony would cease to be represented and maintained in Sydney, and the metropolis would be left in the hands of a church that originated in a compromise and was ushered into existence by unfaithfulness.

The maintenance of a full uncompromised scriptural testimony is an object of great importance. The church's maintenance of such a testimony in its creed, in its teaching, in its life, in its government, and in its discipline, constitutes the faithfulness and, indeed, the excellence in all its elements by which it should be distinguished. The truth has been committed to the Church that it may employ and apply it without curtailment or corruption for the accomplishment of the purposes which it is intended to serve. Nothing therefore can be more inconsistent with the office of the Church and with the design of its existence than the surrender, the throwing away, of any portion of the truth. It is itself an agency appointed by God and the truth is the instrument consisting of many parts with which God has supplied it that by the employment of it it may accomplish the design of its appointment. Its dear duty therefore is to preserve this instrument in its complete-

ness and in unimpaired efficiency, and to employ it, and to

employ each and every part of it as circumstances may require.. Nothing could be more treacherous or suicidal on its part, nothing a more evident violation of its duty, than to enter into any agreement to the effect that as a Church, whatever the individual members of it may do, it will not employ, or even retain in their place, certain parts of this instrument. It is such an agreement, however, that forms the basis of the Union in this colony and of similar unions elsewhere. To that agreement we refused to be parties. We recognise that it is our duty to preserve the weapon of divine truth in the state in which God gave it to us. We therefore occupy our present position, and the efforts in which we are engaged acquire greatly increased importance from the fact that they are directed to the maintenance of it, and thus to the maintenance of a full uncompromised scriptural testimony.

Mr. Buyers, as treasurer of the congregation, then read the following Report: –

"The Deacons' Court of St. George's Church beg to submit to the congregation the following statement of what has been done towards the liquidation of the debt on the church and the payment of the interest on that debt: –

When our present minister was inducted early in 1862, the debt amounted to the very large sum of £12,500. For interest on this sum to February, 1869, there has been paid as follows, viz.: Seven years interest on £5,000 (amount of the portion of the debt secured by mortgage, at 8 per cent, £2,800; interest on the floating debt of £7,600, say £2,625 - £5,425; making a total amount of £17,925. During the last seven years there has been raised by the congregation for the liquidation of the debt and payment of the interest, the sum of £12,692; leaving still due the sum of £5,233, as follows – Amount of mortgage, £6,000; ditto of floating debt, £233. The above figures do not include the ordinary expenses connected with the congregation, which have all been paid with the exception of about £83.

While bearing testimony to the liberality of the congregation generally, the Deacons' Court deem it their duty to make special reference to the numerous and large contributions of Mr. and Mrs. McIntyre, and of the late William Manson, Esq., and to the effective and cheerful assistance uniformly given by Mr. Robert Campbell. It is also proper to record, in accounting for the large reduction of the debt, that has been effected, that Mr. McIntyre has relieved the congregation, during nearly the whole of the period of his connection with it from the payment of stipend.

The congregation are aware that the late Mr. Manson, to whose large and liberal contributions reference has already been made, has, in addition to a bequest of £1,000 as an endowment to the congregation, left a bequest of £2,500, to be applied towards the discharge of the remaining debt, on condition that a similar amount be raised by the congregation. With a view to the fulfilment of this condition the Deacons' Court take leave to submit to the congregation the following plan of operation. They propose – I. That application for subscriptions shall be made to all the members and adherents of the congregation, the payment of such subscriptions as may be obtained to extend over twelve months; and – II. That as many of the congregation as may be willing to do so shall take subscription lists and collecting cards for the purpose of procuring subscriptions outside the congregation.

The office-bearers entertain the hope that all the members and adherents will view it not only as a duty, but also as a privilege to take part in collecting funds to enable the Deacons' Court to avail themselves of the late Mr. Manson's bequest, and thus finally to extinguish the debt, which has hitherto been so grievous an incubus on the energies of the congregation."



This Report having been read, Mr. Robert Campbell moved the following resolution: "That the Report which has now been read be adopted, and that the congregation gratefully acknowledge the great goodness of God in enabling it to effect so large a reduction of the debt on the church, and in affording it ground to hope that the remaining portion of it will soon be cancelled." In course of his remarks, Mr. Campbell stated some facts illustrative of the exercise of liberality referred to in the report. He called upon young men to follow the example of Mr. Manson, who by great diligence in business acquired the means of contributing largely to the cause of Christ, and having acquired them exercised corresponding liberality. His observation in connection with the effort to extinguish the debt led him to the conclusion that to withhold more than is meet in such a case does not by any means promote prosperity, and that the exercise of liberality does not hinder it. He urged that it was of great importance to bear a full scriptural testimony. The Union Church adopted deliberately a mutilated testimony, and the evil consequences of its having done so were already presenting themselves.

Mr. Ewan seconded the resolution, urging the congregation, now so near the goal, to make the necessary effort to reach it.

The resolution, having been put to the meeting was passed unanimously.

Mr. John McDonald, senr., then moved the following resolution: "That the congregation record, on this the first occasion on which it has had an opportunity of doing so, its painful sense of the loss it has sustained in the death of William Manson, Esq., and its high appreciation and grateful remembrance of the eminently valuable services which he rendered to it as one of its office-bearers, as the superintendent of its Sabbath School, and as a large and liberal contributor to its funds." Mr. McDonald was glad it was not necessary for him to make a speech in supporting the resolution he had just read. All present were aware that the congregation was greatly indebted to the late Mr. Manson. He contributed largely to its funds. His regular contributions were large, but he did not restrict himself to these. Whenever an emergency arose, he gave, in conjunction with such as might be able to co-operate, whatever was necessary to meet it, giving on such occasions such sums as £500, £750, and even more when more was required. Many a man whose hands were so full of business as those of Mr. Manson were would have considered himself excused from attending to Church affairs; but he did not do so. He never failed to be in his place as a member and the secretary of the Deacons' Court, and he always contributed largely by his wisdom and energy to the satisfactory transaction of the business, often perplexing enough, that came before that court.

Mr. Cameron seconded the resolution. He bore testimony to the valuable services rendered by Mr. Manson to the congregation. But for these services the congregation would have long ago lost the church, as many expected it inevitably would. He considered that the hand of God was clearly seen in his having raised up for the congregation such friends, and in his having wrought for it by their agency so remarkable a deliverance.

Mr. McIntyre added a few remarks, expressing his high appreciation of the services rendered to the congregation by Mr. Manson, services rendered within the last two years of his life with evidently increased alacrity and satisfaction.

The resolution was then put and passed unanimously.

Subscription lists and collecting cards having been distributed, the meeting, which was well attended and manifested an earnest interest in the business brought before it, was closed with the benediction.

## Correspondence.

### MODERATISM IN OTAGO.

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

Sir. – On the 23rd March, 1848, the "John Wycliffe" arrived at Otago with the first instalment of Scottish settlers who came to form a "class colony" in New Zealand. The settlement, accordingly, has reached its majority; and we need not wonder that, in March last, due notice was taken of the fact by the Otago press. The scattered handful of "old colonists" and "runaway sailors" whom Rev. T. (now Dr.) Burns found it impossible to get to come to church have given place to 50;000 inhabitants. What was primitive wilderness in 1848 has now 200,000 acres under cultivation. But this colonizing experiment had an element of special interest. It was designed from the first to be a Free Church colony. The New Zealand Company, which held land by charter from the Crown in the island, came to an arrangement with a Lay Association in Scotland, according to which so much of the land was to be settled by Free Churchmen under the auspices of the Lay Association. The land was to be sold at £2 per acre, out of which the sum of five shillings per acre was to be reserved for building churches, manses, and schools, and for supporting the ordinances of religion and education. One fruit of this provision is to be seen in the fact that at the present time Dr. Burns, of the first church, Dunedin, is building a magnificent place of worship, 160 feet by 90, with steeple 185 feet high, to hold 1000 persons, and to cost £14,000. Reverting to the early design, practical measures were taken to secure the Free Church character of the settlement There were to be trustees of the funds to be raised by the sale of the lands, these trustees to be resident in New Zealand, members of the Free Church there in communion with the Free Church of Scotland. The churches and schools were to be framed on the model of the Free Church of Scotland, and to be under the jurisdiction of the Free Church Assembly, until a Presbytery should be formed in Otago itself. In a report of a meeting of the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh, we find Rev. J. Sym, Colonial Convener of the time (October, 1847), urging upon ministers of the Church the duty of acting with discrimination in giving certificates to intending emigrants. It is, perhaps, not wonderful that, in these circumstances, the idea of exclusiveness and intolerance was raised. To meet this, we find that, from time to time, the friends of the settlement took occasion to announce that persons of other denominations could settle in the district and acquire property. Dr. Burns, in giving a detailed census for the year 1851, shows that many beside Free Churchmen had settled in Otago. Of 1740 inhabitants there were 843 Free Churchmen, 220 other Presbyterians, 472 Episcopalians, besides some smaller denominations. The Wesleyans are active in the colony, and I see by recent papers the Church of England has a "Diocese of Dunedin," though there appears to be some doubt whether there is a bishop to the diocese.

The Free Church experiment was fairly started. The dream of the poet was more worthily fulfilled than in the case of the Trojan hero carrying his household gods into Italy to found another Ilium. The fine scenery of Otago harbor reminded the Caledonian of Sir Walter Scott's description of the Trossacks. The new township was called after the capital of Scotland. Portobello and Musselburgh are to be found in Otago as well as in Midlothian. Even the malodorous Water of Leith is made to do duty at the antipodes as the more classic Xanthus and Simois had to do in Chaonia. At one point, indeed, the moderns beat the ancients in this kind of imitation. There was the Witness newspaper in Edinburgh, and some time after the colony was established an *Otago Witness* made its appearance at Dunedin. In this interesting colony Dr.. Burns was sole minister for six years, and we need not wonder at the great delight which he expresses when visited in his antipodean retreat by the Rev. W. (now Dr.) Nicolson, on his way to Hobart Town, Tasmania. I have been



looking over the letters from the ecclesiastical father of the settlement, which appear in the *Free Church Home* and *Foreign Record,* and, without doubt, they form a marked contrast to the interminable deluges of small talk which are so often given as missionary intelligence. The real work done is told pointedly and plainly. It is touching to read his account of the early communions held in the settlement, and also of the Scottish stillness of the Sabbath.

But I must not forget the title which I placed at the head of this letter. In 1854 two Free Church Ministers – Messrs. Bannerman and Will – arrived in Otago, and the first Presbytery was formed, the first in Otago and the first in New Zealand. In 1861 the Union fever as well as the gold fever, began to rage, and the result of a meeting of ministers, held at Dunedin in the year named, was the formation of that characteristic of the present age – a basis of Union. We now enter upon a new epoch. The change between 1854 and 1861 is something marvellous, ecclesiastically as well as otherwise. In 1854, the attachment expressed towards the Free Church of Scotland at the formation of the first Presbytery may be understood from such a passage as the following: – "The fundamental principles of this Church in doctrine, polity, and discipline, are, and shall be, those laid down in the standards of the Free Church of Scotland, which shall be, and hereby are adopted as the standards of this Church." It is easy to understand with what approbation such a state of things in Otago was regarded, in Scotland. These proceedings were duly noticed in the Free Church Colonial Report, as "openly and unambiguously avowing the name, the principles, and the standards of the Free Church of Scotland." Yet, in the Basis of 1861, all special affection for the Free Church disappears! The door is as wide open to Erastians and Voluntaries as to the Free Church. If, as is usual in breach of promise cases, all the letters of ardent attachment on both sides were collected and published, it would be difficult to say on which side was the greater warmth displayed – whether on the part of the Free Church of Otago towards the Free Church of Scotland, or on the part of the Free Church of Scotland towards the pet colony of Otago. The cold basis, side by side with the expressions of strong attachment which had formerly been given, prepares us to bestow our tender regards upon the party heartlessly deserted. But we may moderate our grief. Cold as is the basis towards the Free Church of Scotland, that Church herself is delighted with it. Strange, yet true, the Free Church of Scotland is quite enamored of a Union movement, which reduces her to the same rank as Moderates and Voluntaries. But how did Dr. Burns and Mr. Bannerman get entangled with such a basis? for it was subsequently proved that both these gentlemen were determined not to sink their Free Church principles and character. In December, 1863, Mr. Bannerman declared that it would not satisfy him to go back simply upon the original basis. He would require safeguards against the evils which had appeared in the meantime. It is certainly not to the credit of the honesty of Union negotiations, that the real and ultimate designs of them were not seen by all parties, till they were very awkwardly entangled by a preliminary consent. This applies to the Union movement in Victoria, New South Wales, and New Zealand. Yet, notwithstanding this uncom-fortable complication, a part in all three colonies drew back, at all cost, rather than make shipwreck of their ecclesiastical testimony. Looking into the history of the Union movement in New Zealand, I observe that when the basis of 1861 was agreed to, there was an understanding that some change would yet be effected. If Dr. Burns and Mr. Bannerman hoped something satisfactory might yet come of this, they were doomed to be disappointed. A conference met at Auckland to consummate the Union: the basis

was changed, and the conference installed itself as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. The Otago brethren were now startled into their senses. The change in the basis, so far from making it more of a Free Church character, opened a door indefinitely wide for innovations of various sorts. Mr. Bannerman, in the Presbytery of Otago (June, 1863), moved that the doings at Auckland be regarded by the Presbytery as merely the recommendations of a conference. Rev. D. M. Stuart, who was Moderator of Presbytery, left the chair, and moved that the Presbytery protest against the change, and "strongly urge the necessity of restoring the basis to its shape as given at the Dunedin conference, on the ground that the alteration was ignored by the Presbytery, as initiating changes in the established usages of the Church." This was carried by ten to three. This sounds well in Mr. Stuart; but he comes somewhat prominently before us hereafter, and we must not omit another manifestation of his views, at the same meeting, as to initiating changes in the established usages of the Church. It transpired that the innovations more immediately dreaded were in the direction of instrumental music in public worship. Dr. Burns expressed his fears as to the conse- quences of the introduction of such innovations. But Mr. Stuart was amused at the forebodings of Dr. Burns. He had heard the same in England, in regard to the introduction of the organ and the harmonium. If people wanted the one or the other they would have it. They must adapt themselves to circumstances. The people in John Knox's time were wise, and were they in Otago they would adapt themselves to circumstances. We shall see pre-sently that Mr. Stuart is thoroughly consistent in working out his own convenient principle. Meanwhile, let us see how he proceeded to give effect to his own protest against the changed basis. The court broke up without instructing the clerk to send the resolution to anybody. When it met again, a discussion took place as to its destination. The Auckland conference was now a defunct body in the view of the Unionising party, but to the Free Church party the General Assembly was a body ignored. They resolved to transmit the resolution to the Moderator of the conference. Mr. Stuart and others dissented, and drew up a series of eight reasons. One of these contained such language as the following: – "That the attempt, in an indirect manner, to ignore the Assembly was disgraceful in itself, and dishonest towards the other Presbyteries, inasmuch as commissioners from Otago and other Presbyteries had been led by the Otago Presbytery to believe that the making of some alterations in the terms in which the basis of union were expressed, would be no bar to an Assembly being formed." Pretty well this to be adopted by Mr. Stuart, who had come from the Moderator's chair, to move a protest against the action of the Auckland convention in making an alteration in the basis? As to the language in which the Unionists addressed the Presbytery, in their reasons of dissent, Dr. Burns declared that, in the course of long and varied experience, he had never heard such insulting expressions employed. But it was all in the good cause of Union! – a specimen of the kind of brotherly love and affection to be expected from Unionists! By their fruits ye shall know them.

The discussions on innovations in worship occupy a prominent place during the Union movement in New Zealand, and some instructive and symptomatic facts are to be gathered from them. Such discussions have been steady concomitants of Union movements in Scotland and in the colonies. Perhaps the reason is not far to seek. Those who find it convenient to be relieved of the duty of testifying for spiritual truths and principles, distasteful to the world, may also find it congenial to their state of mind to get rid of some of the elements of spiritual worship. It requires no great depth of insight to understand that men of secular tenden- 533 cies feel a constant protest against their own state of mind in the sentiments in the Psalms, inspired as they are by the Holy Ghost. But, whatever the explanation may be, the fact remains, that movements in the direction of an increase of hymns, &c., and of introducing instrumental music in the public worship of God, have been the common attendants upon Union negotiations. It was so in New Zealand. At a meeting of the General Assembly, held in December, 1863, at Wellington, the Rev. Peter Barclay, of Napier, defended the change made in the basis, on the score of consistency. The clause introduced at the Auckland meeting meant "to refer exclusively to the actual existing differences between the usages of the Church and many of the recommendations in the standards as to the order of worship. Their sole object was to vindicate the consistency of the Church in regard to these differences." Now, what is all this circumlocution about? In brief, and plain, and honest English, it means that the Napier congregation have an organ. Some simple people might suggest that it would be a quite legitimate way of squaring standards and usages to put the organ aside. But there is just the difficulty. It would be quite legitimate, but not expedient for Rev. P. Barclay. It would be in the teeth of Rev. D. M. Stuart's useful principle of adapting ourself to circumstances. But, at the General Assembly which met at Dunedin, in 1865, Mr. Barclay gives us more light on the subject. For the Unionising Assemblies, having performed the grand tour of New Zealand, ended in Dunedin, in 1865, where they began, in 1861, Mr. Barclay was Moderator, and, from the Moderator's chair, adverted to the "Napier case." How had he and his congregation got on with the organ? He had said to them – Do what you think right; I will not oppose you. A fine specimen of Mr. Stuart's doctrine of adapting oneself to circumstances. But Mr. Barclay had a historical case, coming under his own notice, to help him. He had been away fifty miles from Napier, at a place called Waipu. When going to hold service, two hymns were handed to him; these were sung while accompanied by a performer on the flute. Now, triumphantly asks the Rev. Peter Barclay, was he to stop the service and tell these people that because they had that flute he would not preach the gospel to them? This is the only alternative that occurs to the fertile imagination of Mr. Barclay. If the gentle blast from the flute is so influential with Mr. Barclay, need we wonder if the more powerful blast from the organ should tear up by the roots his attachment to Presbyterianism altogether? I notice that in the Otago Church itself, a motion, to have the attention of congregations directed to the distinctive principles of Presbyterianism, was quashed. Rev. W. Will did not see the use of it. Rev. Mr. Johnstone let out that he was afraid some of them were getting ashamed of their Presbyterianism.

But although the Otago Church got clear of the Union, discussions on introducing new hymns, &c., continued. Here is some of the literature of the subject. The Rev. A. H. Stabo, at a meeting in January of this year, moved as follows: – "Whereas the present collection of paraphrases and hymns is insufficient for the service of praise in our various congregations, it is humbly overtured by the Presbytery of Southland to the Synod of Otago and Southland to take steps to increase the means of praise in the various congregations of the Synod by the addition of some well selected hymns. But inasmuch as the Free Church of Scotland has the whole subject of Scriptural psalmody under its consideration, the Synod contents itself in the meantime with awaiting the issue of that investigation." This piece of composition reminds me of the words of Pope: –

Nonsense precipitate – like running lead –
That dropp'd through cracks and zigzags of the head.

Let the Free Church take care! The matter is already settled. Mr. Stabo has moved an overture declaring that the present psalter is

insufficient. It remains for the Free Church, as gracefully as she can, to move on in the groove scraped out for her at the antipodes, and proceed at once to the selection of the hymns, and so relieve Mr. Stabo of the necessity of selecting them. But the natural history of the overture is considerately given by Mr. Stabo. He tells us that he had been galloping about the country at such a rate that he had not time properly to collect his thoughts. We saw a little ago that Mr. Barclay was taken all of a sudden and completely swept from his moorings by the blast of the flute player of Waipu. So in the case of Mr. Stabo. He would not have initiated the movement himself, but then there was the pressure from his congregation. An intelligent member had asked him to bring on the subject and get an addition of hymns, and poor Stabo appears to have been as much at his wits' ends as Mr. Barclay, and promised be would do so. After this candid introduction, Mr. Stabo proceeds to prove hymns from Scripture. It is scarcely possible to keep from explosions of laughter at the ludicrous aspects of these matters, although it is enough to sober one down to consider the evidences here given of the stamina of some of those who have gone forth as pioneers to lay the foundations of Presbyterianism in the rising empires of the south.

The history of a report on the state of religion a few months ago in the Otago Church develops some curious points. The convener in the case was Rev. Mr. Sutherland, colleague to Dr. Burns. The report dealt with various forms of irreligion. We are told that Rev. D. M. Stuart condemned the sweeping censure which had been heaped on theatres, dancing, and other amusements as one of those things which gave an outside impression that they held narrow minded and illiberal views. Rev. W. Will took care to explain that the report emanated from Mr. Sutherland alone, and had not received the concurrence of the Committee. Oddly enough, after all this, a vote of thanks was given to the Committee (who, it appears, did nothing), and to the convener, who, as we have seen, virtually got a censure. But the matter did not stop here. The press took it up. Mr. Sutherland's ideas were regarded as of that sort which drove John Bunyan to the verge of lunacy. Then says the journalist: "The protest entered by the Rev. Mr. Stuart against these illiberal views during the late session of the Synod entitles him to the thanks of the community. It is to the advocacy of such men that religion owes its greatest triumphs in the present age!" Alas for antipodean imitations! the words quoted are from the *Otago Witness*. Virgil calls the imitation river the false one – the false Simois. Have we here the *false Witness*? How fares it with the imitator of Knox (!) in adapting himself to circumstances in this style? The Rev. D. M. Stuart is minister of John Knox Church, Dunedin, and his communion roll numbers 600 members. Is it possible to reflect on what has passed in review in the foregoing paragraphs without being haunted with some uncomfortable, some painful conclusions? The Rev. D. M. Stuart is the gentleman who could afford to be amused at the forebodings of Dr. Burns!

As a representative man developing Unionism still further in Otago, we may take Rev. William Will, whose name has occurred already. In September, 1862, he was appointed to proceed to Britain, with the view of furthering the spiritual interests of the colony. But a question arose whether the expenses of the mission could be defrayed out of the trust fund. In December following, the decision of the Presbytery was renewed. Dr. Burns moved that the previous resolution be not carried out. Mr. Will thought the discussion out of order: the mission must be carried out; he could not now submit the question to the decision of the court. The Presbytery divided, seven for and seven against the mission. The Moderator gave the casting vote for Dr. Burns' motion. Mr. 534

Will resigned on the spot. He was ready to quit Otago. He handed in a list of names of gentlemen – ten in number – who had agreed to advance £50 a year for three years to defray the expenses of the mission. Mr. Will's own name was down in the list, and that, he announced, would be scored out, and the Presbytery might do as it liked with the remainder. Next day the Presbytery met again, and a proposal was in shape to be made in the court, viz. – that the mission should be carried out by Mr. Will, but that the Presbytery be relieved of all responsibility in the matter. Dr. Burns agreed to this, but moved in addition that the Presbytery express its disapproval of the attempt of the previous day to coerce the court. This was lost by nine to three. The coarseness of the fibre here in Mr. Will is visible, from afar. But this only fitted him to do the rough work of promoting Union. In the discussion in the Presbytery it was argued that he had given proof of his unfitness to act as a deputy. In Scotland he gave additional proof. He appeared in the Free Church Assembly of 1864. By that time the brethren in Otago were in the position of having ignored the Union, and Mr. Will was in the minority who proposed to recognise it. Doubtless Mr. Will was in a delicate position, but that was just such a position as he could not occupy with good grace. He could not lose the opportunity of introducing the subject of the disputed Union in Otago, on which subject he did not represent the Otago Church. The bad taste was too palpable to escape notice. Even Dr. Candlish could not sit quietly under it. As soon as Mr. Will sat down, Dr. Candlish rose and observed that the Assembly were not committed to Mr. Will's statement. Yet Dr. Candlish knows how to work hard at a point gained in favor of Union, if it be dexterously done. His remark was received with applause. Upon returning to Otago, Mr. Will was himself again at a congregational meeting held in connexion with his arrival. In a long speech given on the occasion we find a great deal of mean vulgarity, spiced with conceit and egotism. His mission was but the arena in which fictitious importance was given to Mr. Will and his petty squabbles. One more specimen of Mr. Will may be given. At one of the discussions on introducing hymns, Mr. Bannerman gave a very earnest and able speech against the serious error of putting any mere human compositions alongside the Psalter already provided by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Here is the beginning of Mr. Will's remarks on the subject: – "He was not quite convinced that there was any indication of the Spirit of God in the tone of Mr. Bannerman's reply to the speech of Mr. Stabo." This language reminds one of the words of Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, who went near and smote Micaiah on the cheek, and said, "Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee?"

The name of Rev. E. Meiklejohn occurs amongst those who spoke like Free Churchmen in the discussions on Union. There is an occasional spurt of oratory about him. He indulges in lifting the banner (metaphorically) – glorious cause – historic associations – thrilling memories, &c. He was awake to the great danger to be apprehended from the tide of innovations. He declared that the Free Church of Scotland would have brought to her own door the policy which she was patronising in the colonies. Even so it has come to pass. But, unfortunately for Mr. Meiklejohn, the tides of one kind and another have been too strong for himself. They have swept him out of Dunedin, and pitched him high, if not dry, on the heights of Kilmore – doubtful promotion from Dunedin. His banner, &c., &c., sadly bedraggled in the mire, is now waving over a Union Church in Victoria.

I had almost omitted to notice that a religious periodical, called the *Evangelist,* was started in January of this year, at Lawrence, in the Presbytery of Clutha, which is under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Otago and Southland. This paper is edited by Rev. J. Cope-

land, M.A., M.D., and Ph. D. An effectual guarantee that there shall he a minimum of Free Church principles promulgated by it, is

to be found in the fact that the editor hails from the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. What is given in the shape of news of the churches, is in the genuine old chronicle style – hard names and dry dates. The device for filling up the pages of a magazine, by drawing upon "stories," weak semi-religious sentimentality, &c., &c., has become so universally understood, that it has found its way even to Lawrence, Zuarpeka, Otago, New Zealand. This weak stuff is foisted in on the shoulders of the "young," who are duly consigned to a "corner," to save the learned editor the trouble of exerting a little more diligence in preparing more substantial materials. The leading articles are suggestive of "saying nothing," *not* "with a deal of skill." There are five numbers of the periodical before me, and there are not more than two articles in it which rise above the dullest commonplace. Some sketches of the New Zealand gold-fields, keeping in view their religious aspect, appear to be the only vein of interest upon which the editor has, as yet, managed to stumble.

I am, &c,
PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, Victoria,
June 8th, 1869.

---

## THE FIRST PROTESTANT SERVICE IN MADRID.

The correspondent of the *Daily News,* writing from Madrid, January 26, says: –

"Yesterday morning I went to Plaza de Santa Catalina de los Donados. It is a street leading off from the Calle Arenal, which those of your readers who have been in Madrid will remember is one of the arteries of the Puerto del Sol. I found out No. 2 by following a stream of Spanish people bent on the same errand. The delay in finding the street made me a few minutes late, so the service had commenced when I arrived. As I passed up the staircase, I heard for the first time since I left England congregational singing to one of Luther's grand old tunes. The room had evidently been a dining or reception room, opening into an ante-room. It had a double row of neat red cushioned benches, with a narrow passage in the centre; a harmonium in one corner. When I entered, the seats were full, and I had some difficulty in finding one. Shortly after it became crowded, and many had to go away, unable to find even standing room. At the extreme end was a small recess with a pulpit, or rather desk. The preacher was a middle-sized man, with a good forehead, and a countenance rather inclined to be handsome. He wore the black gown and white lappets of the Church of England, and the service, which he read in Spanish, was part of her service. I counted 139 present; but how many of these were Protestants, and how many had came from mere curiosity, of course I could not tell. That a goodly number, however, were the former, was unmistakably evidenced by the singing, when it is remembered that in the Roman Catholic churches the people do not sing; all that is left to the priests. The singing was started with a heartiness and a precision impossible amongst those who were not accustomed to it, and the congregation so easily took it up and sustained it as to prove that most of them were familiar with the music. It was the more marked as the majority present were men. There were not a dozen females nor half a dozen children. The preacher, who I afterwards learnt was Pastor Ruet, the Spaniard, who has done so much for Protestantism in Algeria, took for his text Matthew 28: l6th to 20th verses. He is a man of wonderful eloquence, which he wielded with evident power over his audience. I noticed one or two priests amongst them, besides many of what one might call the 'upper classes.' The discourse lasted exactly half an hour, during



the whole of which period he was listened to with the most rapt attention. His manner was deeply earnest, without the least approach to 'rant.' After picturing the scene of his text, and expounding the lessons derivable from it, he alluded to the fact that recent events permitted every Spaniard to think for himself, and to exercise the right so long denied to them, but permitted to other countries, of worshipping God according to the dictates of conscience. In the exercise of that right he, a born Spaniard, was conducting the Protestant worship of Protestant Spaniards. He denied a charge which had been made against them, to the effect that they were carrying on their propaganda by English gold. They were Spaniards, and not beholden for one penny to any one but Spaniards. England certainly, as a Protestant country, sympathised with the movement, but beyond that he and his friends neither asked nor accepted any assistance from England, but were carrying on their mission to their Spanish fellow countrymen in the Spanish language, and by means of exclusively Spanish contributions. The services would be continued twice every Sunday so long as the authorities sanctioned freedom of worship, which it was hoped the Cortes Constituentes would confirm."

---

## THE VALUE OF KNOWLEDGE.

An incident, trivial in itself, was the means of saving M. Latreillo, at the time in prison, from the terrible fate of his follow victims. The surgeon who visited the gaol in which Lat-reille was confined one day observed him carefully examining a small beetle which had found its way into his place of confinement. Upon inquiry, he was informed by the prisoner that the insect was a very rare one: and he then expressed a wish to have it for the purpose of presenting it to two young naturalists of his acquaintance living at Bordeaux. The wish was readily complied with, and the insect was conveyed to MM. Bery de St. Vincent and D'Argilas. Latreille's eminence as an entomologist was already known to these gentlemen, and being thus made acquainted with his perilous situation, they immediately exerted themselves to obtain, if possible, his liberation, in which they ultimately succeeded. One trembles to think that a month later he must have in all probability shared the same fate as his fellow-prisoners, who were shipped as convicts for Cayenne, and the vessel which conveyed them foundered in the Bay of Biscay, when every soul on board perished. The deliverance was truly marvellous if we refer to the cause of it, the accidental discovery of an insect. It has been said by one of our great divines that "a fly with God's message could choke a king." A little insignificant beetle thus saved Latreille. How obscure are the means God often employs, and how apparently inadequate the instruments he uses, to effect his wondrous purposes! It is as though he said, in language not to be mistaken – "I kill, and I make alive." – *The Quiver.*

---

THE LAST MONASTERY IN PRUSSIA. – The monastery of Neustadt, the closing of which was postponed until its inmates should die off, was discovered to be secretly recruiting its members. The Berlin Chamber of Deputies has now suppressed the establishment, which was the last of that class of houses in the kingdom.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 46. SYDNEY, JULY 1869.

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. 46 JULY.

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Address to the Synod of Free Presbyterian Church, by Rev. P. Macpherson A.M. Moderator | … | … | … | 537 |
| Review - "Christ the Counsellor"… | … | … | … | 541 |
| Churchgoers Practices in Melbourne | … | … | … | 543 |
| Congregational Meeting … | … | … | … | 544 |
| Presbytery of Maitland … | … | … | … | 545 |
| Duty of the State towards the Church | … | … | … | 546 |

ADDRESS DELIVERED 20TH APRIL, 1869, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF SYNOD IN THE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ST. KILDA, BY REV. PETER MACPHERSON, A.M., MODERATOR.

"And they cast him out." – John 9: 34

We read, in the gospel narrative, of a man who was cured of blindness with which he had been afflicted from his birth. The Church authorities of the time made strict inquiry in the case. Was it true that he had been born blind? The result of inquiry rendered the fact undeniable. Then was it Jesus of Nazareth who performed the cure? There could be no doubt about that point – for the specific details were given, and he that had been born blind bore witness to them. Then, said the Church authorities, you must give God the glory, for this man

(that performed the miracle) is a sinner. The man who had got his eyes opened demurred to the conclusion: He that opens the eyes of the blind must be from God. The Church authorities are irritated at the pertinacity of the man, are indignant that he should, virtually, read the Jewish doctors a lesson on the elements of true divinity, and to get rid of him, they cast him out of the Church, pass sentence of excommunication upon him. (John 9: 1-34.) Now what was the duty of this excommunicated man with regard to the ordinances of God's appointment, the means of grace whereby Christ, the High Priest, was bringing salvation to his elect? But the question now raised obviously expands in importance. It involves not merely a question as to the precise course which that man took – a believer in Christ, now excommunicated by a body assuming to be the visible Church of God. It involves the much larger question – What are whole bodies of men to do when they are treated in the same way by those wielding ecclesiastical power? Here let us take the bearings of certain parties. There is a large portion of the human race which has been out of sight of the Temple of God, and sitting in pagan darkness. There is another portion, consisting largely of mere Gentiles – unconverted men – but who have this to distinguish them from the former section, that they make themselves very busy about the outer court of the Temple. They take to themselves not a little to do with the worship of God, and indeed claim to have the administration of the affairs of the Kingdom of God in their hands. They constitute, in their own estimation, the visible Church. Besides these two, there is a third, including the true members of Christ's Church. In such a case the intermediate party have claims which the mere heathen have not, and what is more, by historical associations, that body has practical arrangements in its hands, which enable it to wield a most formidable power. Yet it consists largely, sometimes mostly, sometimes almost wholly of Gentiles, unconverted men, and therefore, as surely as there is a moral gulf separating the carnal and the spiritual man, so surely must the intermediate party and the third come into collision. In the case of the blind man we have a specimen. Glancing along the whole line of Church history in Jewish and Gentile times we come into sight of the strange fact, that the real witnesses for Christ in the world have been, up to this hour, very largely occupied in unmasking the false claims made by large and powerful organisations assuming to be the true Church, or branches of it, and yet using all their influence to suppress or silence the real witnesses for God and godliness in the world.

The subject of which we shall treat in the course of a few paragraphs, is the peculiar relation developed, historically, bet-ween the true witnesses and some large ecclesiastical organisations having power and wielding it, very often, if not generally, against the witnesses. For this purpose we have inspired mater- ials to draw from and shall avail ourselves of them accordingly. In the New Testament we have the history of the Church during three ordinary generations of the human family. Also, this period includes the closing times of the Jewish Church and the earliest times of the Christian Church. Each of these three periods presents us with important materials bearing on our inquiry.

The first period is that contained between the birth and death of Christ (A.D. 1-33). Of Christ's witness bearing to the ecclesiastics of his own generation we need not produce specimens in *extenso* when the facts are so patent. We would merely refer to some of the more prominent passages, e.g., his indignation at the way in which the Temple had been desecrated. (John 2: 13-25.) His exposure of the way in which the Scribes and Pharisees had corrupted the law of God. (Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5, 6 ,7.) His terrible denunciation of woes against the Scribes and Pharisees for their pretended sanctity 538
and real hypocrisy. (Matt. 23: 13-39.) But we have practical questions to consider as involved in the foregoing. If Christ came to his own and his own received him not, what was he then to do? The rejecters were in power, humanly speaking. Yea, he himself declared, the Scribes sit in Moses' seat. (Matt. 23: 2.) He has a great mission to fulfil and he must take steps to accomplish it. He can come to no accommodation with the religious teachers of his day. Then there is nothing for it, but to build outside of them. Their foundation is one of sand, he will not build thereon. But here let us estimate well what this involves. Let us not under estimate the offence of the cross. His movement has all the appearance of a petty secession from the national, the Established Church. Where was there ever an ecclesiastical party that could plead divine right and sanction for arrangements, with so much plausible ground as could the Scribes and Pharisees in the days of Christ? If he is the true Messiah, the Messenger sent from God, he starts with the disadvantages of the veriest pretender. Who could doubt that the Jewish Church had in its hands the very oracles of God delivered to Moses and to numerous prophets and seers after him? who could doubt that the covenant, so solemnly made at Sinai, was with the Jewish people? and who could doubt the historical identity of the nation, notwithstanding the rude shaking which it got at the Babylonish captivity? These plausibilities were strong enough to sweep the great mass of the people and their rulers into one formidable current, steadily hostile to the whole work and claims of Christ. Yet, with all its historical claims and remarkable antecedents, the Jewish Church had become the synagogue of Satan. In this strange state of things the Messiah not only delivers his testimony against the ecclesiastics in power, but also makes practical arrangements to meet the case. He chooses twelve disciples, trains them, and in due time sends them forth to the harvest. Anon seventy evangelists are commissioned, and when Christ himself has withdrawn his bodily presence there are men ready and qualified to carry on the administration of the kingdom.

What is thus developed in regard to the time of Christ is the fitting conclusion to the whole history of the Jewish Church. The parable of the wicked husbandmen gives us a summary of that history, and in what aspect is it presented to us? The owner lets out his vineyard to husbandmen. These are put in possession, and they keep possession against the very messengers whom the owner sends from time to time to collect his revenues. At last the only son comes, and they take him forth without the vineyard to kill him. (Matt. 21: 33-46.) Thus is the rightful heir treated, even so, says the apostle, let us go forth without the camp bearing Christ's reproach. (Heb. 13: 13.) Thus the work of the messengers became largely identified with witness bearing against the usurpers in possession, unlawfully wielding the very power with which they had been invested. (Acts 7: 52.)

The second period to which we would refer is that extending from the death of Christ to the death of the Apostle Paul (A:D. 33-46.) What was the condition of the professing Church during this period? We find a body – a community referred to as having a certain corporate unity as a Church, subdivided into smaller communities or congregations. What testimonies have we regarding these? The Apostle Paul says, “There are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision, whose months must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they

ought not for filthy lucre's sake." (Titus 1: 10, 11.) Again, "Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose

god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." (Phil. 3: 18, 19.) It is quite plain that the apostle is speaking, not of believers, nor of mere benighted heathens, but of those who assumed a station in the very courts of the Temple – in the professing Church, who have no right to be there, but who are willing to wield the power which, as usurpers, they may manage to get into their hands. Also, it was no casual or temporary case, the matter had come frequently under his notice and filled him with the deepest grief in prospect of the damage foreshadowed to the cause of truth and holiness.

The passages quoted refer to particular Churches. But we find references of a similar nature on a much more comprehensive scale. There is that passage in Peter: "Spots they are and blemishes sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you, having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin, beguiling unstable souls, an heart they have exercised with covetous practices. . . . When they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error, while they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption. (2 Pet. 2: 13-19.) This is a terrible glimpse into the "amount of corruption which had already crept into the visible Church. The epistle, perhaps, is mainly intended for Jewish converts, still it embraces a wide area. The writer of the epistle refers to it himself as being the second (chap. 3: 1,) and upon turning to the first, we notice it is addressed "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." If Peter's testimony develops what is the state of the Churches on the Asiatic side and among the Jews, Paul's letters give us a glimpse into the state of the Churches on the European side and among the Gentiles.

The testimony of James obviously corroborates that of Peter. Writing to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, his testimony, however, is not restricted to the Asiatic side. His epistle is proof how sadly the inroads of carnality were becoming visible in the professing Church. It is the leading aim of the epistle to show that there is a large amount of profession of faith which is utterly worthless, for it is not borne out as to its claims to genuineness by the appropriate fruits (chap. 2.) There are pride and partiality, swearing and impatience, dealt with in a way that showed these things were prevalent among the Jewish converts (chaps. 2:. 1, 3: 1, 5: 9, 12.) There were wars and fightings among them, and he calls upon the adulterers and adulteresses to humble themselves before God (chap. 4: 1, 4, 10.)

Jude's testimony is remarkably similar to that of Peter (Jude 4-20.) It differs, however, from all the foregoing in being confined to neither Jew nor Gentile, Asiatic nor European. Both of these holy men – Jude and Peter – use very strong language, such as indicates very strong emotion upon seeing the flagrant cases of corruption and depravity in the character and conduct of those who were largely mixed up with the affairs of the visible Church. The passages in both Peter and Jude afford evidence that the wheat and the tares were growing together. (2 Pet. 2: 13, Jude 12.)

It is quite plain that the relations between Paul, Peter, James, and Jude on the one side, and the great body of the visible Church, must have been increasingly uncomfortable. As years rolled on, and ungodly men crept into offices of influence and power in the Church, the materials were ever increasing against which these godly men would have to testify. But very certainly all this could not be done without rousing the vindictive and resentful feelings of those who came under censure. Paul comp-



lains of "false brethren" among the Galatians (Gal. 2: 4,) and Peter declares that "false teachers" were to be looked for (2 Pet. 2: 1.) Men of most opposite characters were now to be found within the professing Church, a collision is therefore to be expected.

But if there is such laxity in practice, we may be quite sure that doctrine, discipline, worship, and Church government all suffer more or less together. The Apostle Paul warns Timothy of the heresy of Hymaneus and Philetus, who were overthrowing the faith of some. (3 Tim. 2: 18.) The Galatian unionising scheme for escaping the offence of the cross produced an early departure from sound doctrine on the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith alone. The apostle writes a whole epistle on the subject, and expresses his astonishment at the rapidity of their defection. (Gal. 3.) As to discipline, there are all the foregoing evidences adduced from the writings of Paul, Peter, James, and Jude. See also what a sharp rebuke the Apostle Paul had to administer to the Corinthians. (1 Cor. 5.) As to worship the apostle warns the Colossians against being beguiled into a worshipping of angels, and will-worship of various kinds. (Col. 2: 18, 23.) As to Church government we shall see the horn of prelacy – the germ of the hierarchy – when we come to the third period of the first century of the Christian era.

The third period of the first century is that extending from the death of the Apostle Paul to the death of the Apostle John – very near the close of the century. Our witness now is John himself. His inspired addresses to the seven Churches of Asia bring before us the actual spiritual condition of these Churches. Ephesus, so warmly commended during the previous generation by the Apostle Paul for her faith and love, (Eph. 1: 15) has fallen from her first love. Original faithfulness in resisting evil, has subsided into a hard, formal orthodoxy, largely wanting in the element of Christian love. (Rev. 2: 1-7.) The counterpart to this is in the Church at Thyatira, where there is much charity and its abounding works, but where there is a sad lack of faithfulness. It is a charity destitute of the firm element that should keep out Jezebel, which it fails to do. Jezebel is allowed to keep ground in the Church, and to seduce the Lord's servants. (Rev. 2: 18-29.) Of the three Churches which are marked by a mixture of good and evil, the remaining one is Pergamos. The history of this Church contained the name of the faithful martyr Antipas, but now she has those that hold the doctrine of Balaam. The result is immorality in the Church. (Rev. 2: 12-17.) Of the remaining four Churches two are commended *simpliciter,* and two are condemned *simpliciter.* Of those condemned is Laodicea – to all human appearance a wealthy and therefore a powerful Church. Such, too, was her own deluded opinion. But the witness of John is decisive: she is wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. (Rev. 3: 14-22.) In contrast to this is the Church at Smyrna. "I Know thy works, and tribulation and poverty, (but thou art rich,)" &c. Important parenthesis! (Rev. 2: 8-11.) Sardis is at the point of extinction through want of watchfulness, and on account of the pernicious influence of abounding licentiousness. (Rev. 3: 1-6.). Philadelphia too, to all appearance, is at the point of extinction. But the cause makes all the difference in the two cases. Philadelphia had been ground down by persecution. "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee

from the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world to try them that dwell upon the earth." (Rev. 3: 7-13.) Of the seven Churches, then, two are condemned *simpliciter,* and three are severely reprimanded. John is duly commissioned to bear testimony against them, and so lays bare to us the corrupt condition into which so many of

them had fallen.

But we get something to our purpose, also, in the amount of the two faithful Churches – Smyrna and Philadelphia. It is plain that the antagonism in these two cases was largely developed between the true witnesses and the body that said they were Jews and were not. (Rev. 2: 9, 3: 9.) Here is plainly the very arrangement in full force of which we are discoursing. Here was the party claiming to be the true Church, having such ecclesiastical position and power as to be very formidable enemies to the real Church of God. Now here, within the Apostolic Church itself, we have a large and influential section set down with the pen of inspiration as the synagogue of Satan. Here clearly were two parties sprung out of that organisation which Christ himself had set up. As the visible Jewish Church became, in course of time, the very headquarters from which Satan wielded his most powerful resistance to the Kingdom of God, so now, in the case of the Gentile Church, the materials are shaping to produce a similar result. Already, within the first century itself, is the evidence palpable, that through human depravity and apostacy, that very organisation set up by Christ, was, to a large extent, to come into the hands of the enemy and to be wielded by him against the true witnesses. Even so the history of the Papacy is the history of the party so long in possession and power, and casting out from time to time the true witnesses. To this it must come. If we try to fill in the details of intercourse between the members of the visible Church at the time when Paul and Peter were enabled, by the grace of God, to testify against corruption in the Church, it is plain that different knots would be formed of those who really sympathised with each other. John supplies us with the natural result, "I wrote unto the Church, but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words, and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church. (3 John, 9, 10.) Of course as to the perversion of the forms of procedure, that is always easily managed by the party in power and numerically strong. Christ himself, as well as Paul and Peter, James, Jude and John, supplied abundant materials; in the course of their testimony, out of which a charge sheet for slander, contumacy, &c., &c., could have been filled in a day's notice. Towards the close, then, of the first century, there is evidence of extensive corruption among the Churches, and that the faithful gave testimony against it. In view of what has passed before us, is it not remarkable, that men of learning should make such laborious efforts to pick up scraps of evidence that certain doctrines and practices can be traced back to the venerable antiquity of the fifth, fourth, or third century, when they could go straight back to the first, that they should weary themselves trying to harmonise the conflicting ideas of the early fathers when they can quote the inspired apostles themselves! If they are in search of the truth they will find it in the oracles of God, as given through the writers of the gospel narratives and of the epistles. If it is some colorable excuse for innovations which they want, we have seen that the germ of the whole of them, is to be found in the first century, then why not go boldly and honestly back to Diotrephes and Judas, and so have both antiquity and apostolic authority together"

In our foregoing review various remarks have been interspersed bearing on the position of witnesses towards the ecclesiastical organisation in power – occupying the outer court – but still the outer court of the Temple itself so as materially to harass the true worshippers, who would enter the inner court, to hold 540

fellowship with God. But looking generally at the whole matter, there are still important considerations not to be overlooked.

1. Being cast out of the Church is often a very favorable symptom, in fact, an evidence in favor of the excommunicated, that his testimony has been pungent. It is surely not without special significance that we are told Christ found the excommunicated man whose eyes he had opened, and that the result of the interview is the full confirmation of the man's faith in Christ (John 9: 35-38), "Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him," &c. (v. 35). Do not these words imply that Christ sought him out, and was it not even so that he fulfilled the prediction in Ezekiel (34: 23), setting forth how the Good Shepherd would seek out and find the sheep that were scattered? It is a fact, that, spiritually, the excommunicated man fared better after than before his expulsion. The parable of the wicked husbandmen, al-ready noticed, shows that casting out and scattering were the rule during the whole of the Jewish Church, allowing, at the same time, some brief exceptional periods. As to the Gentile Church, we have never far to seek till we find a powerful organisation claiming, very arrogantly, to be *the* Church, the only true Church – out of whose pale there is no salvation. As these are in possession of the outer court and hinder the true worshippers from entering the inner court, we have the occasions for witness bearing against the arrogance, errors, heresies, &c., of the party in power. As if to facilitate matters for his faithful people, the great Head of the Church overruled, that in the case of John, the beloved disciple, an actual division should take place between the true and the false. Thus the main track of Church history is clearly laid down in the materials afforded by the history of the Apostolic Church. The very business of the Church historian is to trace out the line of witnesses through the various ages, taking special care to show, that they are to be seen, like beacon lights, through the gloom even of the dark ages. The Church of Rome is the grand parallel to the Church of the Jews for casting out witnesses, although the services of smaller Churches in the same direction should not be forgotten. The Church of England cast out the Puritans; and the Church of Scotland has acquired unenviable notoriety for casting out during the present and the previous centuries. But those cast out have had most important work to do. In connection with his third circuit in Galilee, Christ remarked that the harvest was plenteous, but as the laborers were few, he enjoined upon his disciples to pray the Lord of the Harvest to *send forth* (ἐκβάλῃ) laborers into his harvest (Matthew 9: 38). But the word requires no softening. He had chosen the twelve less than a year before, and now he was sending them forth to preach the gospel of the kingdom; but all this involved their actual or virtual expulsion by the Jewish Church, or excommunication from it.

2. If the position of a witness occupies in Scripture a high place, it is not to be blinked that a true claim to the character is not to be cheaply or easily earned. The post of honor is the post of danger and hardship. Diotrephes was, no doubt, a very important personage in his day, and, beyond all question, he must have been in circumstances to make himself felt by those who did not bow to him. Still the excommunicated of Diotrephes is employed by the Lord Jesus Christ himself to write inspired epistles to the seven Churches of Asia. Paul was surely a faithful witness. Still he had a hard life of it. Those testimonies which he gave against prevailing corruptions in the Church do not seem to

have helped him into wealthy and flourishing congregations. That touching notice about the cloak (2 Timothy 4: 13) would seem to indicate that he had not even the minimum of £300 a year and a free house – except indeed, as to the latter, when he was in prison! His personal appearance was not imposing – his oratory was nothing
to speak of (2 Corinthians 10: 10). His qualifications were zeal,

knowledge, faithfulness, integrity, uprightness, self-denial, etc. But the very qualities, that unfitted him for making up matters with the mere Gentiles who were treading the outer courts of the House of God, were the qualities which have made him a pillar for ever in the inner court amongst the true worshippers. The last things in this world which we would expect, were he now living, would be to find him dallying with "Aunt Sally" at Emerald Hill, exercising himself in a dance at Mr. Ballantyne's bazaar, or taking a ticket in company with Rev. J. O. Dykes to travel by rail on the Lord's day. The penalty of non-conformity fell heavily upon him. Here is one of the illustrations; "Know that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me" (2 Timothy 1:15). Painfully discouraging notice, perhaps in the last year of his life, after so many years of apostolic labor and earnestness! Had he taken a shrewd view of things, that is a worldly wise view, and made up matters with the Galatian unionists, and escaped the offence of the cross, had he taken a careful estimate of wealthy Laodicean congregations, and trimmed his sails accordingly, he might have been able to report the collection of £10,000 for a theological seminary, and aspired to the principleship with £1000 a year, with intimation that, in due course, some promising Levite might look for £600 a year as theological tutor. As it happened, he was enabled, by the grace of God, to take a different course, and was content to be regarded as amongst the off scouring of all things (1 Cor. 4: 13).

3. Witnesses must give evidence. There is a time when mere silence is tantamount to a betrayal of the interests of truth. Paul and Peter, Jude, James, and John could not honestly have consulted their own comfort and ease, and sailed quietly down the current, merely keeping clear of the more flagrant outrages upon Christian character. In the endless list of possibilities brought into review by the ever shifting affairs of the world, we do indeed come into sight of some anomalous positions occupied by both good men and bad men. We find Judas among the twelve. So, also, consorting more or less with the Gentiles we shall find good men – a Pascal and others in the Church of Rome itself. There are some devoted and excellent men intent upon the work of evangelising, who are inclined to take credit to themselves that they keep mostly absent from the courts in which Diotrephes is carrying out his schemes. Yet these good men may help to hurry on a catastrophe in a church, and be an occasion of no small discouragement to those who are bearing the heat and burden of the day more effectually than themselves. What more convenient for diplomatizers getting the power of a church into their hands, than to have a pious man of missionary habits sailing in the same boat with them, and every now and again preaching obedience, and quietness, and avoidance of tumult to those who are beginning to take alarm? An evangelist of this kind in the same division list with Dr. Candlish, is worth twenty votes to the policy of the leaders. Such men, however, have their own punishment to bear. They lead a strange amphibious life between an increasingly corrupt majority, with whom, however, they prudently keep company; and a minority from whom they become practically separated, and with whom, in the nature of things, their real sympathies lie. Such cases existed at the Disruption, and at former testing epochs in the history of the Church of Scotland.

4. But the unavoidable result of faithful witness bearing is that men are tormented – tested – have the touchstone applied to them (Rev. 11: 10.) How the witnesses, in their sackcloth condition, should torment men deserves consideration. Let us look into the matter. There is a large ecclesiastical organization. Its size is not a little owing to the fact that it has opened its doors to the world which has been rushing in like a flood. Here, then, are the 541
Gentiles treading the Outer Court of the Temple. A very few are found lifting up a voice against them. Now the large and powerful body pays a singular tribute to the small handful that testifies against it. The large organization tries very hard to assure friends in the distance that the little knot of scrupulous dissidents is disappearing from the face of the earth. It declares a great many times that it takes no notice of them, that they are invisible to the naked eye. We notice, indeed, that the argument as to visibility is not Protestant but Popish. Visibility or invisibility does not meet the case. Witnesses, though not visible, may be audible. While unseen, they may be heard, even to the ends of the earth. In the 15th century a very powerful church was trying diligently to silence all the witnesses against her evil doings. They were to be put behind lock and key, and there they might testify to each other or to their prison walls. But the Great Head of the church had a provision in Providence against this design. A very strong angel, in the shape of a printer, with types and ink, was sent to multiply the testimonies at such a rate as to paralyse the attempt to silence the witnesses.

Again, the handful of witnesses, who, as a body are pronounced invisible to the naked eye, persistently testify against the defection from truth, and the systematic dissimulation which were manifested in forming the large confederacy; and the laxity, and corrupting and demoralising practices, which were very soon exhibited by the confederacy when it was formed. Now one would think that ordinary self respect would keep those who are most deeply concerned from wishing for any intercourse with the witnesses. We are left to conclude that the tormenting, the testing process, notwithstanding all the contempt expressed, really overrules the question of self-respect. Have we not seen that when pressure of all kinds succeeded in chipping off one or two from the small band, whole Presbyteries were in motion and commotion, against rule, too, to make sure of securing the precious prizes? Have we not seen such cases causing Jubilee to whole General Assemblies? Have not the applicants been, for a few weeks, the most prominent persons in the colony? Now what was the really important matter here? It was the effectual destruction of the testimony of witnesses. No sooner is that accomplished than the unfortunate adventurer is left to drift out of the way. As soon as his witness bearing is effectually destroyed, his importance is gone. Here let us notice that merely to push a witness off his ground is not enough. He may go elsewhere, and still be a witness to the same thing. Paul himself may have to turn to tent-making, but had he abandoned his witness bearing, the honor of writing some of his epistles would have fallen to the lot of some one else.

5. It is important to notice that the testimony of witnesses acquires individuality, distinctness, and character by its completeness in behalf of present truths against present evils. This comes out more clearly in the materials surveyed in the earlier part of these remarks. In setting forth the truth himself, Christ exposed existing errors in doctrine and practice. Paul and Peter did the same. In the case of the seven churches of Asia this point is illustrated with great clearness. At Ephesus the weak point is a want of gracious zeal. At Pergamos the church contains Nicolaitanes and those holding the doctrine of Balsam. At Thyatira Jezebel is in power. Laodicea is corrupted by wealth and

easy circumstances. Transpose the tests and you might allow some of the churches to pass. Try Ephesus by the test of Sardis, and her hard-headed and hard-hearted orthodoxy might have placed her high among the commended churches. The application of all this is plain. It is cheap faithfulness in us to denounce profanity and buffoonery in things ecclesiastical in Spain or Italy, and yet, flowing with the current, to patronise the same things at the bazaar on the

opposite side of the street in behalf of a Presbyterian Church. The reflection occurs to us here, that in times of trial, when pressure is brought to bear severely upon a witness, it is but a natural suggestion that there are other portions of the vineyard free from trials and dangers. May he change places? If God in his providence opens up a clear way, doubtless he may avail himself of it. But certainly, it is not expected, in ordinary circumstances, that the soldier who finds himself in a battalion which must soon come into collision with the enemy shall seek to be relegated to some other portion of the field where no fighting is expected. It would have been a very serious mistake for any one suffering at Smyrna or Philadelphia to take counsel with flesh and blood, and argue – there is a church at Sardis, or there is a church at Laodicea, all is quiet at the one, all is prosperity at the other, all is suffering and trial here, I shall go to Sardis or Laodicea. It is very evident that the one thing needful is trembling in the balance when such are the views taken.

In conclusion, there is nothing new in witnesses occupying isolated positions. It seems to be the besetting sin of large ecclesiastical organisations to become infected with pride and worldliness. But when they become arrogant, the great Head of the Church makes provision for securing the glory to himself. He can save by many or by few. It is not by might or by power, but by his spirit that mountains are to be levelled and the way cleared for the kingdom of God (Zech. 4: 6, 7.) Then let us not despise the day of small things, but seek rather for the grace and spirit of Christ that we may be enabled in our day and generation to acquit ourselves as witnesses for truth and righteousness.

---

## REVIEW.

*Christ the Counsellor; or Practical Teaching for an Age of Progress, being an Exposition of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount*. By the Rev. Jas. B. Laughton, B.A., Minister of St. Andrew's Church, Parramatta.

CHRIST is doubtless the "counsellor" of his Church and of each of his people. Every believer may warrantably say to him "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel," for the Saviour has undertaken and promises to afford him such guidance – "I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go; I will guide thee with mine eye." It is not, however, as a counsellor that he appears in the Sermon on the Mount, but as a lawgiver; for in that discourse, if he does not exactly issue laws, he gives an authoritative exposition of laws which he had already issued, requiring that they shall be understood and obeyed according to their true meaning and intention, as set forth and vindicated in that exposition. It does not, indeed, seem reconcilable with Christ's authority that in executing his office as the prophet and, at the same time, the king of his Church, as he did in delivering the Sermon on the Mount, he should address mere counsels to his hearers, and thus to all whom his words should afterwards reach. It is when he deals with men for the purpose of preserving or reclaiming them from wayward and pernicious courses, presenting the views they should embrace, and the motives by which they should be influenced, and urging them to proceed on those views and from those motives, and not when, as in the Sermon on the Mount, he authoritatively proclaims the law of his kingdom, that he acts the part of a "counsellor." We are constrained, therefore, to object to the adoption for an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount of the title, "Christ the Counsellor." If the exposition is indeed an exposition of that sermon, the title is inappropriate.

We have also been unable to discover anything in the views maintained in the volume before us, or in the practical lessons deduced from them, that would suggest or that justifies the sub-title, 542
"Practical teaching for an age of progress." The development and application of our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount was long ago carried further than it is by our author, and as an "exposition," therefore, his production is in no way allied or conducive to progress. Besides, the idea that a just exposition of the Sermon on the Mount will present "practical teaching" in any way specially or exclusively adapted to "an age of progress," implies a most erroneous conception of the design and bearing of that sermon. The "practical teaching" of the Sermon on the Mount is adapted to every age; and as it referred, in the first instance, to the characteristics of an age of deep defection, it is at least as fully adapted to such an age as to one of progress.

The fact to which we have now adverted – the fact, namely, that in the Sermon on the Mount our Lord dealt, in the first instance, with an age of defection, suggested to us the suspicion that by "practical teaching for an age of progress," our author meant teaching fitted to repress or correct the change of position which, while those who effect it in their own case call it "progress," is really retrogression. The following passage, however, seems to forbid this interpretation: –

"The writer believes that Christianity is both an expansive and a progressive religion. We have, it is true, only the same old gospel to preach; but in the method of preaching it, and in the application of its doctrines to the correction of human errors, and to the instruction of mankind in the way of righteousness and peace, we ought clearly to be progressive. The Church of Christ ought not to be obnoxious to the charge of being the only champion of illiberality in an Age of Freedom, and the only hindrance to advancement in an Age of Progress." (p. xiii.)

From this passage it appears that the "progress" of which our author speaks is progress of which he approves, progress, accordingly, which he would promote and not check. We should like therefore to know wherein it consists. He says he "believes that Christianity is both an expansive and progressive religion." We are led, therefore, to conclude that the progress which he intends consists partly in the *expansion* of Christianity. But what are we to understand by the expansion of Christianity? Are we to understand by it an enlargement of the doctrinal creed or of the ethical code of Christianity, by the addition to the former of some new dogma or to the latter of some new precept? If it be in this sense that we are to understand the expansion of Christianity, then, pray, what is the new doctrine or the new precept by the introduction and establishment of which the present age has effected the expansion of it, and thus earned for itself the character of "an age of progress?" Or is the expansion intended analogous to the expansion of water when converted into vapour, – expansion reached by vagueness of conception and statement, and the obliteration which such vagueness implies of the boundaries of the constituent truths of the Church's belief, and of that belief as a whole, the expansion of broad churchism. This is the only expansion of which we find a trace in the volume before us, although we are glad to say we could find a great deal more of it elsewhere.

We are equally at a loss to determine what is meant by the *progressiveness* of Christianity, which, in conjunction with its expansiveness, we are taught to regard as so far realised in the

"progress" by which "the age" is said to be distinguished. Christianity was perfect as it proceeded from its author, and there is no room therefore for its making progress, that is, for its advancing from a less perfect to a more perfect state. There has been, indeed, a gradual extension of the limits within which it is embraced; but it cannot with any propriety be called a "progressive religion" on this ground, for it is not itself the subject of the progress which

this extension constitutes. The progress in the case is not the progress of Christianity, but the progress of the reception of Christianity.

Mr. Laughton admits, in the passage we have quoted, that "we have only the same old gospel to preach." But is not this Gospel Christianity, and, if it be still and ought always to be "the same" and unchanged, how can Christianity be said to be "an expansive and progressive religion?" The answer which our author's remarks supply to this question is, that "in the method of preaching" the Gospel, "and in the application of its doctrines to the correction of human errors, and to the instruction of mankind in the way of righteousness and peace, we ought clearly to be progressive." But, admitting that "we ought to be progressive" in the respects indicated, it in no way follows that Christianity is progressive, or expansive either.

When our author adds "the Church of Christ ought not to be obnoxious to the charge of being the only champion of illiberality in an age of freedom," we cannot attach any meaning to the language which he employs, that will bring it into harmony with just views of the Church's functions and obligations. He is a minister of a Presbyterian Church, and we should like to know in what respect or at what point a Presbyterian Church, that is at all such as a Presbyterian Church ought to be, can come into conflict with any legitimate form of "freedom" to which this or any other "age" can attain. There are, indeed, two forms of "freedom" to which faithful Presbyterian Churches have always opposed themselves, freedom with respect to matters of belief and freedom in practice. These forms of freedom or, rather, of license faithful Presbyterian Churches have always restrained and corrected by the vigorous exercise of discipline, preserving thus soundness of doctrine and purity of communion. Their doing so may, no doubt, be called, and, indeed, has often been called "illiberality," but it is, notwithstanding, the discharge of an important duty imposed upon them by Christian duty of which the discharge is equally necessary that they may themselves be the recipients, and that they may instrumentally be the dispensers of blessings. Is it this "illiberality" that Mr. Laughton means? We very much fear it is, so far at least as regards matters of belief; for the account which he gives of the strictness of his own views is, that "he fully recognises and contends for the necessity of maintaining 'the old paths' and 'the old landmarks' both with respect to the essential doctrines of the gospel and the obligations of the moral law;" and we are thus left to conclude that he does not "contend for the necessity of maintaining" those "doctrines of the gospel" which he excludes from the category of "essential doctrines" of it, and that he thus escapes "the charge of being the champion of illiberality."

But it is time that we proceed from the title of the book to the book itself. The book is composed of a series of discourses, addressed in the first instance to the author's congregation, and afterwards recast for publication, all except the last two. Discourses, according to the relation which they bear to the passages of Scripture on which they are founded, fall into different classes. Some discourses, if they do not themselves present an exposition of the *text,* deal with the result of a careful exposition of it, that is, with the precise view which it conveys, and not merely with the general element contained in that view, the element common to it with the view conveyed by each of a greater or less number of partially parallel passages. Other discourses deal only with this general element; and discourses are sometimes delivered which do not connect themselves with the text with even this degree of closeness. For these last the text serves only for a motto. Now discourses generally, we conceive, and certainly expository discourses, ought to bear to the passages of which they profess to 543
to treat the first and closest of the three relations indicated. The discourses before us, however, do not bear this relation to the sermon on the Mount. They fail, therefore, as an exposition.

And, while the precise teaching of the successive passages of the sermon is not seized, what they teach is not always presented with sufficient definiteness even under its general aspect.

Passing from these defects of treatment, on which our space will not permit us to dwell, we are constrained to advert to a grave doctrinal error into which the writer has fallen, and that on a point on which unsound views are at present very prevalent, and prevalent even among certain Presbyterians, – on the fundamental subject of the atonement. "The many," he says, referring, we presume, to Rom. 5: 19, – "the many, that is, all mankind, are made righteous by Christ to the same extent that they became guilty by the fall of Adam; or, in other words, the guilt of original sin is so far taken away by the work of Christ, that no man is condemned on that ground alone." (p. 143.) This statement is at variance alike with the teaching of Scripture and with that of the Westminster standards. According to the Confession of Faith, "the Lord Jesus . . . hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him." Chap. VIII. sec. v. In the next section it is added, "the virtue, efficacy, and benefits thereof [of the work of redemption] were communicated to the elect in all ages." And again in section viii, we find this statement, "to all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same." Thus the Westminster Confession distinctly teaches that what Christ by the work of redemption has effected and procured he has effected and procured for "those whom the Father hath given unto him," and not for "all mankind;" and that to these and to these alone, that is, to the elect, "the virtue, efficacy, and benefits" of that work are communicated. It recognises no such effect of the work of redemption, as that "all mankind are made righteous by Christ to"' any "extent," greater or less. Indeed the statement that men "are made righteous" to the extent indicated by our author, in the passage we have quoted, though not fully, involves a contradiction. Relative righteousness, that is, the righteousness on account of which God accepts those who possess it, – and it is this righteousness that must be intended in the passage, – if it exists at all, must be perfect, The least imperfection destroys it. This righteousness arises from the fulfilment of the condition prescribed by the law. If that condition has been fulfilled, it has been fulfilled, and a perfect righteousness results; if it has not been fulfilled, that is, fulfilled in its whole extent, it has not been fulfilled, and no righteousness whatever exists in the case. Now those who believe in Christ, or are in him as being vitally united to him, are in the position of persons in whose case the condition prescribed by the law has been fulfilled, and they possess, therefore, a perfect righteousness, the righteousness of Christ is unto them and upon them; others are not in such a position more or less, and possess no righteousness whatever.

To those who are not in Christ, first federally, and then further as having been brought in vital union to him by the Spirit, none of the benefits of redemption are applied. All application of those benefits originates in, and is based on, the union to Christ,

in the two respects indicated, of those to whom they are applied. Accordingly it is only to those who are in Christ that his righteousness is imputed; in other words, it is only those that are in Christ, and not "all mankind," as our author teaches, that are "made righteous."

And then, further, those that are "made righteous" shall be saved; Christ has "purchased" for them, as the Confession of Faith expresses it, "not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven." Therefore, if "all mankind" were "made righteous," all mankind should be saved, a doctrine which we presume Mr. Laughton does not hold.

Our author's views are not only erroneous in the respects and to the extent now indicated, but also crude. Evidently he has not determined and adjusted their relations as parts or elements of the same system. Hence we find expressions employed by him elsewhere that cannot be reconciled with the doctrine of the passage under consideration. Thus he represents it as "the most culpable unfaithfulness," as it certainly is, "to palliate or gloze over the unpalatable truth, that all men are born sinners and children of wrath." (p. 524.) But if "all mankind are made righteous by Christ to the same extent that they became guilty by the fall of Adam," are they not "made righteous" thus from their birth? and how, then, can it be said that they are born "children of wrath" Those who are "made righteous" are not "children of wrath."

The following passage affords a specimen of the style and better characteristics of the volume: –

"In fact, such is, to a large extent, the perverted state of public sentiment, that it is scarcely possible to obtain money for any work of piety or mercy – whether it be the building of a church, the maintenance of a mission, the support of an hospital or infirmary, or the relief of persons who have been ruined by some exceptional and unforeseen calamity – without ostentatious publicity. Is it not a just cause of complaint that while many professed disciples of Christ give willingly and largely when the gift is to bring some credit to themselves, they do not give so willingly or so largely when their gifts are unknown? Is not secret charity comparatively rare – the left hand being in most cases fully cognizant of the doings of the right? And is it not well known that the most effectual way of raising money is to do it with blare of trumpet and tuck of drum? In some form or other men require to be bribed into giving; and whatever form the bribe assumes, the gifts so obtained are not charity, but "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." If a remonstrance be hazarded – if it be hinted that this trumpeting of alms is opposed to true Christian charity, and savours too much of this world, the feeble whisper is immediately silenced by such painfully significant remarks as, "We cannot help it: what other course can we adopt? We find it impossible to obtain the funds necessary for the maintenance of our operations without creating a public excitement of some kind." (p. 276.)

This representation, which is most truthful, reveals a deplorable state of things; and particularly it lays bare the origin of bazaars and kindred means of raising funds. It is high time for Churches to have done with the plying of such temptations.

---

## CHURCH GOERS PRACTICES IN MELBOURNE.

Sir, – Some things in connection with church going in Melbourne suggest reflections which to my mind appear sufficiently grave; and, under this impression, I ask a corner of your space for the following observations.

I am one of those who think that the sanctity of the Sabbath is one of the outworks of public morality. And few things, I fancy, have done more to undermine the esteem in which that day should be held, than the practice of running public conveyances for pleasure or business during its continuance. In writing for the readers of the *Testimony*, I may take for granted that it is unnecessary to argue either the necessity Sabbath sanctification, or the inconsistency of the practice above referred to with a due regard to the sacredness of the weekly rest; and therefore I proceed at once to one of those malpractices of some of our church goers to which I have alluded.

544

It is a very common practice, then, in Melbourne to employ the railway trains and cabs for the purpose of reaching and returning from places of worship. From peculiarities of education and association in the denominations of English origin, I do not so much wonder that the practice prevails amongst them. But it is very deplorable to find it quite as extensively prevalent among churchgoers whose Scottish training should have preserved them from the temptation. I understand it is quite common in the Union Church with members and office-bearers to take this liberty with the day of rest. Mr. Hetherington's congregation, I am told, is mainly composed of persons and families who attend divine worship in this way. Dr. Cairns' congregation is little better, so far as I can learn. So that these two representatives – the one of the Established Church of Scotland, the other of the Free Church in the Union – either positively approve or indolently wink at this violation of the weekly rest going on under their own observation. A case of very sudden death in a railway carriage, on Sabbath, the 20th of June last, brought the practice referred to prominently into notice. One of Mr. Hetherington's elders, a Mr. John Brown, had been assisting at the communion service at Mr. Kininmont's congregation, I believe. He returned home to Footscray (one of the suburbs of Melbourne) by train, at a quarter past three; but though the journey did not last much over five minutes, and he entered the railway carriage in perfect health, before the journey was over, he had fallen down in a fit, and was dead. I bring forward this melancholy event solely on account of the publicity which the newspaper reports of it gave to the existence of the fact of Sabbath travelling among churchgoers in Melbourne, and that even among elders of the Union Church. Surely it is a very inconsistent thing for those who frequent the house of God to make use of an agency for that purpose the direct result of which is to deprive a whole class of their fellow men the same privilege which they themselves rise, and, we may hope, still highly value. I never could understand how any intelligent attendant on divine service can reconcile it with the first principles of morality or religion that he should endeavor his own salvation by means plainly involving risk, or rather detriment and damage, to the spiritual interests of his neighbours. Yet surely there is such risk and detriment to the engine-driver who works his engine, and the cabman who drops his passenger at the church door, both of whom are excluded from the services of the sanctuary by their attendance on the self-indulgent churchgoer. It is a very hardening system to both parties. I have heard a churchgoer seriously argue that the cabman will break the Sabbath in any case; and that, therefore, no wrong is done him by the churchgoing passenger. I will not detain your readers by offering a refutation of such reasoning, or rather of such jesuitry.

But I have it on my mind to say that this unhappy practice appears quite accordant with the spirit of the Union Church in Victoria. No umbrage seems to be taken at it by the ministers. Nay, rather, the tendency of the practice seems to be, to extend itself among them also. Mr. Dykes, a great idol of the Victorian Unionists, is an example of this. Then the abatement of that zea1, which Dr. Cairns worthily showed in this cause at the outset of his career in Melbourne, has kept pace with his progress in the advanced views of Unionism. I have an impression that no Church ever rises, in its history, higher than the spirit which has marked its origin.

Unionism at that rate has but a mean history to make.

Another practice, to which I would refer as much in vogue in Melbourne, is that of selecting the theatres as places of stated assembly for the worship of God on the Sabbath day. This expedient has not been adopted as yet by any body calling itself Presbyterian; but it appears to be a rage among the Baptists and Indepen-

dents. And it has come to be partly a passport to popularity, partly an accepted gauge and touchstone of popular gifts, that newcomers especially should create a furore, which the walls of existing churches shall not be sufficient to contain, and that they shall take the Theatre Royal as a stepping stone towards some new cathedral to be built for them, eclipsing all its neighbours. We have had before, and we have again, advertisements of regular Sabbath services in this favorite haunt, admission to the *dress circle* being particularly specified as *only by ticket.* I have known Free Presbyterians in Melbourne give countenance, by their attendance, to this repulsive practice. For myself, I never could reconcile the spirit of Sabbath worship with the (to me) inevitable associations connected with these pagan institutions. It is, no doubt, true that holy places, properly so called, have no existence under the Gospel. But, surely, if it be an error in one extreme to consecrate churches, it is a greater error to whitewash theatres. It is inexpedient to eat meat in an idols temple. A man may hold himself strong enough in a moral sense to do that without injury to himself. But there are others who will thereby be emboldened to eat the things offered to the idols. And theatre going on the Sabbath will have no small influence, I apprehend, towards theatre going on the Saturday. The recommendations specially affected in a Theatre Royal preacher may be gathered from a newspaper notice of the latest debutante in that line. I quote from the *Argus* of the 20th June: "The Rev. Mr. Clark preached in the Theatre Royal yesterday evening, to a *house* crowded to excess in every part. . . . Mr. Clark might give a lesson in elocution not only to most of his clerical brethren in and around Melb- ourne, but also to many of the *professional wearers of the sock and buskin who tread the boards of the theatre on week days*." I have known Free Presbyterians, I must confess, who profess they see no evil in theatres and theatrical performances *per se*; and I have felt painfully humiliated to listen to the avowal. To me, as I read the New Testament, the use of the word "hypocrite" is conclusive evidence of the degraded character of "play-actors," and consequently of theatres. I need not tell some of your readers that "*hypocrite*" is pure Greek for "*play-actor*;" and that no character is denounced with such unsparing severity in Scripture as the character so denoted. The vilest of all courses in religion is be a play-actor in it. Would such a representation of the case be truthful if play-acting and play-actors were not vile in themselves?

I fear influences of a very damaging kind are abroad in this colony. The impression is rising that the first generation of colonial youths will be marked with features of great moral degeneracy. The Churches are helping forward this prospect by such practices as I have described. Great pains are taken by Unionists to proclaim the successes of their system in Victoria. But I believe the real test of Unionism will be met in the character which it shall be found to have impressed on the population: and so tried, it is at least premature for any man to boast about it. If evil times are to arise (and we are forewarned of them), those cannot be but evil systems that flourish – in the world's sense – under them.

I am, &c.,
OBSERVER.

---

## CONGREGATIONAL MEETING.

On Tuesday, 29th June last, a meeting of the members and adherents of the church attending the ministry of the Rev. Mr. McCulloch, in the districts of Maitland and Ahalton, was held in the Presbyterian schoolhouse, East Maitland. The Rev. Mr. Donald, who presided, and opened the meeting with prayer, stated that the main object of the meeting was to consider whether it would not be advisable to have the arrangement which at present 545

existed in regard to the Sabbath services amongst them changed, and whether, instead of having these services the one Sabbath at Morpeth and the other at East Maitland, it would not be better that they should agree to a proposal to have them regularly every Sabbath at East Maitland. Mr. Donald stated that, for his own part, he considered that the plan of having service every Sabbath at East Maitland, if carried out, would, under the divine blessing, be most conducive to the interests of the church, as well as more for the advancement of religion than the present method; and he hoped that those who resided in the Ahalton district would acquiesce in this opinion. Mr. Donald having asked if any one desired to address the meeting, Mr. Hugh McDonald stated that he belonged to the Ahalton section of the congregation, and that it was more convenient for him personally to attend service at Morpeth, still he was willing to agree to the proposal mentioned by the chairman for various reasons. He said that the desire which he had for the good of the cause outweighed with him any personal considerations, and that he felt it to be his duty on that ground to go in with the plan indicated, as he was convinced that the church could not be expected to increase, especially in towns, unless there was continuous service kept up every Sabbath. Mr. McDonald further said that he believed that having the Sabbath services regularly in East Maitland would meet Mr. McCulloch's own views if he should remain in his present charge, and that he thought was another reason why the meeting should entertain the proposal mentioned by the chairman. Mr. McDonald also said that in the event of Mr. McCulloch remaining amongst them, he hoped that he would take up his abode in East Maitland, and that, in that case, it would be their duty to look out for a suitable house for his residence. Mr. McDonald then moved that this meeting agree to the proposal that the services be held every Sabbath at East Maitland instead of being continued as at present. This motion was seconded by Mr. McPhee. Mr. Porter supported the motion, inasmuch as he conceived that it would be for the interest of the church. Mr. McLean also supported the motion for the same reason. Mr. Philip stated that there were several individuals residing in the neighborhood of Morpeth, whose families were young, and therefore not likely to be able to attend church at a distance; but he had no doubt that in the event of Mr. McCulloch taking up his abode in East Maitland there would be occasional services in Morpeth to meet the wants of those referred to. He cordially supported the motion. Mr. McDonald's motion was then put to the meeting in the usual way, and unanimously agreed to. Mr. Hugh McDonald again addressed the meeting, and said that as they had agreed that a change should be made in the arrangements for Sabbath services amongst them, they would have to take steps to get the new plan carried into effect; he therefore moved that Mr. Porter and Mr. Campbell be appointed to wait on the managers of the East Maitland School of Arts to enquire on what terms it could be obtained when the proposed change in the services should take place. This motion was seconded by Mr. Smith, and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Porter stated that he would take advantage of this meeting to bring forward a proposal concerning obtaining a suitable horse for Mr. McCulloch, in the event of his remaining in the district. It was well known to them all that Mr. McCulloch had a great amount of riding, and he thought that they ought to

take steps to provide him with a suitable horse. He begged, therefore, to move that means be adopted to supply Mr. McCulloch with a suitable horse, and that a subscription be opened in the different districts for that purpose. Mr. McRae seconded this motion, which was heartily agreed to. Mr. Porter stated further that he would take advantage of this meeting to read a statement of the in-

come and expenditure of the East Maitland branch of the congregation for the last six months. From this statement it appeared that the income for the past six months was for sustentation fund £29 12s., and for other purposes £9 9s. 6d., all of which had been laid out as per statement. It was arranged that the deputies appointed at the meeting held lately to represent this congregation at the Presbytery, should bring the matters agreed to at this meeting before the Presbytery if required; when they shall meet on 1st July.

---

PRESBYTERY OF MA ITLAN D.

A meeting of the Presbytery of Maitland was held in the Presbyterian Schoolhouse, East Maitland, on the 1st instant. Sederunt: – Rev. J. McCulloch, Moderator; Rev. W. S. Donald, Minister; and Messrs. Samuel Porter and Malcolm Gillies, Elders. The minutes of last meeting having been read and approved of, the Clerk, at the request of the Presbytery, read the deliverance come to in regard to the call from the congregation at Grafton to the Rev. James McCulloch. In reference to this deliverance the Clerk stated that there was one point which he thought the Presbytery should have before them, previously to Mr. McCulloch being requested to make any statement, inasmuch as it was adverted to at last meeting, and might have some bearing upon the settling of the question. The point was this, viz., that a congregational meeting of the members in the Ahalton and Maitland part of Mr. McCulloch's charge had been held on the 29th June; and that a proposal had been unanimously agreed to at the meeting to the effect that the Sabbath services should be conducted every Sabbath at East Maitland, instead of alternately at Morpeth and East Maitland as at present. Mr. Hugh McDonald and the other commissioners from the congregation confirmed the statement of the Clerk. The Rev. Mr. McCulloch then proceeded to address the Presbytery in regard to the call which had been sent to him from the Clarence. He spoke to the following effect: That he never felt himself placed in such grave circumstances as those in which he was placed today, and that the thought of the responsibility involved in his present position was sometimes like to overwhelm him. He stated that the competing congregations viewed each its own claims, but that he had to look at the claims of both, compare them together, and try to find out the path of duty as to the course he should pursue in regard to these. He adverted to the claims of both congregations, and to the difficulties in the way of coming to a decision. He valued highly the attachment of his congregation. At the same time he believed that they over estimated his worth, and took an exaggerated view of the necessity of his presence in their midst, and he had no doubt that, if he should be translated, the Presbytery would do what it could in the way of giving supplies. In conclusion Mr. McCulloch stated, that after all the consideration he had been able to give the matter, he was still unable to make up his mind as to the path of duty; as to whether he should accept the call or continue in his present charge. He said that there were three courses open to the Presbytery, either to give him more time for farther consideration, or refer the matter to the Synod as some members of Presbytery not present recommended, or else to decide at once, in which case he would leave himself in the hands of the Presbytery. Mr. McCulloch having concluded his address, the Clerk said he felt himself in a peculiarly responsible position in being called upon to take action in this important case in the absence of other members of Presbytery. He said it would have been a great relief to his mind if those members of Presbytery, who were so well entitled to their confidence, had been present to assist them with their counsel, and to take a share of the responsibility in deciding as to the proper course 546

to be pursued in dealing with this call to Mr. McCulloch. Still as those members to whom he referred had not been able to attend this meeting, it would fall to those who were present to deal with the case submitted to them in the way that they thought most likely to promote the glory of God and the good of the Church. The Clerk further observed that, as for himself, if Mr. McCulloch had been able to state to the Presbytery that he had (on the solemn and prayerful consideration of the subject which he was sure had been given to it) seen it to be his duty to accept of this call, then he for one would have respected that statement, and would have agreed, though reluctantly, to the translation. The case, however, was entirely different as it now stood. Mr. McCulloch had declared that he could not make up his mind, and that he was unable to decide for himself. He thus had rendered it necessary for the Presbytery to decide for him to the best of their ability. Mr. McCulloch had specified three courses, any of which might be followed by the Presbytery in coming to a decision. As to the first, viz., giving Mr. McCulloch more time for deliberation, he (the Clerk) did not think that that would be judicious in the circumstances. He was aware that Mr. McCulloch had already given the matter the most earnest and prayerful consideration, and his opinion was that the result would be the same though longer time was granted, and that it would ultimately have to be decided either by the Synod or Presbytery, although the first course indicated by Mr. McCulloch should be followed. The question, then, was whether should the Presbytery come to a deliverance at once, or should they refer the case to the Synod. He (the Clerk) did not think that any good purpose would be served by referring the case to the Synod. It would be attended, he conceived, with injurious effects to hang up the matter so long, and he was satisfied that even in the event of the Synod being called upon to decide, the decision would be of the same nature as that to which he supposed the Presbytery would come in the circumstances. He was of opinion, then, that a deliverance should be come to at once. As to the nature of the deliverance, he supposed that the members of the Presbytery would be of one mind on that point, viz., to retain Mr. McCulloch in his present charge. He for one sympathised much with the people of Grafton, and most earnestly desired to see a minister settled among them, but, at the same time, it required very superior claims indeed to be shown on the part of a calling congregation to induce a Presbytery to break the pastoral tie between a minister and an attached people, especially when the minister called did not see his way clear to accept the call. In his opinion, the claims of the calling congregation in this case did not appear so superior to the claims of Mr. McCulloch's present charge as to induce him to be a party to breaking the pastoral tie. He therefore saw no other way open to the Presbytery but to refuse the translation.

Mr. Porter addressed the Presbytery, and said that he agreed with what had been already stated, and that it was his opinion that it would be unwise to delay the matter by referring it to the Synod; and that he thought that the Presbytery ought to come to a decision at once. The people at the Clarence were no doubt in great want of a settled ministry amongst them; but there were other ministers open to them to whom they might give a call although Mr. McCulloch should be retained in his present charge.

Mr. Gillies agreed with what had already been said as to deciding the matter at once. He was strongly opposed to Mr. McCulloch's being sent to the Clarence, for various reasons. For one thing, he did not think the climate there would suit Mr. McCulloch's health. At the same time he said, that though he was opposed to Mr. McCulloch's translation to the Clarence, he nevertheless sympathised with the people there, and would not object to his visiting that

district, even for several months at a time, if it were agreeable to Mr. McCulloch himself to do so. It was then moved and unanimously agreed to, that the Presbytery having heard Mr. McCulloch's statement in regard to the call given him from Grafton, to the effect that he is unable to come to a decision as to the path of duty, Resolve – That although they most deeply sympathise with the congregation at Grafton in their present circumstances, and though they deplore the long continued want of a settled ministry in that congregation, and will do all in their power, under the Divine blessing, to remedy that want, still they cannot see that it would be their duty – as the matter is left in their hands – to loose Mr. McCulloch from his present attached charge, they therefore feel constrained to refuse the translation of Mr. McCulloch to Grafton, and resolve accordingly. After this motion had been agreed to, Mr. McCulloch stated that he had still difficulty about having more time for deliberation, but that he supposed it would be best to allow the matter to rest. He said that his sole reason for the difficulty was that there was a wide margin of a Presbyterian population on the Clarence to work upon.

After transacting some other unimportant business, and appointing a Committee on supplies, the Presbytery adjourned to meet on the 14th September next.

The Committee to arrange supplies subsequently agreed that Mr. McCulloch should be appointed to visit the Clarence about the end of July, and Mr. Donald should supply for him as far as possible in his absence, Mr. McCulloch was also instructed to write to Mr. Alexander McIntyre with a view to obtain his services for the Clarence at as early a date as possible. The Committee considered it best that Mr. McLeod should continue his labors in the meantime on the Hastings and in the surrounding districts, in compliance with the memorial sent some time ago to the Presbytery, as also in accordance with the intelligence lately received in regard to the hazard to the district if Mr. McLeod were removed, at least for the present. It was, however, thought advisable to recommend that (if Mr. McIntyre and Mr. McLeod could so arrange) one or other of them should visit the Barrington as soon as possible and give service on a Sabbath. Mr. Donald was appointed to supply as often as possible at Clarence Town till further arrangements.

---

## DUTY OF THE STATE TOWARDS THE CHURCH.

On the 10th March, the Rev. Dr. Miller moved in the Presbytery of Glasgow the following overture, which, our readers may remember, Dr. Rainy borrowed and moved in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, in opposition to the more decided and specific overture moved by the Rev. Mr. Balfour, of Holyrood: –

"Whereas the Presbytery, at its meeting on the 3rd day of February last, overtured the General Assembly to take measures to keep before the world one vital fact of our Church's testimony, namely; that Jesus Christ is the only Lord and King in Zion – a doctrine the practical carrying out of which is indispensable to His glory and the Church's well being; and further, whereas another and correlative truth is also an express doctrine of the Word of God, namely, that the powers that be, which are ordained of God, have been put under Christ, that He might be the Head over all things to the Church, which is his body – a principle ever maintained by this Church as a principle essential to the honor of her only Head and Lord as King of nations as well as King in Zion; and whereas, at this time and in these lands, this principle is in imminent danger of being practically lost sight of and of being theoretically ignored. Therefore, it is hereby overtured by the Free Presbytery of Glasgow to the ensuing General Assembly to adopt such means as to its wisdom may seem best for keeping 547
prominently in view of all the people the duty which, as under Christ, the nation owes to the Church and to the truth of the living God."

From Dr. Gibson's speech in support of this overture, we make the following extract, the views presented in it being no less important here than they are in Scotland. Being scriptural views, like all scriptural views, they are important everywhere: –

"He said he did not require to do more in reference to Dr. Buchanan's assertion that the independence of the Church of Christ is at present the great European question, as in Austria, Italy, and Spain, than to say in one word it was the very reverse of this, viz., that it is the independence of the State that is the question of the day. On the mere principle of Voluntaryism, the State, an ordinance of God, as well as the Church, ought never to consent to allow any party calling itself a Church to deal with the character, and consequently civil interests of its members as it might choose, merely because it called itself a Church, or even pleaded conscience. Rulers would insist, and were entitled to insist, that the powers of the Church be defined and limited in a way they could understand; and the only way that a Church could justify its claim of right to exemption from civil control was by showing to the State, first, the State's own duty to Christ and His Church, and, second, the Church's duty to the State – both defined on grounds of Scripture. It was thus that our Scottish Reformers justified their claims and contended for them from the time of Knox downwards, and unless on such grounds it was utterly absurd to plead religious rights against the State. To claim spiritual independence from the State for the Church, without admitting the right of the State to ask, and your duty to tell it, on what grounds you claim it, and permitting it to be a consenting party, was in fact the Popish claim and the essence of spiritual despotism. It was the claim which Popery set up, and through the voluntary liberality of the superstitious of all ranks, and in spite of States and without state endowments, which she never got in any nation in Europe, made good, and tyrannised alike over Churches and nations. This Dr. Buchanan had himself expressed in his now too celebrated lecture in the volume entitled "Protestantism and Popery Contrasted," published in 1837. But as another leader of the Union movement said, when he was made to answer himself, *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis.* Very good. Men might change, but when they renounced the views and principles and actings of more than half an ordinary lifetime they had need to give good reasons, and though they did, they need no longer expect that men could have any great confidence in the wisdom of their opinions, which might be one thing today and the reverse tomorrow. Moreover, it was a very dangerous course. It was true in this, as well as in Virgil's sense, *facilis descensus*. Dr. Gibson went on to quote a passage in Dr. Buchanan's late speech, remarking, with regard to it, that it turned the question away from one of obligation to hold a Bible truth, as the Free Church held the doctrine of the duty of the civil magistrate to Christ and his Church to be, into one of the lawfulness of civil establishments of religion; and of "the idolatry of Church establishments;" and not only so, but as if those to whom he pointed were making it a question of the necessity of state support for the "loaves and fishes." Now, Dr. Buchanan could not but know that that was not the question with him (Dr.

Gibson), though it was a question, and very important one. The question with him and with those who held his views was one of Bible truth, viz., whether in the word of God it is clearly revealed that the magistrate, the supreme ruler or authority of a Christian nation, is under Christ and bound to act for Christ, and to serve him actually and positively; and whether that question of Bible truth is matter of

obligation on the Christian conscience, the conscience of the individual, the Church, and of the State. Dr. Buchanan seemed to hold this doctrine "personally," but not relatively – that was, he did not feel bound to hold it in all circumstances, or to insist that others should hold it, though God's Word declared it. His language was a little curious. In remarking on Dr. Begg, he said – "I do not forget that Dr. Begg plainly intimated that we ought to maintain our principles. I am of the same opinion. I do not know one of our principles which I am prepared personally to abandon or disallow." Well, what was the meaning of that? What benefit to the Church, to the world, to the "manifestation of the truth to every man's conscience in the eight of God;" nay, of what importance was it to any one but himself what he "personally" held or abandoned? But it was of importance what he held or abandoned as a minister of Christ, as a public teacher of religion, as a leader in the Church, and as a negotiator whether with Churches or rulers, and as having confessed and vowed to maintain a truth, and to witness to it for the honor of God and His Christ, Dr. Buchanan could relevantly take up such a position only on the notion underlying his whole statement, viz., that he was really arguing for another object altogether – viz., union – and union, must be carried out whether the universal dominion of Christ be admitted or denied in its only practical sense. This was in reality the standpoint, or, if it were not a pun, the sandpoint, the baseless ground of their whole argumentation. They had yet to prove that union on such a ground and at such a cost was binding his (Dr. Gibson's) conscience, whatever they might say of their own.

(*To be continued.*)


# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 47. SYDNEY, AUGUST 1869.

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. 47 AUGUST.


**CONTENTS**.


PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Token of the Covenant; or, the Subjects, the Mode, and the Nature and Design of Baptism … … … … | 549 |
| Moderatism in Victoria … … … … | 552 |
| Duty of the Church towards the State … … … | 554 |
| Union Question … … … … … | 556 |
| Review– "Why Presbyterians leave their own Church: the Causes and Cure" | 556 |
| New Hebrides Mission … … … … | 557 |
| Correspondence – Capital Punishment … … … | 558 |
| Death of the Rev. James Macbean of Port Augusta … … | 559 |


## THE TOKEN OF THE COVENANT OR, THE SUBJECTS, THE MODE, AND THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.


(*Continued from page* 528)


29. As we cannot obtain from the opponents of infant baptisms any proof of their doctrine, we shall proceed, not

exactly to prove but to confirm our own. We have already proved it by showing that the application of the initiatory rite to infants was instituted by God, and has not been abolished. But, though no further proof of it is necessary, it may be advantageous to shew, in confirmation of it, that it entirely harmonises with scripture representations. With this view, we request attention to the manner in which the scriptures mention the baptism of families. An instance occurs in the Acts of the Apostles, 16: 14, 15. – "A certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us; whose heart the Lord had opened that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul. And, when she was baptised and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there. And she constrained us." Here it is only with respect to Lydia herself we are informed that she was converted, but baptism was administered not only to herself but also to her household. The words of the narrative are, "she was baptised and her household." If baptism had been administered to each member of her household on anti-pedobaptist principles, the administration of it could scarcely have been related in such terms. If the fact of the case was that she was converted, and that, on her being converted and professing faith in Christ, not only herself was baptised but also her household, the narrative is exactly such as we would have expected. But, if each individual was baptised, according to anti-pedobaptist principles on his own profession of faith, the narrative certainly does not present the case in this light. It mentions only Lydia's conversion, and then with her conversion connects not only her own baptism, but also that of her household, without the slightest intimation that the members of her household were themselves converted. This certainly has a very pedobaptist look, and has no resemblance whatever to an anti-pedobaptist account of anti-pedobaptist proceedings.

30. In the same chapter, verses 30-34, we have a similar account of the baptism of a household, of that of the Philippian jailer. "Sirs" this was the inquiry of the jailor, "What must I do to be saved?" and they said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed *their* stripes; and was baptised, he and all his straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." It is only of the conversion and faith of the jailor himself that we have evidence in this narrative. It is stated of *him* that "he took them," – Paul and Silas, – "the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes." He thus afforded a practical proof, and made an open practical profession of his faith; and, on his having done so, baptism as administered; not only to himself, but also to his entire household, – he "was baptised, he and all his, straightway." It is true that "they spoke the word of the Lord," not only "unto himself," but also "to all that were in his house;" but, then, we are not informed what reception any, except himself, gave to the word thus spoken. The authorised version, indeed, of the last clause of verse 34 – "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house," – conveys the impression that "all his house" believed in God." But the literal rendering of this part of the narrative is, "he rejoiced with all his house, having believed in God." Thus it is only himself that is represented as "having believed;" and even as regards the rejoicing, no more is stated, than that *he* rejoiced *domestically*, for "with all his house" in our translation is the rendering of one word in the original, that word being an adverb which may be translated *domestically*, and which immediately follows and qualifies the word for "rejoiced." It is not said that he rejoiced and all his house, but that he rejoiced domestically; that is, expressed his joy by some act or service in which he called upon his whole household to take part. This statement affords no evidence, and none is afforded in any other part of the narrative, that his household believed. Though, "having believed in God, he rejoiced domestically," it in no way follows that; because the rejoicing was a household or family rejoicing, the members of his household had also "believed in God," and had thus in their own spiritual history and experience the same cause of rejoicing, that he had in his. If he had rec-



overed from some severe and dangerous illness, he might, very properly, have "rejoiced domestically," or "with all his house;" but surely, none would infer from the household character of the rejoicing, in this case, that the members of his household had experienced a similar recovery; and, when it is stated that, having believed in God, he rejoiced domestically; it can quite as little be inferred, from the household character of the rejoicing, that the members of his household exercised a similar faith. And, then, as to the statement that "the word of the Lord" was spoken, "to all that were in his house," do our opponents need to be told that many of those to whom the word of the Lord is spoken continue in unbelief?

31. In short, the view presented by the narrative is, that the jailor believed, and that, on his believing, baptism was administered not only to himself but also to "all his straightway;" that is that the pedobaptist mode of procedure was adopted in the case, – the same mode of procedure exactly as was adopted, under the Mosaic economy in admitting proselytes. If the anti-pedobaptist mode of procedure had been adopted in baptising the jailer's household, and the baptism of it had been related by an anti-pedobaptist historian, the narrative would have been very different from that of Luke. Such an historian, – an historian writing under the bias of anti-pedobaptist views, and relating an administration of baptism in accordance with those views, – would never have framed a narrative which records only the faith of the jailer himself, and which conveys that, on his having furnished evidence of faith, both himself and all his were baptised "straightway." Luke has penned precisely such a narrative; but, most assuredly, if he had been an anti-pedobaptist and had been recording anti-pedobaptist proceedings, he would have written very differently. His narrative would, in that case, have borne, that not only the jailor himself, but also "all his" believed, and that he and they were baptised on a profession of faith made by them individually. He would have felt it the more necessary to bring it clearly out that baptism was administered to each individual on a profession of faith made by himself personally, as the universal and well known mode of procedure in the analogous case of the admission of proselytes was that when the head of a family was found qualified for admission, the right of initiation was applied not only to himself but also to the members of his household.

32. We have not insisted on the high probability that there were infants in some, if not in all, of the families of which the scriptures record that they were baptised, the record in two at least of the cases clearly indicating that they were baptised on a profession of faith made by their respective heads. Our argument has been that, while the scripture mode of relating that families or households were baptised is throughout in

exact harmony with pedobaptist views and practice, it cannot be reconciled with those of anti-pedobaptists. There is, however, a high probability that there were infants in some at least of the families in question. Besides, the practice of baptising families on a profession of faith made by the heads of such families, which the cases under consideration, when viewed in the light in which, we have seen, the scripture narrative presents them, clearly establish, involves the baptism of infants. The practice of baptising families on a profession of faith made by the heads of them is recorded; families therefore are to be baptised, on such profession; but infants form often a part of families, and therefore, as families are to be baptised, infants are to be baptised, for the families of which infants form a part would not be baptised, if the infant members of them were not

baptised. The practice established is the practice of baptising the families on a credible profession of faith made by the heads of them, and not the practice of baptising a certain class of families on such profession, for nothing whatever is mentioned to distinguish the families baptised from other families. Now the practice of baptising families clearly comprehends in it the practice of baptising infants for in many families, there are infant members; and, therefore, if the infant members of families, the heads of which make a credible profession of faith, are not baptised, the practice of baptising families on such profession, unequivocally established by the authoritative example of the apostles, is abandoned, and a course at variance with that practice is adopted.

33. Further and strong confirmation is afforded to our doctrine by the manner in which the apostle speaks in the following passage of the bringing in of the Gentiles and the restoration of the Jews, Rom. 11: 17,18; – "If some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches; but if thou boast thou bearest not the root but the root thee." And again, verses 23, 24, "They also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in, for God is able to graft them in again; for if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and wert grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive tree, how much more shall these which be the natural branches be grafted into their own olive tree? Here the "good olive tree" clearly represents the visible church; and, when "some branches" are represented as "broken off" from the olive tree, the meaning evidently is, that some of the members of the visible Church were cast out by the rejection of the Jews. All the members, however, were not cast out; the church was not dissolved; it still continued. Into the church which thus continued, or into the olive tree, still standing, though some branches were broken off, the Gentiles were grafted. Now, infants were members of the church as it existed under the Mosaic dispensation, and, therefore, as it was into this church that the Gentiles were admitted, infants were members of the church into which they were admitted, and, consequently, of the church as it existed after their admission. And, further, when it is stated that the Jews shall be grafted in again – grafted into their own olive tree – the church into which they shall be admitted, to be their own olive tree, must recognise the membership of infants; for the membership of infants was recognised by the church from which they had been cast out.

34. What the apostle in this passage contemplates as already effected, our Lord predicts in Matt 21: 43 – "the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" Here the church, spoken of figuratively by the apostle as an "olive tree," is designated "the kingdom of God" –a designation strictly appropriate. This "kingdom of God," our Lord predicts, should be "taken from" the Jews and given to a nation "bringing forth the fruits thereof." It was not to be destroyed, to cease, or to be essentially changed; it was only to be transferred from one nation to another, – still continuing the same kingdom. While the prophecy implies that it was to remain unchanged as to all that was essential to it, it particularly indicates that it was to remain such that it could "be given to a nation." God had given it to the Jews, as a nation, – to their infants as well as to their adults; and now he was to give it to another "nation," that is, to Gentiles; and, in being thus given to another "nation," it must as before be given to infants, as well as to adults, for,



if not given to infants, it would not be given to "a nation," – infants forming a very considerable part of every nation. Besides, into the church which was taken from the Jews infants were admitted as members, and, as it was the same church that was taken from the Jews that was to be given to the Gentiles, therefore into the church that was to be given to the Gentiles, infants were to be admitted as members. According to anti-pedolaptist principles this prophecy, and there are not a few such, cannot be fulfilled. They do not admit of the giving of the kingdom of God to "a nation;" they admit of the giving it only to those who make a personal profession of religion, and those who make such a profession or are capable of making it do not in any case form the whole of a nation.

35. Christ himself holds such language with respect to infant children as implies, if it does not expressly recognise their church membership. He does so in the following passage: – "He took a child, and set him in the midst of them; and when he had taken him in his arms, be said unto them, 'whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me.'" The word rendered "child" in this passage denotes a *little child,* and that the child spoken of was a little child is further indicated by the fact that Christ "took him in his arms." Referring, then, to this little child, Christ says to his disciples, "whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me," Now how could one receive a "little child in Christ's name," if little children could have no visible connection with him? But how could a little child or any one else have a visible connection with Christ otherwise than by visible church membership? To receive one "in Christ's name" is to receive him as "belonging to Christ," (see v. 51); but that we may be in a position to receive any one as belonging to Christ, he must visibly belong to him, and those who so belong to him are just the members of the visible church. Accordingly that we may be in a position to receive little children as belonging to Christ, – and he himself represents it as our duty to receive some little children as belonging to him, – such little children must be members of the visible church.

36. In Mark 10: 14, Christ uses language, with respect to little children, very similar to that which we have now examined. "Suffer," he says, "the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." The declaration, "of such is the kingdom of heaven," means that "the kingdom of heaven," belongs to "such" little children as "they were bringing to him" at the time, – that it is theirs, belonging to them, not, indeed, exclusively, but in common with others. If the meaning were that the kingdom of heaven belongs to those who are "such" in disposition as the children referred to, the fact stated would clearly have no force, as a reason why those little children should be suffered to come to him, – it would have been irrelevant to say

"suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Our Lord, then, testifies that the kingdom of heaven belongs to such little children, as those to whom he referred; and, from this fact, in whatever sense, "the kingdom of heaven" is to be taken, it follows that such little children should not be excluded from the membership of the visible church. If by the kingdom of heaven we are to understand the kingdom of glory, then, surely those to whom it belongs, are not to be excluded from the visible church, the corresponding kingdom on earth; and, if we are to understand by it the visible church itself, Christ's kingdom as it is administered on earth, then, surely, those to whom it belongs are not to be excluded from it. Christ himself regards and treats little children as capable of occupying a place among those to whom the kingdom of heaven belongs; and how then can they be incapable of being admitted amongst them by the outward rite

of admission? Are higher qualifications necessary to constitute them fit subjects of the outward rite of admission, than are necessary for the actual occupation of the position to which outwardly admission is given by that rite? If they may be actually among those to whom the kingdom of heaven belongs, may they not be treated, outwardly, as being among them? It would be a strange anomaly if they might not; but this anomaly the anti-pedobaptist system presents. The truth is that the views of our opponents with respect to the relation of infants to the covenant of grace and the outward administration of it are grievously erroneous, as is painfully manifest, when we contrast their treatment of little children and their statements respecting them, with the treatment given to them and claimed for them by Christ, in the instance before us.

37. With the procedure towards infants which Christ thus required and exemplified, and with what we have seen the scriptures so abundantly teach with respect to their relation to the covenant of grace, and to the outward administration of it, the exhortation addressed by Peter to those that were "pricked in their hearts" on the day of Pentecost fully harmonises, Having "said unto them, repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," he adds, in enforcement of this exhortation, "for the promise is unto you and to your children." He evidently refers to the great promise which God gave to Abraham when he instituted circumcision, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed." And, in testifying that this promise was still in force, did he not intimate to them that the outward rite of admission to an interest in it, was still, as hitherto, to be applied to their children? If he did not intend to convey this intimation, the reference to the promise as being not only to themselves but also to their children was calculated to mislead. And why was it made? How could the fact that the promise was to their children enforce the exhortation addressed to them, if in no part of their compliance with it they required the warrant and encouragement of a promise to their children? If they were only exhorted to repent and to be themselves baptised, they required no promise to their children to be in a position to comply with the exhortation. It is only on the supposition that, as a matter of course, their own baptism would be followed by the baptism of their children, that there could be any propriety in the reference to the promise to their children. A partially instructed Jew, when exhorted to repent and to enter the Christian Church by baptism, would naturally enough inquire in his own mind, "but if I submit to baptism, what is to be done with my children?" This inquiry the apostle anticipates and satisfies. "The promise," he announces, " is to your children," as well as to yourselves, and, therefore, if you are baptised, they shall be baptised as your children. They shall be treated in this respect, as they were treated under the former dispensation, and in accordance with the promise, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed."

38. We shall only adduce one other passage, l Cor. 7: 14, which affords direct and strong confirmation to the doctrine of infant baptism, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy," When both the parents were unbelieving, and therefore heathen, their children were also heathen, and therefore "unclean," unfit to be admitted to the membership of the church; but, when one of the parents believed, their children were "holy," not of course in respect of personal character, but relatively, as being set apart, and thus brought in a position to be admitted into the church. This seems to be the only sense of which this passage admits, and, thus understood, it makes immediate reference to the baptism of infants for it is only by baptism that infants are admitted to the membership of the visible church.

552

39. Other passages might be adduced, but we shall only further, in support of infant baptism, refer to the fact that the Jewish converts never complained of the treatment given to their children under the new dispensation. If their children were not baptised, they would be excluded from the position occupied by children under the former dispensation; and it cannot for a moment be imagined that their parents would submit quietly, without murmur or complaint, to this exclusion of them.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.
## (DR. IRVING HETHERINGTON.)

*To the Editor of "The Testimony."*

Sir, – Sir Richard Bourke, one of the former Governors of New South Wales, thus wrote to Lord Glenelg, on the 1st September, 1837: – "Nor am I sanguine in expecting that the two gentlemen last arrived will succeed in entitling themselves to stipends from Government otherwise than as itinerant ministers." Sir Richard mistook one of his men most certainly, for one of the two referred to was none other than the Rev. Irving Hetherington, who will, perhaps, be a more celebrated character in colonial history than Sir Richard Bourke himself. Mr. Hetherington, it appears, had some trouble in regard to his stipend after his arrival in New South Wales. It will be seen presently, however, that he has amply avenged himself upon Governments for nearly a quarter of a century for any delay and annoyance which he may have encountered at the outset of his colonial career. This will be brought out by giving a brief account of two explosions which have taken place in this colony, and which throw a lurid glare of light upon the doings of moderates and moderatism, of which Mr. Hetherington has been for so long the "head-centre."

The first of these explosions took place in the Victorian Parliament, in December, 1866, during the existence of the first ministry (that of Mr. Haines) formed under the new constitution. Mr. Sargood, a member of the Legislative Assembly, gave notice of motion for a return of lands alienated by a Crown to religious bodies for religious purposes; also, of the actual purposes for which any of these lands had been used, by whom they were occupied, rented, or leased, for what rent, and for what term. In moving for the return he stated that lands alienated to religious bodies had been used for secular purposes. He gave; as an instance, one case in which land had been used for the purpose of a dancing saloon. He understood that in this place scenes of the most lewd and disreputable character were enacted. On other portions of these lands warehouses had been erected, from which a large revenue was derived. On others, storehouses for timber, provisions, &c., were built, and from them a revenue of £400 per

annum was obtained. In another instance, tents had been erected on lands given for religious purposes, from which a rent of four shillings and five shillings a week was derived. Mr. Embling corroborated the statements made by Mr. Sargood: lands granted for religious purposes had been appropriated to the basest uses, and a revenue raised from one portion for the support of a minister who had no congregation to preach to. Mr. C. Campbell said that the dancing saloon to which reference had been made was in existence twelve months ago, and the congregation in Collins Street had taken steps for its removal, but without avail. Captain Clarke, the Surveyor-General, stated that he had put himself in communication with the different religious bodies on the subject. In rep-ly, he had been informed that the Church of England had no Government grants of land appropriated otherwise than for the purposes for which they had been given. The Roman Catholics rep-lied to the same effect. So also did the Wesleyans. But now a new

series begins. Captain Clarke spoke as follows: – "A reply had been received from the head of the Presbyterian Church, the Rev. Mr. Hetherington, stating that a few pieces belonging to that denomination were occupied in the manner pointed out by the honorable member." It appeared the Independents also represented by Rev. A. Morison, were in the same position. As to the revenues derived, Captain Clarke stated that the annual revenue received by the Independents for these lands was £1099 19s. 6d., and the expenditure about £550. By the Presbyterians for the frontage to Russell St., which was leased for twenty-eight years, £14 9s: for the site on which the warehouse of the Messrs. Budge was built for a similar term, £168 per annum; for a site to Mr. Newton, for a similar term, £108 per annum; and to Mr. McEwan, fronting Little Collins Street, for a similar term, £24 per annum. So far the information which had been obtained by Captain Clarke on the subject. It is worthy of notice in passing, that the two most important properties concerned, the one Presbyterian and the other Independent, are exactly opposite each other. Russell St. running between. With all these secular structures, they kept each other well in countenance. In fact, they do so to this day. The warehouses, etc., are, still to the fore in Mr. Hetherington's section; I presume the twenty-eight years' leases have not yet run out. On the Independent block, although a unique building costing some £16,000 or £20,000 has been recently erected, yet part of the block is occupied by a cutter of tombstones. Rev. A. Morison, the Independent minister himself, has wound up by joining Mr. Hetherington. It is scarcely necessary to say one word as to the hardening, degrading, demoralising effects which such arrangements must produce on all parties implicated. In the agitations against state aid, facts like those which I have now adduced supplied voluntaries and others with their sharpest weapons. It was a few months after the action taken in Parliament that I returned to Victoria, and I remember that the ill savour of the facts which had been brought out was still in the nostrils of parties. But moderates can breathe and fatten in an atmosphere which would stifle others.

The second explosion to which I refer took place lately in the Supreme Court of Victoria. On the 14th June last, his Honor Judge Molesworth gave decision in a case in Equity, in which trustees for a Presbyterian site in East Melbourne took legal proceedings against the Board of Land and Works. The occasion was as follows. On the 29th May, 1862, when Mr. Hetherington's party were represented by Rev. Mr. Gow, the moderates applied for a site in East Melbourne. The Board of Land and Works promised to give it. The ground was marked off into three sections, for church, manse, and school. A schoolhouse was built, and classes were conducted. But the portions set apart for church and manse were not used for these purposes. In the words of the learned Judge – "The trustees set about turning the rest of the two acres to profit since 1865, and let it at rent to numerous persons who built and occupied small temporary houses upon it, and treated those rents as mixed up with their general trust funds." The amount which had accumulated in these circumstances rose up to the snug little sum of £1400. But Governments want money as well as churches: The Board of Land and Works seem to have come to the conclusion that they too could turn this ground to secular account. Mr. Hetherington must have opened his eyes when be found the church and manse site advertised for sale. The trustees, who had been taking things so quietly for about fifteen years, were suddenly galvanised into motion. The Judge observed that "the trustees seem to have been stirred into activity as to building a manse only by the disposition of the Board of Land and Works to sell the land." But what now was to be done? Would Mr. Hetherington quietly surrender his ill-kept ground?



The manipulator of two Synod of Victoria Bills, for absorbing properties from other denominations, may be supposed to have a considerable "earth hunger." It is not to be expected that Mr. Hetherington and his moderate friends would quietly allow the sweet morsel desired by the Board of Land and Works to be taken out of their very teeth without a struggle. The trustees, of course, were the parties to take legal action. They came to their work armed, with a double-barrelled instrument – a petition to the Supreme Court to do justice against the Queen, and a Bill to restrain the Board of Land and Works from putting up the land for sale. You may form some idea of the diligence of the parties concerned when I tell you that they swept the course from Elizabeth to Victoria for arguments! A statute dating from the respectable antiquity of 43 Elizabeth was brought into requisition, and what was that? A statute to enforce the fulfilment of charitable trusts? Something of the ludicrous comes over one as he bethinks himself of the arrogant Presbyterian Church trying to shield itself in dishonorable occupation of pieces of Crown lands, obtained virtually under false pretences, under the plea of charitable trust! But here the unionists made a mistake. The learned Judge took the argument as evidence of stress of weather with the petitioners. Transposing circumstances, I can well imagine the grim sardonic smile which will play upon Mr. Hetherington's face should Free Church trustees plead charitable trust against the transfer of properties to the union. But sometimes sharp instruments brought into requisition for cutting one's neighbours are used to cut oneself. Far fetched as was the plea founded on 43 Elizabeth, it was the best adduced by the petitioners. The rest was little else than ringing the changes on the fond idea that neither the Board nor Parliament itself might, could, would, or should sell the land. Fond conceit! The Judge took up each phase of the Protean argument with exemplary patience, and brushed away the cobwebs in detail. Here is a little piece of dissimulation and shuffling quite worthy of union negotiations, but which was laid bare by the Judge. He pointed out that "the petition and bill does not disclose the fact that the original letter of May 29, 1862, – distinguished three parcels of ground to be held for three distinct objects, with the view, it would appear, of using evidence of expenditure upon one parcel to support a title to all three." Charitable trusts! where is the charity? Does it consist in swelling some moderate's stipend? But of this more presently. Judge Molesworth's decision in the case is given in a sentence: – "I do not think it should be supposed to be the meaning of such grants that religious bodies should turn their land to profit, raising no subscriptions, deferring the erection of churches, &c., so long and until the accumulation of profits should form a fund for their buildings." The petition and bill were

dismissed with costs.

So far the two explosions. But now sundry questions arise. What becomes of all the money? How did church extension progress under the moderate dominion of Mr. Hetherington, when lands obtained for churches and manses were used in such a variety of other ways? Let us try to gather up some facts regarding the latter of these questions. We turn up a Blue Book, and find a Victorian census for 1867. There were in that year about 28,000 adherents belonging to the Church of Scotland: 19,000 to the Free Church, and 9000 to the United Presbyterian. The ministers in connection with the same denominations for the same year were, as nearly as I can make out, 14 Moderate, 32 Free, and 14 U.P. In the important matter of establishing charges, Mr. Hetherington falls to the ground – his beloved ground – at once. According to the statistics, he had three times as many adherents as the United Presbyterians, and only the same number of ministers. The United Presbyterians progressed with the work of settling ministers

at three times the rate of the ponderous Moderate. Again: in comparison with the Free Church, Mr. Hetherington's adherents were as three to two. Yet the Free Church ministers were to Mr. Hetherington's as two to one. These figures give us over again about the very same rate of three to one in favor of the Free Church against Mr. Hetherington. Allowance has to be made for Home confusion in the census returns, for a large number returned themselves generally as "Presbyterians." Yet it may be easily presumed that it was no one of the three denominations that lost all these; also, no arrangement of the figures free Mr. Hetherington from the charge of having been remarkably stagnant while others were moving.

But we can bring this matter down to a focus where we shall also get a glimpse of some of the money from the warehouses, &c. Narrowing down our sphere of observation to Melbourne, I find that up to 1857, the year already taken into calculation, there were three Free Church congregations with settled ministers, and two United Presbyterian. Over against this, Mr. Hetherington has just himself to show, though his adherents are as numerous, according to the figures given, as both the other two. Was not the moderatism that resisted church extension in Scotland represented to the life here by Mr. Hetherington?

As to the destination of the money: I have before me a printed annual congregational statement of affairs in regard to the Scots Church over which Mr. Hetherington so long presided. This statement is for the year 1863-64. I notice the interesting distinction of "seat rents" and "ground rents." The latter item brings to the "correct" side of the account the snug little sum of £218 19s. 7d. Amongst the disbursements I notice £851 0s. 10d., stipend for Mr. Hetherington, though £146 1s. 3d. comes as arrears. So Mr. Hetherington pocketed the rents, and neglected church extension! But let us see if we can relieve Mr. Hetherington at some point of a little of the disgracefulness which attaches to the facts which I have brought out. Perhaps Mr. Hetherington has a taste for architecture and fine grounds, and has unstintingly spent every shilling that came from "ground rents" on the ornamentation of the grounds. We pass along Collins Street: banks, public offices, warehouses, all sorts of buildings attract our attention right and left – many of them most costly structures, and a credit to the city. You come to Mr. Hetherington's corner. On an elevation – in fact on Eastern Hill – with frontage to three streets, it is one of the finest sites in Melbourne. But church, manse, and school, grounds and all, strike one at once as twenty years behind date. But I must keep to my promise: if any little point to Mr. Hetherington's credit could be discovered, he was to have the benefit of it. In the annual statement, 1863-64, there is an entry setting forth that the princely sum of £8 had been laid out on the grounds! With this survey of Mr. Hetherington's peculiar style of managing sites and funds, we need not wonder at some curious attempts made by his friends to "turn an honest penny" on behalf of the denomination. One of his trustees leased a building in South Melbourne to a Unitarian, who actually opened it for worship on the 4th April, 1858. This however, was not acceptable to Mr. Hetherington. It was the occasion of an outburst of orthodoxy from Mr. Hetherington that must have stunned his friends as much as his foes. The building was reclaimed speedily and summarily.

But Mr. Hetherington's monopoly in Melbourne was destined to be invaded at last. A congregation sprang up, as if by magic in West Melbourne, and got a minister settled in spite of Mr. Hetherington. This was in 1866. I gave you an account of it about the time.

Such is another glimpse at the dark orb of Moderatism around which Dr. Cairns, Mr. McEachran, &c:, &c. are content to rev-



volve. In their heart of hearts what do they think of him? Were they proud of their Union Church the other day when they saw the disreputable shifts in the shape of pleas resorted to in order to retain church grounds, or given for church purposes, but which they had been desecrating to secular purposes? But the illustrations given of matters in regard to the Scots' Church, Collins Street, and its present incumbent, afford a favorable occasion for a strong contrast with the former incumbent, the late Rev. James Forbes. That splendid property, so disreputably treated by Mr. Hetherington, was about as disreputably obtained. You will remember Mr. Forbes worthily followed up the deed of demission of the Free Church of Scotland by his demission of the Scots' Church property, Melbourne. He himself declared it was the most valuable property the Moderates got in the southern hemisphere, being valued at that early time at £4000. Mr. Forbes forsook it at the call of duty. But the moral value of Christian faithfulness like this is to be obliterated from the face of the earth. Here is part of the process, showing very instructively the operation of the invisible powers. A volume of engravings, entitled "Victoria Illustrated," is got up in a costly style for the drawing-rooms of the men of substance in the land. It contains engravings of all the principal buildings, &c. It was issued by Messrs. Sands and Kenny in 1862. The engraving of the Scots' Church and Manse is duly labelled "Rev. Irving Hetherington's Church and Manse." The letter-press description is as follows: – "The church and manse occupies one of the finest sites in the city of Melbourne, at the intersection of Collins and Russell streets. The church was erected in 1841, and has been lately extensively re-modelled and furnished with a tower and spire. The manse was erected in 1862. The Rev. Irving Hetherington is the minister. This is the first Presbyterian Church erected in the colony, and is distinguished as the scene of the union of the Presbyterian Churches in April, 1859, and as the place of meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria." The date on the manse in scroll work round the upper windows is 1861, the year in which the first pastor, Mr. Forbes, died. Of the site I have spoken already. But you will notice if Mt. Hetherington himself had written that notice for the publishers, the name of Mr. Forbes could not have been more cautiously avoided. Mr. Forbes was the first settled Presbyterian minister in the colony, the Scots' Church was his first charge, he was the founder of the Free Church in the colony, and he was the first Presbyterian minister who died in the colony. A good number of "firsts," but none of them suitable to be recorded. Yet twice over in very short space the name of Mr. Hetherington occurs. When one meets with the like of this it may be made an occasion of doing honor to the name that is so mysteriously suppressed. In

shining contrast to the degrading Moderatism and secularity displayed by Mr. Hetherington take the following brief notice of Mr. Forbes from Mr. Bonwick's *Port Phillip.* "The Rev. James Forbes arrived in Melbourne, January 28th, 1839. His memory is dearly cherished by all classes and religious professions. Wholly devoted to his Master's business, he lived a useful and devoted life. One of the old hands thus spake of him to the writer. 'He *was* a good man – why he wouldn't think of making money.'" The book containing this was published in 1856, and we know from the foregoing how Mr. Hetherington was distinguishing himself in that very year. Let us hope the invisible powers will not get that valuable entry suppressed in future editions. But the righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance (Ps. 112: 6), and certainly the contrast between the first and second pastor of the Scots' Church is calculated to become a classic point in the history of colonial Presbyterianism. With all his astuteness perhaps Mr. Hetherington is laboriously filling in the shady parts

of the picture which is to set off with all the greater brightness the noble elements of character which were found in Mr. Forbes.

I am, &c.,
PETER MacPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, Victoria,
August 9th, 1869.

---

## DUTY OF THE STATE TOWARDS THE CHURCH.

(*Continued from page* 546.)

In this same passage, Dr. Buchanan said he would not go into any union that would not allow him to hold his opinions – of course "personally – or freely to consider any question that might practically arise; or, in other words, when circumstances in Providence might require it. But meantime, he argued, Providence did not require him to stand up for it as between him and the U. P. Church more than between him and the State. But he added what seemed still stronger – "And much less would I go into any such union that did not carry on its very face a full and unhesitating acknowledgement that nations and their rulers, as such, are under obligations to submit themselves to Christ, and, both to frame their laws and to regulate their conduct by His Word." So far as the question at issue was concerned, this was mere words so long as the United Presbyterians held that the province of the magistrate is only secular. If they believed it was more, then let them say so. They had not done it as yet. One word would expose the fallacy of this very promising statement of Dr. Buchanan. It would have been all very fine if he had told *what* laws he and his United Presbyterian friends would allow the nations and their rulers under Christ to make for the benefit of the Church of Christ. He, perhaps, "personally" would allow them to make such laws and do such things as they did for the Church of Scotland for two hundred years; and which he most stoutly and eagerly defended before the Disruption, and had repeatedly expressed his approval of since. But would his Voluntary friends allow that? Not a bit of it. They had most positively refused it in the Union Committee; and Dr. Harper's pamphlet, approved by Dr. Cairns and Dr. Andrew Thomson, had most conclusively settled that point. They would allow neither sanction nor ratification, because, they said, that implied coercion. Again, in the same passage, Dr. Buchanan said he could not make an open question of the great doctrine of Christ's sole headship over the Church; but he would make an open question of the lawfulness of civil establishments of religion: and then he could take refuge in the difficulties, nay, impossibility, in various countries of setting them up. But the question was not what rulers in certain circumstances could do, but what God's Word said they ought to do. What right had Dr. Buchanan, while asserting the duty of the Church to her sole Head and King, to deny or put aside the nation's duty to the same glorious and sole Head and King of nations, and relieve them from any positive duty to discharge on behalf of his Church or truth? He would reply, doubtless, that he held both headships in the Free Church sense. Be it so, "personally." But would their United Presbyterian friends agree with him? Nothing of the kind. They stoutly denied it. After some further observations on this head, Dr. Gibson proceeded to remark on what he termed the extreme danger of Dr. Buchanan's present position. In his view, it opened up the way to make any Scripture doctrine an open question, when holding by it might prove an obstacle to the present union. And he believed there were signs that by the Union Committee the Free Church views of the extent of the Atonement, of the principle of the Confession of Faith as to the worship of God, the principle as to the marriage of a man with the sister of his deceased wife or with his brother's widow, also the question of the 555
speedy revisal of the Confession of Faith (on all of which wide differences prevailed between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches), were being got over or passed over without any definite result, and were to be left open questions for the United Church, if such union should ever take place. A fine harvest might be looked for in the Church autumn from such a seedtime. Open questions, with a view to preserve unity, or at least liberty to hold and teach error in one church as well as truth; had ever been a favourite scheme with, innovating errorists. We hear (Dr. Gibson went on to say) a great deal of Providence of late, when it is convenient to follow the popular cry. Providence, if we are to judge from the speeches of some of our friends, means politicians and the most powerful political parties. Sir Henry Moncrieff, in a late speech, is reported to have said he refused to attack the Churches of Scotland and England, yet there was a "political urgency" for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, believing that it will do no injury to religion. Is the Church of England not vastly more corrupt than the Irish Church? But what is the "political urgency?" The cry of Paul Cullen, the Irish brass band, and their ignorant followers. And because some of us refuse to make such a Providence our guide – as a Providence undoubtedly is, as was the Indian mutiny – we are to be ridiculed as dreamers, or calumniated as Erastians and looking after the loaves and fishes. I never got any of the loaves and fishes of the Established Church, and it has none better to give me than I possess; but I cannot, for all that, turn my back on what I have solemnly professed I believe, and am still bound to hold. But who entitles men to make their views of Providence the interpreters of the Divine word and law? On what side would they have been in the days of Darius, King of Persia? They would have pronounced Nehemiah a "visionary." Where would they have been in the days of the prelatic persecution in Scotland from 1660 to 1888? Would they have been on the side of the Rutherfords, the Calderwoods, Hendersons, and Gillespies? Their principle would have led them to comply with the times as the leadings of Providence, and to have pronounced these noble Scots worthies "visionaries." Such was in fact the principle of the men in Haggai's day, who said "The time is not come, the time that the Lord's house should be built." Much better were it that men should at once avow themselves Voluntaries – who at least have maintained some consistency than to get themselves involved in such entanglements; and those office-bearers of our church, whether ministers or elders, who say they are Voluntaries, should openly join them. They do the Free Church no credit by remaining in it – only to betray its principles; and least of all should any of them presume to put their names to a document recommending a periodical which they say is set up to teach and defend Free Church principles. What next? I should not like to

see my name in any such conjunction. I think, after all this, I am entitled to remind Dr. Buchanan of his responsibility in the line I have been pointing out, as he has warned us, in very solemn terms, of ours, not in resisting union, for that is not our position, but resisting the breaking down, ignoring, and putting under a bushel great truths to bring it about – a course most injurious to all truth; and I most earnestly and in all good feeling, if he will allow it, beseech him, as the main leader of the course on which I have been remarking, to cease from it. Dr. Buchanan, even in the very cautious and qualified language of his late overture, and in his speech, admits not only that it is lawful in the magistrate to own Christ and His truth, and to serve Christ as a principle, but he admits and says he holds it even in the concrete form of civil establishments of religion. If then, the magistrate does exercise this power in a lawful manner, if Dr. Buchanan throws in his lot with those who deny it and resist it, he is throwing in his

lot with those who resist the ordinance of God. We are told the question is not a practical one, nor likely to be in our day. I say it is a practical question even in relation to the State in many ways. But this is not now the question with us. We are not now negotiating with the State, but we are negotiating with Churches; and the practical question is – Are we entitled to ignore, or bury, or declare indifferent any truth of God's Word which we declare to be truth; and, still more, are we entitled to join with those who, even as a Church, not only ignore, but whose representatives affirm the contrary? This is the practical question for us. It is not, are we to go up to negotiate with Mr: Gladstone and his cabinet, but with Dr. Harper, and his cabinet, on the avowed principle of sinking, nay, admitting the lawfulness of opposing, great truths of God's Word. As we have been repeatedly reminded of our responsibility in maintaining the negative, it is both lawful and expedient, nay, dutiful, to remind Dr. Buchanan of his, for there is no doubt that he has been the leader in maintaining such views. But he can never establish them from Scripture, and he has never attempted it. From beginning to end of the Bible he will not find the slightest vestige of support for the doctrine that any religious truth or moral precept is to be a question of circumstance, either for your creed or practice. God may, through the blood of Christ, pardon an error and a sin in both, but to trust to that is to sin because grace doth abound, and to affirm it as right to do what I will not express. In every such truth and every such precept as God reveals and enjoins, both in relation to individual and social duty, it is done on the authority of God, and no provision is made for exceptional circumstances. Even human laws proceed on this principle, and make no provision for exceptional cases or small crimes. If we, as ministers of Christ, either as individuals or as a church, take upon ourselves such an office, it is assuming a dispensing power, natural enough to the human heart, and in human circumstances, and which finds its full culmination in Pio Nono, and every other Pio, or rather *impio,* which occupies the fabulous chair of St. Peter at Rome. What are the "circumstances" (to use Dr. Buchanan's term) that are leading to all this? Obviously and clearly, whatever may be the opinions of statesmen, it is not statesmen, but another party altogether, that has forced Dr. Buchanan and his coadjutors into this line of statement. It was the threat of the United Presbyterian Union Committee in 1867 that, unless our committee and the Assembly itself declared that there was no bar to union in the first head of the programme they would advise their Synod to put an end to the negotiations. We have heard a good deal of late, though in the wrong direction, of the men of the Second Reformation in Scotland; but I know what answer they would have given to such a demand to surrender any part of their Confession of Faith, by what the noble Henderson said when a more formidable power than the United Presbyterian Committee command the Covenanters to surrender their Covenant. He said, among other things, "Although we do not compare the Scriptures of God with our Confession of Faith, yet, as the rendering (surrendering) of the Bible was the sin of the traditions of old, and a sign of the denial of the truth contained therein, so the rendering of our Confession of Faith, so solemnly sworn and subscribed, for staying the course of defection, and for barring of Popery and all other corruptions of religion, could be interpreted to be no less than a real denial of our faith before men in a time when God calleth for the confession, thereof." I hold this to be equally applicable when, at the threat, or the bidding of men, whether civil or ecclesiastical, or to gain a present peace or party object, whatever it may be, you surrender any truth of God's Word, and, above all,



when it is denied, resisted, reviled. Would Henderson act thus now? Was he who dictated the words "on the knees of our hearts" a man of servility? Oh, for such men back again! And yet we have among ourselves some men who turn them into ridicule, and a greater number whose "hear, hear" and "laughter" give them celebrity in the parenthesis of a newspaper report. While I have no wish to continue a line of remark which, though it can neither be held offensive nor unfair, may be unpleasant to others, yet the necessity of our position demands it. After reading a passage from a speech, showing Dr. Buchanan's views on the subject in the year 1853, Dr. Gibson proceeded – It is with no feeling of party warfare, and with no desire to put Dr. Buchanan in an inconsistent position, that I quote these passages of his speech, but to express, as I have more than once done, the opinion that if I reviled from my repeatedly pledged vows to maintain our principles, at all times, and at all hazards, nay, still continue to say I hold them, and yet continue sent to make them open questions – in other words, "bury" them out of mind – I would feel that as a public man, so far as my influence and example went, I was teaching society a very demoralising lesson – a lesson they surely do not require at the present time, and which too many are following without our help. I say it with sorrow, that I feel if I were acting such a part – call it defection or anything you like, by a gentler name if you can – I was fully warranting the judgment which the discerning secular press is passing on such renunciation of the principles and acting of a lifetime; while yet these writers are affirming that the conduct condemned is helping on their own notions of secular liberty.

---

## UNION QUESTION,

In the General .Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, the subject of union with the United Presbyterian Church and with the Reformed Presbyterian Church was taken up on Tuesday, the 25th May, when the report of the Union Committee was laid on the table by the convener, Dr. Robert Buchanan, who labored in a long address to reconcile the Free Church to the occupation of the position it would assume by entering into a union on the basis indicated in the report, or for which it supplies the materials. In accordance with the recommendation with which the report concluded, Princ- ipal Fairbairn moved the following resolution: –

"That the General Assembly receive the report, approve of the diligence of the committee, and of the pains and labor they have bestowed upon the various and important heads of inquiry which it embraces; appoint the report to lie on the table till the Assembly of next year, and meanwhile, and in order to ripen the mind of the Church for such further action as may be called for in connection with the union question, direct the report to be published for the information of all the office-bearers and

members of the Church. That the Assembly reappoint the committee with the former instructions, and in particular with the instruction to watch over the whole subject; and in the event of receiving from any quarter suggestions or information tending to throw additional light upon it, to bring up, if they shall see cause, a supplementary report to next Assembly. And, further, that being deeply alive to the heavy responsibility which must lie upon the Church in connection with the ultimate disposal of this union question, and to the consequent and urgent need she has of divine light and guidance, the Assembly exhort all her faithful people to abound in prayer to Almighty God that he may be pleased to bring all the courts and congregations of the Church to see eye to eye, and to be of one mind and of one heart regarding it; and meanwhile, recommend them to cultivate fraternal intercourse, as means and opportunity may offer, with the office-bearers, congregations, and

members of the Churches concerned in these union negotiations, and with all others who love in sincerity the Lord Jesus Christ."

The Rev. Mr. Nixon of Montrose moved the following amendment: –

That the report now submitted to the General Assembly be received, and thanks recorded to the committee for their diligence and labor in connection with the matters therein embraced. That there are serious differences of opinion as to whether and how far the results arrived at, in the negotiations for union, conserve the doctrines of Scripture and of the Church, to which we have all given our adherence, with reference to the duty of nations to Christ, and to other vital matters of faith and practice. That as these divisions of opinion are such as must turn the prosecution of the union movement, on its present footing, into a means of rending this Church, it is indispensable to her peace and prosperity, and to the most pressing interests of that very union, in truth and love whereto the movement was intended to advance, that no further steps be taken in the said movement until negotiations can be renewed with due regard to the scriptural principles and the peace of this Church."

We regret our space does not admit of our giving extracts from any of the speeches delivered. We shall, however, reserve space for such extracts in our next issue.

The general ground on which those who supported the amendment and opposed the motion did so was, that, by adopting the motion and sending the report to the Presbyteries and congregations of the Church, the General Assembly would, at least indirectly and virtually, declare its approval of it; while, – so the minority held and we think, most justly, – it is unworthy of approval.

Dr. Fairbairn's motion was carried by a large majority, 429 having voted for it, while only 89 voted for Mr. Nixon's amendment. This division, however, does not at all exhibit the comparative strength of the two parties into which the Free Church is divided on the subject of union, those who are ready to compromise its principles for the sake of union, and those who are determined to maintain its principles. It was not generally recognised that the adoption of the course prescribed by the motion would be a step in the direction of compromise.

Immediately after the division. Mr. Nixon gave in for himself and as many as concurred with him the following dissent:

"The undersigned dissent from and protest against the resolution now adopted by the Assembly: – *First,* Because it implies that the Assembly is of opinion that upon the materials presented by the Union Committee a basis of union with the United Presbyterian and Reformed Presbyterian Churches maybe founded, whereas these materials do not imply that the Free Church, in entering upon such a union, is to maintain principles for which she has hitherto contended. *Second,* Because these principles are not only of vast importance in their bearing on the honor of Christ as King of Nations as well as King of Saints, but are of immediate practical importance, and require to be definitely settled with a view to the harmonious working of any united Church. *Third,* Because the recent proceedings upon the union question have caused great divisions in the Free Church, and as they promise to lead to no satisfactory result, it is absolutely essential that they should be brought to a close, in order to our internal unity and the success of all our operations in behalf of the cause of Christ both at home and abroad."

---

## REVIEW

*Why Presbyterians leave their own Church*: *the Causes and the Cure*. John L Sheriff, 18 Wynyard Square.

It is unhappily, the fact that, to use our author's mode of expression, which, however, we consider defective, that in not a few



instances, Presbyterians have left, and still leave, "their own church." The occurrence, and especially the frequent occurrence, of such defection, every enlightened and zealous Presbyterian must regard, on various grounds, as a grave evil. We, for our part, view it in that light; and we should, therefore, rejoice in the publication of the pamphlet before us, if it accomplished to any considerable extent, and by becoming and legitimate means, the object which the writer proposes to himself – that of setting forth "the causes and the cure" of the evil in question. But we cannot look upon it as at all fitted to accomplish that object more or less. Our estimate of it is, that while it is written professedly in the interest of Presbyterianism, it is far more likely to alienate and disgust Presbyterians, than to attract or retain them; and, if the members of other communions fall into the error – and it would not be a slight one – of regarding the writer as a representative Presbyterian, his production cannot fail to strengthen the prejudice, greater or less, with which they already regard the system which he disgraces by his advocacy of its claims. Presbyterians, we should imagine, are not likely to be retained in their own church, or, if they have wandered from it, reclaimed, by a writer who treats them with indignity and insult, and, from the language which he applies to them, seems specially anx-ious though one can scarcely suppose that this could be his object – to expose them to ridicule and, contempt. Of the language to which we refer, the following are specimens: – "Saunders, in his race for riches, has often shown most suppleness in directions where [in which] he should have shown least." "That small grey eye of his has discovered the fact that leading people belonged, or addicted themselves to, a more fashionable church than his own." "Saunders has old opinions, old histories, old saws, old prejudices to surmount." – "He smiles down all scruple by using the peculiarly Christian maxim, 'When you live in Turkey you must do as the Turkeys do.'" "Janet, his wife, opines that in a certain 'connection' she would be a finer lady than she can hope to be in her own, receiving and paying calls among a far different set from the levelling and porridge fed plebeians who unceremoniously jostle her at St. Mungo's." – "Inspired thus loftily, Saunders steals away from his ecclesiastical home." – "All this pleases Saunders. He feels his importance; and it is by no means in vain that this species of net is spread in the sight of this conceited and silly bird." – Now, surely, this is not becoming language to be applied to a nation as much entitled to respect and consideration as any represented in our community; and it is not such language as ought to be employed by one who has assumed the grave office of persuading his co-religionists to steadfast adherence to the scriptural faith and worship of the church of their fathers, – an office not to be performed by violating every requirement of courtesy and good taste, and descending to the

vulgarity and license of a buffoon.

When the pamphleteer speaks of "Presbyterians leaving their own church," he does not place the defection with which he charges them in the light in which it ought to be viewed. The fact that a certain church is "their own church" is no valid reason why they should continue in connection with it. There are many whose duty it is to leave "their own church." The claims of a church must arise primarily from the scripturalness of its creed, its worship, and its government; and the offence committed by Presbyterians when they "leave their own church" and join, say, the Church of England, lies in abandoning a church, whose character has, in all res-pects, been brought into close conformity to the scriptures, for a church whose imperfect reformation has left it still disfigured with not a little of an unscriptural character and of popish origin.

While the author of the pamphlet objects, as we also do on the grounds we have indicated, to Presbyterians leaving "their own church," he does not seem to have any objection to their church, by the adoption of innovations, virtually leaving them. By the adoption of this course, the scriptural purity and simplicity of Presbyterian worship is destroyed; a craving for aesthetic and sensational worship is created or encouraged; and, as a natural consequence, such worship will be sought where, at least within the territory of Protestantism, it is supplied in the greatest perfection. If Presbyterians are to be retained in their own communion, an opposite course must be pursued. The distinctive character of a pure Presbyterian Church, the excellencies which constitute its distinctive character, must be carefully preserved in association with life, enlightened zeal, and well directed activity. If this were done, and Presbyterian Churches were consequently what they ought to be, – if the testimony of the Church of Scotland were borne without compromise, and the truths which it embodies applied in faith, and with faithfulness, affection, and sufficient intelligence to the hearts and consciences of men, few Presbyterians would leave their own church, or resort to the ministrations of other communions, except when local circumstances rendered it impossible for them to attend on those of their own; and even then they would resort to them only temporarily.

Many years ago (we think in 1842), a tract on the subject of the pamphlet before us was written by the late Dr. James Hamilton, of London; and what a contrast the former production presents to the latter! Dr. Hamilton's tract is what it ought to be; and, though the name of the author were not given, the reader would soon perceive that it was written by a Christian gentleman who fully sympathised with the faithful contendings and the noble worthies of the Church of his fathers. We wish much it were in circulation in the colony. The title of it is "Remembering Zion."

---

## NEW HEBRIDES MISSION.
## THE FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MISSION VESSEL "DAY SPRING."

The season which has just closed has been singularly barren of striking events. We have little to report of the triumphs of the gospel on these islands; but it is no less true that we have far less to record of a depressing nature. Our mission vessel has pursued the even tenor of her way, ministering to the wants and comforts of the Missionaries, conveying the messengers of salvation from island to island; and promoting, in various ways, the general interests of the cause. We owe a debt of gratitude to God for his providential care over her; and for the measure of success which has attended her voyage.

The "Day Spring" arrived at these islands on the 23rd of April last, after a speedy and prosperous voyage from Melbourne, and she has been in active service ever since. The island of Aneiteum is her headquarters here; but most of her time is spent in missionary voyages. The following statement will give some idea of her work during the season. She has been once at New Caledonia, twice at the Loyalty Islands, four times at Futuna, seven times at Tana, nine times at Aniwa, nine times at Erromanga, five times at Fate, and once at each of the following islands, viz.: Espiritu Santo, Ambrym, Tonga, Awos, Three Hills, Makuru, and Nguna. These islands are comprised within an area of 400 miles in length, and 200 miles in width; and we feel assured that the amount of work done will satisfy the friends of the Mission. During these voyages our vessel has carried a large number of native passengers, having on board at various times during the season 78 Aneiteumese, 156 Tanese, 8 Futunese, 9 Aniwans, 27 Erromangans, 6 Fatians, and 30 natives of other islands. The time was when few natives were willing to voyage in the "Day Spring;" but their confidence has been gained where she is known, and is now becoming oppressive to us. It seems desirable to oblige



natives with a passage when this can be done without material interference with her work. An opportunity is thus afforded of forming their acquaintance under favorable circumstances, and acts of kindness seldom fail to win the heart even of a savage. Many of our native passengers visit the island of Aneiteum, and it is always a strange and impressive sight to them to see a people living under the peaceful influence of the gospel who, a few years ago, were like themselves "foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another."

The Annual Meeting of our Mission was held on Aneiteum in May last, and was a most agreeable, harmonious, and profitable one. The absence of our esteemed brother, the Rev. D. Morrison, was felt by every member present. He has been obliged, on account of failing health, to retire from the missionary work for a season. It is our earnest prayer to God that his health may be restored, and that he may be spared to labor in the work which he so much loves. The withdrawal of any member of the .Mission, when the work to be done is so great, and the laborers so few, is a most serious matter. Our consolation is that all events are under the control of God; and he doeth all things well.

The mission families have enjoyed a moderate share of health, and been enabled to prosecute their labors without any serious interruption. The work on Aneiteum, under the direction of Messrs. Geddie and Inglis, advances with little change. The Rev. J. Copeland is laying a sure foundation on Futuna, and being a man of deeds rather than words, little is known of his earnest and self-denying labors in the cause of Christ, but we anticipate good results on that island in due time. The Rev. J. Paton has found on Aniwa a people well prepared for the gospel through the labors of our native teachers, and he and his excellent wife are, with characteristic zeal, carrying forward the work which has been so successfully begun. On the island of Eromanga the Rev. J. Gordon has generously given up his station at Dillon's Bay to the Rev. J. McNair, and has removed to the opposite side of the island to grapple with the difficulties of a new station: and though these devoted brethren have encountered many trials, yet there are occasional gleams of sunshine which encourage them in their work of faith and labor of love. The Rev. J. and Mrs. Cosh have, by providential events, been left alone on Fate for the present, but they are not alone for God is with them; and they labor in his cause with tokens of success.

The most important event of the season lies been the settlement of the Rev. T. Neilson and wife on Tana. It is nearly two years since Nauka, the principal chief of Port Resolution, consented to receive a missionary, but the way was not clear to occupy that field until the present season. We are glad to say that

existing obstacles have disappeared to a large extent, and Mr. Neilson now occupies the field of his choice. He has erected a neat cottage in a suitable locality, and commences his missionary labors with fair prospects of success. We have much confidence in the Tanese, and do not anticipate, in the case of Mr. Neilson, more than the average perils incident to missionary life in these islands.

The missionary work on these islands is in a hopeful state at the present time. We are using God's means for the religious and moral elevation of these deeply degraded islanders; – and we trust that we have God's blessing also. If our progress has not been rapid many things seem to indicate that it has been sure. The experience of the past affords much ground for thankfulness to God, and demands no less than encourages increased exertion to extend the Redeemer's cause on these islands. Our great want at present is the want of men – men of faith and prayer – men whose hearts are warm with love to Christ and love to the souls of men –

men who are willing to spend and be spent for Christ. We have been laboring to arouse these long benighted islanders to a sense of their danger; and now that the cry reaches us from various quarters, "Come over and help us," shall we shrink from the consequences of our success, and leave them to perish in their sins. May God raise up instruments for his own work, and kindle in many a heart an unquenchable desire to come far hence, and preach among the "Gentiles" the unsearchable riches of Christ.

It is with extreme regret that we renew our solemn protest against the traffic in natives which has of late years sprung up in these islands. Cargoes of human beings are yearly carried off from this group by vessels bearing the British flag, and disposed of for a certain term of years in Queensland or the Fiji Islands. If to deprive a man of his liberty, and subject him to involuntary servitude is slavery, then we have no hesitation in pronouncing this traffic a revival of the slave trade. In some cases the unhappy victims are treacherously seized; in other cases advantage is taken of their ignorance and credulity, and the instances are rare in which they know where they are going, what they are to do, and how long they are to be away. The whole system, as it is conducted in these islands, is a gross violation of the laws of God, and a cruel outrage on the most sacred rights of man. The removal of a cargo of natives from any of these islands, where Christian influence is still unfelt, is always a calamitous event. There is an abrupt disruption of all natural, domestic, and social ties which leaves society in a very chaotic state, and confusion, disorder, and bloodshed are not infrequently the result. It is satisfactory to know that stringent laws have been enacted in Australia at least, for the protection of the natives, which shows that public feeling is yet sound on the subject; but alas! the evil is done, and they are deprived of their liberty before these laws can reach them. We would now call on the friends of missions to unite their influence against the unhallowed traffic which is fast desolating these fair islands.

In conclusion, we would solicit the continued interest of our dear young friends in our missionary vessel. It was your contributions that built the "Day Spring," and your contributions must keep her afloat. The children belonging to the Wesleyan, London, and other missionary societies have their missionary vessels, and it is right that Presbyterian children should be represented on the sea also. Let your contributions be accompanied by your prayers, that God would make our vessel a messenger of mercy to many who are now sitting in darkness, and "in the region and shadow of death," and generations yet unborn shall bless you.

*Contributions in aid of the Day Spring are earnestly solicited from Sabbath Schools and other friends of the New Hebrides Mission.*

# Correspondence.

## CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

[The following letter ought to have appeared earlier; but, though it has immediate reference to a meeting held some time ago, the views it presents and maintains are of permanent importance.]

*To the Editor of "The Testimony."*

Sir, – I have lately read an account of a meeting held in Sydney by certain parties favorable to, and bent on, the total abolition of capital punishment. In that account, there is no mention of any scriptural argument being adduced in favor of the object contemplated, or of any attempt being made to grapple with the passages of Scripture, which are so obviously opposed to the accomplishment of such an object. Among others that might be adduced against such an object, is that contained in Genesis 9: 6; "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man." Here we have the divine intimat- 559

ion respecting the punishment of murder, and the reason assigned, "for in the image of God made he man." The most criminal aspect of murder is that the perpetrator has put forth his hand against God's image, and he consequently forfeits his life. Every man – even the most depraved – bears the natural image of God; and this renders it peculiarly criminal to abuse him; just as it in reckoned a sort of treason to destroy a king's image, as the act implies hatred against him, and that, if he himself were within reach, he would be treated in the same manner. The time at which this command was issued is to be noted. It was during the period of the patriarchal economy, and long before the Jewish nation had any existence; hence it cannot be called a mere Jewish institution.

We are aware that the statement above referred to has been represented as a divine warning or a divine enunciation of a fact, and not as a divine command prescribing the course to be adopted in regard to a wilful murderer. But the absurdity of this interpretation is quite apparent, when it is viewed in connection with the latter part of the statement "for in the image of God made he man." What force or sense, could there be in this, if the foregoing clause is to be taken as a warning against shedding even the blood of a murderer, or if it only enunciates the fact that the life of the murderer would be taken, – a fact, according to these reasoners, abhorrent to God.

According to them, God predicts that the unwarrantable result of taking the life of a murderer will take place, for this reason, that he made man in his own image. To put such reasoning as this into the mouth of the Divine Being is shocking in the highest degree. The inflicting of capital punishment is, we believe, sometimes characterised as a revengeful act, and it is alleged that the magistrate, in inflicting it, is assuming the place of God, as a proof that on this ground it ought to be condemned, the words of the Apostle are quoted: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves – but rather give place unto wrath, for it is written, Vengeance is mine and I will repay saith the Lord." Such parties have only to read the first four verses of the following chapter to see that the passage above quoted is in no way applicable to the case, in support of which it is adduced, The magistrate in this, as in other lawful exercises of his office, is acting as God's minister, carrying out his appointment. "He is the minister of God to thee for good; but if thou do that which is evil be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Rom. 13: 4. He, by whom these words were written, evidently did not hold that, in every case, capital punishment ought to be abolished. For, in his defence before Festus, he thus speaks: "If I have committed

anything worthy of death I refuse not to die." The Apostle admits that there are crimes worthy of death, and stated that, if he had committed any of these, he would not object to the law taking its course. On other occasions he maintained his just rights, and, if he had considered that death punishment ought, in no case, to be inflicted, he would doubtless have objected to it. It will he a sad day for this country if it ever should have a legislature so daring as to repeal the divine enactment regarding the disposal of murderers. And it is high time that all who would maintain that enactment combine together for resisting the efforts made for setting it aside in the legislation of the land.

I am, yours truly,

PRESBYTER.

18th June, 1869.

---

DEATH OF THE REV. JAMES MACBEAN,
OF FORT AUGUSTUS.

[The following paragraph, which we extract from an Inverness paper, will be interesting to those of our readers who knew Mr. Macbean, as we have no doubt many of them did. There are two sisters of Mr. Macbean's in the colony, Mrs. Peter Stewart of Syd-ney, and Mrs. George Cameron of Maitland.]

Our obituary of today records the death of this distinguished servant of God, than whom no minister was more highly esteemed in the wide circle of his acquaintance and influence in the north of Scotland. He was an eloquent, fervid, and most impressive preacher both in English and Gaelic, though in the latter he shone pre-eminently – a star of the first magnitude. For a period of forty years he has been in labors manifold in his Master's cause, and through his instrumentality, we believe, many in various parts of the Highlands and Islands have been won to Christ, and added to the Church of such as shall be saved. We believe Mr. Macbean commenced his public career as inspector of Gaelic schools, and in this office did good service. He labored for many years with eminent success in Lewis and the Hebrides, and since the Disruption in Fort Augustus, assisting with great acceptance on communion occasions throughout the north, devoting himself with untiring zeal and energy to the work of the ministry, and taking the most lively and intelligent and active interest in the great questions of the day that bore on the cause of Christ's kingdom and the social and moral amelioration of the people. He had come to Inverness with the view of collecting some money amongst friends to aid in the liquidation of debt on ecclesiastical buildings, and had intended to preach in the East Church on the second Sabbath preceding his death. The Rev. Mr. Sutherland improved the solemn event on Sabbath last, preaching in the morning from 2 Corinthians 5: 8, in the afternoon from Hebrews 13: 7, and in the evening 1st Thessalonians 4: 13. Mr. Sutherland bore affectionate tribute to the eminent worth of the lamented deceased, his distinguished gifts and graces, his rare pulpit ability, the unction of his ministrations, and his admirable suitableness for the evangelistic work that had been assigned him by the Master to do. He remarked that he, whose presence at the great congregation on communion seasons had been so often hailed with delight by God's people, would be seen no more – the tongue that had so often spoken a word in season was mute and silent in death. A foremost standard-bearer had been cut down in the field – a prince and a great man had fallen in Israel. Mr. S. expressed his sense of the magnitude of the losses the Church had sustained. The Lord had visited her with breach on breach. One after another of their most honored ministers was taken from ministering to sinners on earth to the service of the upper sanctuary. Star after star was disappearing from the firmament, but the residue of the spirit was with him by whose light they had shone, and whose radiance they had been honored to reflect and to diffuse.


# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 48. SYDNEY, SEPTEMBER 1869.

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. 48 SEPTEMBER.


**CONTENTS**.


PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Token of the Covenant; or, the Subjects, the Mode, and the Nature and Design of Baptism … … … … | 561 |
| Dancing and Doing Alms … … … … | 563 |
| The Relations of Civil Rulers to Religion … … … | 565 |
| Moderatism in Victoria – Rev. P. S. Menzies A.M. … … | 566 |

Remembering Zion … … … … … 569
Death of Rev. Francis Macbean … … … … 570
Death of Rev. Archibald McGilvray … … … 570
A Conversation between a Minister and one of his Hearers … 571

## THE TOKEN OF THE COVENANT OR, THE SUBJECTS, THE MODE, AND THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

(*Continued from page* 552.)

### II. MODE OF BAPTISM.

40. We now proceed to the second of the topics we proposed to consider, – the mode of baptism, and let us first determine the state of the question. Some, then, maintain that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism; in opposition to these we hold that baptism is scripturally and validly administered not only by immersion but also by sprinkling or effusion. We do not deny that immersion is a legitimate mode of baptism; our opponents hold that it is, and we agree with them. But we hold that sprinkling or effusion is also a legitimate mode of administering the ordinance, and this our opponents deny. The question, then, is, is sprinkling or effusion a legitimate and valid mode of baptism; this question presents for determination the only point at issue. It may be remarked here

that, though it so happens among us that those, who hold that infants are not to be baptised, hold also that sprinkling or effusion is not a legitimate mode of baptism, still there is no connection between the two positions; and, accordingly, there have been persons who held the former but rejected the latter of them. The anti-pedobaptist dogma, therefore, and the dogma that baptism is not legitimately administered by sprinkling or effusion are not to be regarded as so connected, as parts of one system, that what affords support to the one affords also some support to the other. On the contrary, they are so entirely detached from each other, logically, that the establishment or refutation of either would leave the claims of the other to belief wholly unaffected.

41. Those who deny that sprinkling or effusion is a legitimate mode of baptism maintain that the Greek words for *Baptise* and *baptism* signify respectively, *immerse, plunge, dip,* and *immersion, plunging, dipping,* and are so restricted to those significations, that the use of them to denote the administration of baptism and baptism itself proves that the only proper mode of baptism is immersion. They make a similar assertion with respect to the meaning of the Greek word *bapto,* from which the word for baptise – *baptizo* – is derived. Let us examine what ground they have for this restriction of the meaning of these words, and for the argument which they found upon it: and let us begin with *bapto* as the primitive or parent word. Our examples of the use of it we shall give only in literal translations, "putting the corresponding word or words in italic. This will be most convenient for most readers; for the passages in Greek would interrupt their progress, like so many fences across their path, while they would yield them no compensating advantage. The following then are examples of the use of *bapto** : – "Being pressed, it *stains* the hand." Here there is no plunging, nor the least approach to it. "The pool was *stained* or *tinged* with blood." Here again plunging is out of the question; or, if there be plunging, it is the "blood," with which the operation is performed, that is plunged in the "pool," on which it is performed, and not the "pool" in the blood, as, according to the meaning to which our opponents restrict the word, ought to be the case. "*Staining or smearing* (his face) with tawny colours." The person doing this would not dip his face in those colours, but would apply the colours to his face. In the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament this word is used in Daniel 4: 33, (Greek 30) – "His body" – Nebuchadnezzar's – *was wet* with the dew of heaven; and again in the next chapter, verse 21, where the same words occur. This "wetting" was, of course, effected by the descent of the "dew" upon Nebuchadnezzar's "body," and not by the immersion of his "body" in the "dew." Whatever the dew wets, it wets by falling on it. From its entire economy there can be no immersion in it. If it were collected in some bath or cistern so that immersion in it could take place, it would assume the character of water and would be divested of that of dew. But it was not by immersion in such dew water that Nebuchadnezzar's body was wet. "He was driven from men and did eat grass as oxen; and," of course, in the circumstances into which the divine judgment thus degraded him, "the dew of heaven" fell on him, and "his body was wet" with it, or *from* it, as it is expressed in the Greek, that is, from the action of the dew upon it.

42. From the parent, which clearly will not accept *immerse* as its distinctive and exclusive meaning, we proceed to the offspring, the Greek word for *baptise*. Our opponents maintain,

* See Ewing's Greek Lexicon under the word



that the distinctive and exclusive meaning of this word is *immerse,* and argue that, therefore, as it is the word employed in the scriptures to denote the administration of baptism, the scriptural mode of administering baptism is immersion. It wholly vitiates this argument, whatever force it might otherwise have, that the alleged fact on which it is founded is not the actual fact in the case. *Immerse* or *plunge* is not the distinctive and exclusive meaning of the word in question. That word occurs in the following passage in which *plunge* cannot well be the meaning of it. "She – Judith – went out in the night, into the valley of Bethulia and *washed* (*baptised herself*) in the camp in (or rather, *at* * ) the fountain of water." Though we retain the translation, "in the fountain" it does not at all follow that the operation performed was that of plunging in it. She might, be said to perform it "in the fountain," though she only stood at the side of the fountain, and took from it with her hand or otherwise the water which she used in performing it. And, while the language does not necessarily denote, if it at all denotes, plunging, it does not appear that the circumstances would admit of it. We at once meet with the difficulty that she could not well plunge in a fountain; and, though it were practicable, it would have been improper to have plunged in a fountain from which water was drawn for drinking, the only fountain apparently available for the purpose. Besides, it would have been necessary for her to undress in preparation for plunging; but how could she undress, with any propriety or decency, at a fountain in a camp occupied by some two hundred thousand soldiers? No modest woman would undress or perform an operation that required undressing in such circumstances, and we may rest assured that Judith did neither. Whether her nightly lustrations were intended to promote personal cleanliness or to secure ceremonial purity, plunging was not necessary to accomplish her object; and are we gratuitously to suppose that she performed an unnecessary operation, which, supposing it practicable, would have been grossly indecent in a crowded camp? Such a supposition cannot for a moment be entertained. Here then is an instance in which the Greek word for *baptise* does not signify *plunge* or immerse. The circumstances will not permit us to attach that meaning to it, and we doubt much if the construction in which it occurs will; while the use of the

preposition *epi* with the genetive is in perfect harmony with the view that she stood *on* the side of the fountain and took *from* it the water used by her in the operation which she was performing. **

43. In Ecclesiastes 34: 30, the word under consideration is applied to one "that is *washed* (*G*reek *baptised,*) from the pollution of a dead body;" now was the washing in such a case as this effected by *plunging*? The answer to this question is furnished by Numbers 19: 13. There we read – "Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel; because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him." We are thus taught, in the plainest manner, that it was by *sprinkling* and not by *plunging* that one who had contracted uncleanness by touching a dead body was purified; and one thus purified is viewed in the passage which we have quoted from Ecclesiastes as being baptised. In other words according to the phraseology of that passage one is *baptised* by being *sprinkled.*

---

* "The preposition used is "epi," of which the primary meaning is "upon." It is here followed by the genetive.

* * See Winer's Gram., Sect. 51, Donaldson's Greek Gram., Sect. 983. *a*.

Referring to this and other instances and modes of purification the apostle, Heb. 9: 10, calls them "divers *baptisms,"* – the word rendered "washings" in our translation being the Greek word for *baptism.* We have just seen that, according to the usage exemplified in Ecclesiastes 34: 30, he that was *sprinkled* with the water of separation, and thus purified was baptised; and in the passage now before us, this purification, by *sprinkling* and not by *plunging*, is called a *baptism*, for it is included in the "divers baptisms" spoken of, and is, indeed, mentioned as one of them in the immediately succeeding context, – verse 13.

44. It is a similar baptism, – baptism not by the application of the baptised to the water, but by the application of the water to the baptised, – that is intended in Luke 11: 37-38. We are informed in that passage that our Lord, having been invited by a Pharisee to dine with him, "went in and sat down to meat;" and that, "when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first *washed* (Greek *baptised,*) before dinner." He did not expect that Christ would *baptise* by plunging or immersing his whole body in water. The traditions and customs of his sect and nation did not require such a baptism under the circumstances. What they required, and he accordingly expected, was that his guest would "wash his hands" before "he sat down to meat," for "the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders;" and it was customary among them to wash the hands by pouring water upon them. We have thus the most conclusive proof that, according to Luke's phraseology, – for it is clearly in the evangelist's own words that the cause of the Pharisee's wonder, namely, that Christ had not "first baptised before dinner," is stated, – a person has been "baptised," when water has been applied, for the purpose of purification, even to a small part of his body, as, for example, to his hands, and thus applied by affusion. But leaving out of view the mode of application, let it be distinctly observed that the fact is in evidence, that, according to the evangelist's phraseology, a person has been "baptised" when, for the purpose of purification, water has been applied even to his bands. Now, clearly, a person thus baptised has not been plunged, – he has been baptised without having been plunged. Even though it may have been by plunging that his hands have been washed, still he himself, the subject of the baptism effected in the case, has not been plunged; he has been baptised without having been plunged, water having been applied only to his hands. Here, again, the assertion of our opponents, confident as it is, – and, of course, it is very confident, – is flatly contradicted by usage, and by scripture usage too. The evangelist informs us that the Pharisee marvelled that the Saviour "was not first before dinner baptised" by washing his hands; but if *baptising* were just plunging and nothing else, he would not be *baptised,* that is to say, he would be *plunged,* however often he washed his hands and in what-ever way he washed them. But baptising is not plunging exclusively; it is the application of water, in whatever way, for the purpose of purification, and therefore he to whose hands it has been applied for this purpose has, according to the Scripture mode of viewing the matter, been baptised.

45. In the following passage cases of baptism are referred to, that were of very frequent occurrence amongst the Jews at the time of which the evangelist writes. "When they come from the market, except they wash (Greek *baptise*), they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing (Greek *baptisms)* of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." The "brazen vessels" intended were probably such as were used for culinary purposes; and the word rendered tables means properly *couches, beds*, and it



is the *couches* on which they reclined at table, large enough to accommodate several persons, that seem to be particularly meant. Now such brazen vessels could not be conveniently "washed" or baptised by being plunged in water, and plunging could still less be resorted to in "baptising" couches. Such a mode of treating such articles of furniture, as any one on the least reflection must perceive, would be quite impracticable among ourselves, and, though not impracticable, would in many instances be open to grave objections; and it was equally impracticable and objectionable among the Jews in the time of our Lord.

46. In Mark 1: 8, we read that one of the declarations that John the Baptist made, as he "preached," was, "I indeed have baptised you with water, but he (Christ) shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost." The idea of being plunged in the Spirit seems gross and irreverent, and certainly receives no countenance from Scripture representation, but is, indeed, inconsistent with it. The Bible teaches us to conceive and speak of the Spirit as being "poured forth" upon those to whom he is communicated; and we have the clearest evidence that when it was predicted and promised that Christ should "baptise with the Holy Ghost," what was intended was, that he should "pour forth" the Spirit on the subjects of that baptism. Christ himself, immediately before his ascension reiterated and renewed the announcement of the Baptist. "John truly baptised with water," he said to the apostles, "but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." – Acts 1: 5. And, when this promise was fulfilled on the day of pentecost, Peter testified with respect to the fulfilment of it, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit." Acts 2: 16-18. Thus we have express testimony that Christ "baptised them with the Holy Ghost" by "pouring out on them of his Spirit;" he baptised them by affusion. And here the enquiry suggests itself, – when John said "I baptise you

with water, but he that cometh after me shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost," is it to be supposed that the *mode* of the baptism which he administered was different from that of the baptism which it symbolised. The baptism symbolised was by affusion, and is it to be supposed that the baptism which symbolised it was not by affusion but by immersion? This want of correspondence would be wholly inconsistent with the relation which they bore to each other; and we shall by-and-by find that there are strong grounds for concluding that John's baptism, – the symbolising baptism in the case, – was by affusion.

47. It is thus evident that the assertion of our opponents with respect to the meaning of the word for *baptise* and of the kindred word for *baptism* is as baseless as it is confident, and that the application of those words to the ordinance under consideration affords no countenance whatever to the doctrine, that the legitimate mode of administering it is immersion. And neither do the prepositions, rendered *into, in, out of, from,* that are used in connection with the words in question. Thus when it is stated that Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch "went down into the water," and that, when Philip had baptised, the eunuch, they "came up *out* of the water," (Acts 8: 37, 39), the language does not at all require that we should regard the eunuch as having been baptised by immersion; for the prepositions rendered *into* and *out of* may be rendered with equal propriety *unto* or *to* and *from.* The former is used in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus from the dead, – "Jesus, therefore; again groaning in himself, cometh to the grave," John 11: 38. Here clearly the meaning of the preposition is not *into* but *to,* as our translators have rendered it; for the Saviour only came *to* the grave, he did not go *into* it. The latter of these prepositions is used in John 6: 23, – "Then came other boats *from* Tiberias." They had not been on dry land *in* the city, so that they came *out* of it; they only came *from* it. But retaining the rendering of the authorised version, the narrative does not by any means necessarily convey that the eunuch was immersed. Though the water were only ankle deep, if they alighted from the chariot and stood in it, it might be said that they went down *into,* and afterwards came up *out of* the water.

Whether we translate the prepositions by *into* and *out of,* or by *to* and *from*, I apprehend the narrative would not suggest immersion, except to a mind preoccupied with the idea of it or prepossessed in its favour. There is no hint, it will be observed, of any undressing and putting on of bathing clothes, or of the subsequent and reverse process of putting off the bathing clothes and then dressing; and yet, if there had been an immersion, such changing of garments could scarcely have been dispensed with. And then it is a source of difficulty, on the supposition that the going down into the water implied immersion, that Philip went down into the water as well as the eunuch, that thus Philip as well as the eunuch was immersed, and that the eunuch, being immersed already, could not be immersed to be baptized, unless Philip, himself immersed, raised him bodily out of the water, and then plunged him into it, an operation that would require considerable strength, and, on certain not improbable suppositions, greater strength than the operator could exert. These are very awkward difficulties, which, however, all disappear if we take the view, that the Ethiopian treasurer was immersed neither before he was baptized nor during the administration of the ordinance, but that, having gone down *into* shallow water or gone down *to* the water, that is, to the edge of it, he was baptized by affusion.

48. There is still another preposition which our opponents have pressed into their service, and of which, therefore, we must take some notice, – the preposition rendered *in* in the following passage, "They were baptised of him in Jordan" (Matt. 3: 6). This preposition might with equal propriety be rendered *at.* But the statement "that they were baptised *in* Jordan," taking it as our translators give it, conveys no intimation that in being baptised they were immersed in the river. This mode of expression is equally appropriate on the supposition, that John, standing with them at the side of the river, raised from it with his hand or otherwise the water with which he baptized them. In perfect harmony with this view of the circumstances, it is stated towards the close of the brief history of John's baptism, given in this chapter, (verse 16,) that "Jesus, when he was baptised," in Jordan, (see verse 6 and 13), "went up straightway from the water." Our translators say "*out of* the water," but the preposition here is not *ek,* the preposition rendered *out of,* on which we formerly remarked, but *apo* which means *from.* The impression which this representation conveys is, that our Lord was not *in* the water, but only *at* the edge of it.

---

## DANCING AND DOING ALMS, OR BALLS AND BENEVOLENCE.

Neither the rich nor the poor are in man's normal condition. Accumulation and poverty alike have their origin in the derangement which sin has caused. In the absence of this derangement none would desire ought else or more than the seasonable and adequate supply of their wants, and by an exercise of ind-564

ustry which, instead of fatiguing, would itself afford enjoyment, all would obtain this supply as the unfailing provision made for them by the fatherly care and providence of God. In such circumstances there would be no inducement to accumulate, and before the entrance of sin avarice and kindred lusts had no existence, and accumulation therefore would not result from their activity.

In the state of things, however, to which the fall has given rise and which now obtains, we have the rich and the poor with us, or, to express ourselves more generally, society is composed of those who have enough and, to a greater or less extent, to spare, and of those who, to a greater or less extent, are in want. The diversity of circumstances which thus exists serves, as, indeed, existing, it could not fail to serve, important purposes in the scheme of divine Providence, and, particularly, forms a large and marked element of the case with which each individual has to deal in acting his part, whether he be poor or rich, as a subject of the divine government.

On the poor certain duties devolve in consequence of their being poor, and among them the cherishing of certain feelings and the maintenance of a certain bearing and deportment towards the rich. And, on the other hand, certain duties devolve on the rich as being rich, and among these, and very prominent among them, the cherishing of certain feelings and the pursuit of a certain practical course towards the poor. To this latter branch of the duties of the rich there seems at present, judging from the strange antics – for we cannot use a milder expression – that have recently been played and that are played from time to time, as a mode of discharging them, to be an urgent necessity for directing attention.

The first duty which the rich owe to the poor is that of sympathising with them, discharging thus towards them the obligation to weep with those that weep, which the benevolent sovereign of the universe has imposed upon all. Whatever further duty it may devolve upon them to perform towards them, they are first of all to feel for them with honest and genuine feeling; they are to enter into their afflictions and sorrows, so that, in a sense, and so far as this appropriation may be practicable, they shall make them their own. It is only when they have performed or,

rather, when they are at the time performing this first duty that they can proceed aright to perform the duty that lies beyond it and that, indeed, constitutes the complement and continuation of it, the duty of affording material relief. They may, no doubt, afford such relief mechanically and from corrupt motives, but their duty in the matter is, to afford it under the influence and in practical manifestation of the feelings with which they ought to regard – with which an enlightened Christian philanthropist would regard – the case of those to whom they afford it. Now whatever precise peculiarities may distinguish the case of those to whom it may be afforded in a given instance, the existence of such a case, and the existence of it as one of a countless number, is a sufficiently grave and melancholy fact, and ought, of course, to be regarded with corresponding feelings. But if it be regarded with such feelings, and, consequently, dealt with under their influence and in expression of them, the mode of dealing with it will from beginning to end and in all its details be in harmony with them. It will throughout be grave and earnest. Dancing, most assuredly, will have no place in it. A fancy dress ball or a ball of any kind will form no part of it or accessory to it.

This express exclusion of balls from the list of legitimate means of affording relief to the necessitous would not have so much as occurred to us, if repeated instances of recourse to them avowedly for this purpose had not suggested it to us. For surely there is something incongruous and even revolting, something which it is impossible to reconcile with honest earnestness and right feeling, in the conduct of those whose first step in proceeding, as they profess, to deal with the wants and disadvantages to which some of their neighbours are subjected, is to procure for themselves highly exciting and by no means inexpensive pleasure – the pleasure, not at all elevating or even pure, which the ballroom yields. What is there in the case before them at which they rejoice, that they indulge in such festivity? One would suppose that in the presence of the evils which it exhibits and of the illustration which it affords of the lazar house character which to so deplorable an extent man's earthly habitation bears, they would be too sad, for the time if not permanently, to relish or even endure at least such pleasures as are sought beyond the range of activity and enjoyment which God has assigned to us here.

But it will, we presume, be alleged by those, who held recently in Sydney a ball of the kind to which we refer, that their object was not to procure pleasure for themselves but to procure funds for the School of Industry. But whatever funds they procured they procured from themselves; and, surely, it was a strange circuitous and wasteful method of procuring funds from themselves, to expend on a ball for dresses, in carriage hire, for the use of the room in which the ball was held, and for music and refreshments, probably ten times the amount of the funds they thus procured. Would it not have been more simple and greatly more effective, and, at the same time, more consonant with genuine benevolence and with honest earnestness of purpose in the matter, if they contributed directly towards the funds, which, professedly, they sought to replenish by holding a ball, all that the ball cost them. If they had adopted this method, their contribution to those funds would have exceeded, we have no doubt, by some ninety per cent, the amount, which the expensive and fantastic, though to themselves attractive, mode of collection which they adopted left them to contribute.

The truth is, however, that the real object of the School of Industry ball was wholly different from the professed object of it. The necessities of the School of Industry merely furnished an excuse for holding it, placing it at the same time in such a relation, that those who held it might, by a little dexterity in self deception, imagine that in holding it they were doing a very charitable thing, and doing it in a peculiarly elegant manner and with great refinement. As to the real object of it, it was exactly what the object of balls always is and, from the entire conception and adaptations of the thing, must be. If men were not "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," balls would be unknown.

In the arrangements of Divine Providence the exercise of benevolence is intended to benefit not only those towards whom, but also and still more, though in a different manner, those by whom it is exercised. Thus the right exercise of it is attended with a double blessing, the greater blessing accruing to those who exercise it, for "it is more blessed to give than to receive." But, when such wretched caricatures of the exercise of benevolence as the holding of charity balls are substituted for the genuine exercise of it, the blessedness of giving is forfeited. Nor is this all while the operation of the ballroom as it affects not only the spiritual interests of those who resort to it; but also their moral condition, is always and necessarily highly pernicious, the charity ball exerts a peculiar and distinctive demoralising influence, arising partly from the fact that such balls are always held "under false pretences," and not less from the further fact, that they introduce mirth under its giddiest form in a relation in which sympathetic sorrow: and grave earnestness, if not tears, are called for, and thus at once display and produce a levity and callousness, which unwomanly as they are, only fashionable women could exhibit. 565

The part that men take in charity balls they take at the instance of such women.

---

## THE RELATIONS OF CIVIL RULERS TO RELIGION.

In proceeding to constitute the Free Church Assembly, the Rev. Mr. Nixon preached an able and seasonable discourse from John 18: 36, and treated of the relation to his truth and kingdom in which Christ has placed civil rulers, setting forth their duty with respect to popery, with respect to the independence of the Church of Christ, and with respect to the promotion and support of the true religion.

1. DUTY OF CIVIL RULERS WITH RESPECT TO POPERY.

"With the word of Christ to guide them, civil rulers are bound to deal with the Romish Church as the greatest enemy on earth of all the interests which it is their duty, to protect, foster, and advance; as the enemy of Christ, the enemy of his truth, the enemy of the Sabbath, the enemy of men's salvation, the enemy of the rights and liberties of all Christian Churches, the enemy of the sound education of the young, the enemy of conscience, the enemy of human freedom, the enemy of all human progress, the greatest enemy of all worldly states and kingdoms, as well as of that kingdom which is not of this world. If civil rulers require to give this system standing room within the land, they cannot be of the truth and hear the voice of Christ, without, at the same time, perceiving and remembering that they are tolerating the presence of an enemy that will try, in return for the shelter received, to crush the very national liberty of which it is permitted to take advantage. To attempt *bribing* into quietness and loyalty such a system is as wicked, and will be found as foolish, as it would be to attempt bribing the wicked one himself to let truth prevail and virtue flourish. And the rulers are neither wisely patriotic, nor faithful Christian rulers, who fail to watch this system with a jealous eye, and resolutely to keep it in check, until the truth, the grace, and the power of Christ accomplish its destruction, and the Churches and nations are at length enabled to breathe freely by being delivered from its presence."

2. DUTY OF CIVIL RULERS WITH RESPECT TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"They are forbidden to rule his kingdom, and to control it

within its own spiritual province, by their laws and power. Alas for all State Churches in Europe, for civil government has stripped them of their dignity as subject in spiritual things only to Christ, and has taken from them the power to serve him faithfully according to his word. Alas for even the Established Church of the northern part of Britain, for it has allowed the civil power to enter within it and to set aside the law of Christ. Alas, still more, for the Church of England, for many of the best of her ministers and people have learned to trust and even glory in the civil supremacy which is her shame; that supremacy which has taken the keys of the kingdom given by Christ to his ministers and placed them in the hands of the civil magistrate; that supremacy which has superseded his courts, annihilated his discipline, protected the preaching of the deadliest error from her pulpits, and harbours popish, infidel, and profligate teachers, equally with the true and faithful ministers of the gospel, in safety and worldly comfort within her pale."

3. DUTY OF CIVIL RULERS WITH RESPECT TO THE PROMOTION AND SUPPORT OF THE TRUE RELIGION.

"There is a relation of official neutrality on the part of civil rulers to the truth and kingdom of Christ for which many in the present day contend. The advocates of this neutrality may indeed hold that civil rulers ought to be personally Christians – ought to go to their official work as rulers in a Christian spirit, as any human worker should go to his work in a Christian spirit – and that

they even ought to take laws from the Bible, so far as concerns the outward conduct of subjects to each other in the civil relations of life. On that ground – on the ground of civil justice between man and man – civil rulers may enforce a proper law of marriage, secure freedom from labor on the Sabbath to those who wish to spend it in religious duties, and furnish opportunities to the people generally when they wish them for acts of public humiliation or thanksgiving. But even these arrangements, though made in outward conformity with the letter of the requirements of the Divine Word, are, according to these advocates of neutrality, to be made by the civil magistrate in favor of his subjects merely on the ground of the civil obligation which rulers and ruled, and the ruled among themselves, owe to each other, and not on the ground of the civil magistrate's competence to interfere in any way whatever with the relations in which they stand to God, or on the ground of his having any direct official duty to perform to the truth and kingdom of Christ. For they hold very resolutely that the sphere of the magistrate's duty in no way touches religion as it lies between men and God; that, as regards religion, in that view of it, he discharges the whole of the duty incumbent on him, and goes the whole length allowed to him, when officially he simply and alike protects all in adopting and practising what religion they prefer; and that, as regards the Churches of Christ, he fulfils his obligations to them when he secures equally to them, and to all religious societies of whatever name, a fair field and no further favor. It is an untenable foundation on which to erect this theory to tell us that the end of the magistrate's office is the temporal welfare of society. For, first, it s a painfully unfounded assumption to say of any human agency whatever, that absolutely the only end it is intended and ought to be employed to secure is one of a temporal and perishable nature. Whatever immediate formal end certain kinds of human agency may be appointed to serve, there is not one of them that has not for its ultimate and higher end results that reach, and ought to be realised as reaching, through eternity. Second, even while the civil magistrate is to contemplate, as the immediate formal end of his government, the temporal welfare of society, he is bound as a reasonable, and, still more as a Christian man, to take the best, the cheapest, the easiest, and the surest way of accomplishing that end. And as godliness has the promise of the life which now is, as well as of that which is to come, the civil magistrate, as having charge of the life that now is, is officially bound actively to foster that godliness by which, more than by all other means within his reach, this, the immediate formal end of his office, may be attained. Third, as we have already said, while the temporal wellbeing of society is the immediate formal end of the magistrate's office, it is not true that this is the actual, ultimate, principal end of his office, or of any office in this world. In all departments of human agency men are bound to have regard to the glory of God and the future and eternal destiny of every son of man. And therefore, both with a view to the immediate formal end of his government, which is the public good, and with a view also to the ultimate and infinitely the most important results of all human agency, the civil magistrate is bound to recognise, and to act under the acknowledgment of, the relation in which he and his government, and those that compose it, stand to God and his word, to Christ and his truth and kingdom. It is said that any distinction officially made by the civil magistrate in favor of true Christians and true Churches, and in favor of the truth, is civil injustice to those who hold by what is reckoned vital error in religion. But to affirm that the civil magistrate who, with the general consent, affords peculiar countenance and support to the truth and kingdom of Christ in the land, acts unjustly by hose who are opposed to the truth, is to affirm that 566
men are wronged by having to live in a land in which, contrary to their notions of fitness, the best means are effectually used and divinely blessed for advancing the highest interests for time and for eternity of the great bulk and body of the people. The advocates of official neutrality on the part of civil rulers in the conflicts going on between truth and error in religion are accustomed to argue, that civil rulers could not legislate at all in favor of the truth without employing such coercion in its favor as is contrary to the spirit and enactments of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. That means that formal legislation in every shape and form in favor of true religion involves the offence of violence to the consciences of men and to the right of private judgment. But this averment seems a mere abuse of words, and the raising up of a mere bugbear. All legislation in favor of the truth and kingdom of Christ that sought to compel men to believe those doctrines which the laws set forth as truth, by subjecting those who differed from these doctrines to penalties from which such as received them were freed – all that sort of legislation would be chargeable with the coercion of conscience, and is therefore to be utterly abhorred. But to say that civil rulers cannot officially and legislatively set forth the claims of Christ, of his truth and kingdom, to universal acceptance, without resorting to such compulsion, is to contradict reason and observation as well as Scripture. To say that civil government cannot use its moral influence alone for any purpose is to shut our eyes to as plain a fact as that the sun shines. Even in political matters, it often uses its mere moral influence with nations abroad, and with its people at home, to secure the adoption of sound principles and courses of action, in cases in which it has and claims no power to enforce its counsels. And surely what civil government does even in political matters, it can do in reference to those higher truths and interests in which it is bound to take the deepest concern. 'Tis said, indeed, that to give such aid even to true religion in a land, if there be some in that land who dissent from the religion aided and from the aid given, is to "violate political justice" This is simply a pompous way of uttering what is absurd and presumptuous; for it is the same as to say that the rulers and people of a nation must, as such, avoid making any profession and abstain from giving any practical proof of their national

relation and responsibility to the Prince of the kings of the earth, the Governor among the nations, if a few factious Christians are not satisfied that the thing is rightly done, or if a few free thinkers are of opinion that the thing should not be done at all. We hear again occasionally a little big talk in a small way about the principle of what is dignified with the name of fiscal responsibility, as entitling, and even requiring of civil rulers, whenever they assist Christian services, to direct and control authoritatively the services so assisted, in order that they may have due control over the means applied for such a purpose; as if, forsooth, civil rulers had not sufficient control over their own resources, in being able and bound, at any moment, to withdraw them, when they ceased to reckon the services worthy of their aid. It is said, however, to be contrary to the nature, the genius, and the spirit of Christianity, that civil rulers should aid materially in its advancement. But true religion has been essentially of the same nature from the beginning of the world. And if assistance was given to it with Divine approbation, not only by Jewish rulers, but by Gentile monarchs in ancient times, such assistance was not opposed to the nature of true religion then, and cannot be opposed to it now. In this matter, as in many others, extremes meet. Advocates of indiscriminate State support to all religions, and advocates of the refusal of all State support to any, agree in this, that all religions should be placed on the same level in the eye of the law, the only difference between them being the height

of the level to be occupied by them all alike. Neither of these doctrines seems to be that inculcated on Pilate when Jesus said – "For this purpose came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth; he that is of the truth heareth my voice." They both seem more allied to Pilate's answer – "What is truth?" as if he, as a civil ruler, could and would make no distinction between them. 'Tis to be hoped few faithful servants of Christ will be found anywhere in any of the Churches vindicating the policy of statesmen in patronising all religions alike, and especially courting those which are most unscrupulous, intriguing, and dangerous, and that the time is at hand when, as unspeakably the least of two evils, the demand will be made to cease from giving such support as is now given to any, rather than it should be more and more extended to all. But 'tis, I think, not less to be resolved that civil rulers shall not be permitted to make no distinction in law, and in such countenance and exceptional aid as circumstances still permit and require, between Christ's truth and the devil's lie. The testimony to Christ's *supremacy,* which it has been the distinguished lot of the Scottish Church and Scottish people to bear, has, from providential events, been forcibly rendered in the special form of a testimony to his *supremacy* over *the Church and over the nation* in their direct relations to each other under himself. In the cause of union this testimony ought to be faithfully upheld; for it is the only standard under which, with the Divine blessing, you can help to rally the Presbyterian population of the land. Whatever priestly or political craftsmen say to the contrary, this system of Knox and Melville, and Henderson and Rutherford, and Gillespie and the Erskines, and Chalmers, is in all its essential characteristics so Christian, so wise, so comprehensive, so generous, so Scottish, so practical, and so pressing a system, that if spoken home to our people's hearts, it will yet rouse the deepest, holiest feelings of their nature, and lead them to grasp with fresh firmness, and spread aloft and rally under the old so sacred banner, on which, in characters as bright as the sun, is to be seen inscribed – For the Covenant and Crown of Christ.

---

## MODERATISM IN VICTORIA – REV. P. S. MENZIES, A.M.

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

Sir – I saw it observed in the public press that after the profound impression made by the Rev. J. O. Dykes, the Presbyterian Church resolved to look out for a minister of high attainment to act as colleague to Rev. I. Hetherington. The result was the arrival of Rev. Peter Sinclair Menzies, A:M., of the Established Church of Scotland, who came to the colony about a year ago. Unfortunately, the reference made to Mr. Dykes was only too significant. Whatever were the gifts and graces of the former assistant of Dr. Candlish, Edinburgh, and of Dr. Cairns, Melbourne, he had certain qualifications which were every way calculated to make him the darling of a large and influential portion of the public. These endearing qualifications were liberal views on the Sabbath question and also on the inspiration of the holy Scriptures. Even the secular press, which is not much given to praising sermons, was in raptures with Mr. Dykes. No doubt it was most natural that those who are systematically engaged in the desecration of the Sabbath in connexion with daily journals, should be delighted to find a popular preacher, whose practice in regard to the Sabbath came so near their own. Mr. Dykes reaped a handsome reward for his liberal views and enlightened practice. We shall see pres- ently that Mr. Menzies is following in a similar track, and that he has already dipped his colors to a phase of popular ungodliness.

There is a large number of persons in most professing Christian communities, who are quite willing to tread the courts of the temple, and to bear some kind of character for religion, but who 567

simply will not bear the cross. Amongst these worldlings are many men of substance, who can contribute largely for the support of ordinances, if in some way or other the cross is kept out of the road. Now, without doubt, it is a most important and profitable art, the art of preaching so as to keep friends with them. Where men are absorbed in pleasure and business, the interests of eternity are practically pushed aside. Now a preacher, that has the art of dexterously throwing a haze over the whole subject of futurity, is obviously suited for these persons. Still more specially, to throw a mist, in some plausible way, over the fate of the finally impenitent in the world to come, is really to deal with the main difficulty that besets their path. Men are content to live without God and without hope in the world, but then – death, eternity, and the plain declarations of Scripture on the whole subject! These startle them. But let a minister of religion cast some shadows of doubt on the eternity of punishment of the finally ungodly, and he will be received as an angel from heaven. In showing what relation Mr. Menzies has to the matter in hand, I wish also to notice a production which appeared some time ago, called "Earnest." It is a poem in blank verse by A. G. Middleton, Esq., for some time editor of the Presbyterian *Banner,* published in Melbourne in 1853-4. It appears that after this he was for some time a lay reader in the Church of England, but his doctrinal beliefs precluded him from going forward to the ministry, whether in a Presbyterian or Episcopalian Church. He comes out now in "Earnest" with a frantic attack upon the doctrine of the eternity of punishment. One of the daily journals in Melbourne treated the poem of Mr. Middleton to a lengthened review, and while admitting that Mr. Middleton had not proved the universal redemption of mankind, yet declared that he had dealt a staggering blow to the doctrine of eternal torment.

But let us come to close quarters with Mr. Menzies. Besides being a star as a preacher, he writes largely in the *Union Magazine.* He has been well advertised – in fact he is advertised almost every week, and is frequently noticed in the newspapers. In May last a notice appeared from some one who went to hear him, and who declares he was so astonished to find a harmonium in a Presbyterian Church, that, for a moment, he thought he must have

gone to the wrong place. He declares that Mr. Menzies continues earnest and eloquent, but he does not continue to "draw," like some other seminaries. But if Mr. Menzies ceased to "draw," he was determined not to give up using the means. The notice I have quoted was in May. In the June number of the *Union Magazine* he had an article on Massilon, one of a series as the "French Pulpit." Here is a specimen of it: –

"Yet it is not to such minor blemishes we allude when we say that, after a careful reading of Massillon's sermons, we feel a want in them. It is not any want of faithful conscience probing. It is not the absence of vigorous and scathing rebuke of men's actual sins, nor yet of a pleading, tender, hopeful compassion, through the great Anointed Sacrifice, reaching unto the vast abyss of the sinner's despair, nor is it (though that cannot escape notice) the predominance of the gospel of amendment over the gospel of faith – one expects the *ex opere* principle in the system to which Massillon belongs. It is rather the want, to use the language of musicians, of delicate, spiritual *timbre,* of a certain lowly and reverent mysticism, which, without at all obscuring the clear light of God's promises, has ever in our highest English eloquence – in Taylor, in Hall, in Chalmers, in Robertson – surrounded allusions to mysterious subjects with the proper halo of inaccessible marvel, chastening the splendour of the heavenly draperies, drawing a discreet veil over the fate of the impenitent, allowing for much in God, that under the present conditions of our being, where 'we see through a glass darkly,' must be unrevealed and unrevealable."

Such a deluge of words and ideas is enough to take the breath from one. The amount of *glitter* is dazzling; still it is not all gold that glitters, so let us test the article. It is not long since that which was supposed to be a gigantic diamond worth millions, turned out to be a vulgar quartz crystal worth, at best, a few shillings. The heavenly draperies themselves may prove no more than a purple patch of tawdry rags. The "timbre" may be found to be *timber* – a substantial log – no, not substantial, but a worm-eaten and rotten log. Having gathered a little breath, let us try to find out what all this is about. We are warned it is no minor defect that the critic is going to point out. But though important it is not want of faithful conscience probing, rebuking of sin, &c. Nor is it the "predominance of the gospel of amendment over the gospel of faith." Well, in passing, this is rather an easy way for a Protestant divine to dispose of the *ex opere* principle. The Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, show us how much the question weighed with the great Apostle of the Gentiles. Certainly the question arises whether it is judicious, in a popular magazine, to make so little of that fundamental error which, perhaps, more than any other, subverted the Christian Church and brought on all the will-worship and works of the dark ages. We cross the thres-hold and enter the inner shrine, but the object of our search is for a time not to be distinguished. It is surrounded with mysticism, halo, draperies, and a veil. What subject is it that Mr. Menzies winds up and hides nearly out of sight in this way? Can we go close and look through the veil, and to this side of the draperies and find it out? One subject emerges into form and shape. It is the fate of the impenitent! Well, unquestionably this is an important subject, and has been dealt with by more than Taylor, Hall, Chalmers, and Robertson. The great prophet sent from God, the Lord Jesus Christ, dealt often with the subject, and how did he treat it? He was not given to gratifying idle and unimportant questions, and many times he would not lift aside the veil of obscurity in which some subjects were involved. But is this a subject to be left doubtful – even the destiny throughout all ages of futurity of immortal souls? Did not Christ himself remove that thick veil which conceals the spiritual world from mortal eye, and show us the awful spectacle of the rich man in torment, in hell, craving for a drop of water to cool the point of his tongue? What of the red rags of mysticism, and halo, and heavenly (?) draperies, and discreet (?) veil here? Are they not the purple patch which the shrewd old pagan condemned. Again, who reiterated with such intense solemnity the warning against that hell where the worm never dies and the fire is not quenched, and where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth? And yet again, who drew aside the heavenly draperies and the veil that separates us from the Day of Judgment, and let us see the programme of events for that awful day when the wicked shall be remanded as cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels?

But did Taylor, and Hall, and Chalmers, and Robertson treat this solemnly important subject in the way which Mr. Menzies ascribes to them? I am specially concerned for the honor of one of these names, that of Chalmers, and I look to see what warrant Mr. Menzies has for making a mummy of him with all his draperies, heavenly or otherwise, his veils, discreet or otherwise. I take up his Prelections, and in the notes on Hill's Divinity, I come to the subject, "Condition of Man after death." What do we find there? Any materials out of which Mr. Menzies has woven his heavenly drap-eries and discreet veils? – for he refers to Dr. Chalmers. Let the following speak for itself. " On the subject of the eternity of future punishment I do not want you to hold with me the language of a stern dogmatist; but sure I am that the cause of practical religion will suffer greatly in your hands if you gloss over or reduce the 568
plain literalities of Scripture on the awful question." Another passage from the same chapter is so pertinent to the subject on which I touched at the outset that it may be given. "Only think what the great, the mischievous delusion is with the great majority of the species. It is not in general that they disbelieve in the realities of a future state, neither is it that they purpose not, some time or other, to provide against them. Perhaps in every Christian land every nine out of ten have an indefinite but vague purpose of turning round and betaking themselves in good earnest to the work of preparation ere they die; but they cannot and will not put forth the resolution of entering on this decisive movement yet. They are for postponing it a little longer and a little longer, and it is just this habit of perpetually adjourning the question, of shifting it forward, by succeeding intervals, to a more convenient season, by quieting the present by a resolve which shall take effect at some time or somewhere in the distant futurity before them," &c.

But the farther we penetrate into this heap of draperies and veils, the more nonsense we find. In what sort of relationship to the human race were Chalmers, &c. placed by Mr. Menzies when he gave them the left-handed compliment of chastening those heavenly draperies, and drawing a veil over the fate of the impenitent? Were they seers to whom God committed a message for the human race, and did they, discreetly, as Mr. Menzies declares, keep back part of the message? And that, too, on the awfully important subject of the fate of the impenitent? Then instead of being commended for their treatment of the heavenly draperies, their spiritual haberdashery was just a criminal failure to declare the whole counsel of God. But of course there is the alternative. They were not seers entrusted with a message in the way supposed. The counsel of God, so far as it is proper for us to have it, is revealed in the Scriptures. If Chalmers and the others tampered with that counsel we can bring them to the text. But in point of fact what could they do in the case with the heavenly draperies, &c.? Doubtless they might have considered it was a great mistake in the All-wise to make the fate of the impenitent so plain, and to represent it in such awful terms as are employed in Scripture. They might have set themselves to tone down and

throw a gloss over the inspired teachings on the subject. If this be a chas-tening of the heavenly draperies and a discreet use of the veil, I can understand it perfectly, but instead of commending it, the par-ties concerned are to be held convicted of handling the word of God deceitfully. In the case of Chalmers, at least, the shallow compliment is an unwarrantable aspersion.

But if Chalmers, &c. are erroneously complimented for being unfaithful to God and their fellow-men, the Almighty himself is put in a position which will not stand investigation. His promises are not to be obscured, but his threatenings – those awful ones which set forth the fate of the finally impenitent – these may be modified by the mysticism and the halo and the draperies and the veil. The promises of eternal life are to be fulfilled, but God may fall from his threatenings of eternal death. I have no doubt there are not a few delighted to hear such doctrine from a minister of religion.

We turn now for a moment to see how Mr. Middleton gets on with the subject. It is only proper at once to warn you, that his treatment is in direct opposition to the muffling and mystifying plan. He dashes hard on the backbone of the subject, and intends to stun and shock the reader. Still farther, there are three things which Mr. Middleton, or his hero, Earnest, hates with unutterable hatred. These are the decrees, the creeds, and the Calvinistic ministers. Rather startling from the quondam editor of the *Presbyterian Banner,* but Presbyterianism is not to be justified of all her Victorian children. But now we may proceed. Earnest's father dies and goes to hell direct. His children ditto! His brothers and sisters,

ditto! It is needless to pause and ask him how he knows all this. There is a little bit of the poet's art to bring everlasting shame and confusion on the decrees, the creeds, and the Calvinistic preachers. The reviewer in the daily journal already referred to said that the subject should have been treated in prose, and not in the form of a poem. This is a total mistake. "Poetic license" is a shield to Earnest in proceeding in a style and tone which, in prose, would be simply insufferable. How then does Earnest deal his staggering blow to the dogma of eternal torment? He besieges the throne of the Almighty with a series of dreadful shrieks in behalf of those whom he loves, and who are in the flames of hell. In question, in statement, in remonstrance, in every possible way he makes his appeals. Is God a God of love, and will he condemn to hell for ever? Is human love so great, and is God's love less? &c., &c. Then how at last does he get deliverance for his captives? He works himself up to a phrenzy on the subject. It would seem that he must have been painfully haunted night and day with his meditations on the important subject. A crisis comes. He is worn out with excitement. The subject has burnt into his brain. He goes to the Yarra Yarra river when it is in flood in order to drown himself. But then death – judgment – hell! He is pulled up sharply at the prospect, and relapses into sheer mental paralysis. He emerges from the painful ordeal entirely prostrate, but with the delightful conviction that all mankind will at last be saved. God has something of his own in every human breast, which he will not disown, which he will bring to himself whithersoever the bearer of that divine element may have wandered. And so the external universe, heaven and hell, time and eternity, and all their interests square themselves, as if by magic, to this merely subjective experience of Earnest! And this is the staggering blow to the dogma of eternal torment! I have mentioned the Yarra Yarra above, I may say still farther that Victoria claims the credit of this new gospel. Mr. Middleton, with the candour of genius, acknowledges that he got it from some one at Queenscliffe. There was a corroboree of Blacks at the public-house there, and the natives, being supplied with drink, made the night and darkness terrible in various ways, besides throwing burning boomerangs into the air. A chance group of Europeans make sundry remarks about the poor Blacks. One philosopher makes some disparaging remark about the dogmas of the preachers, which enlists Mr. Middleton's sympathies at once. Next morning early he and the unknown philosopher meet at the lighthouse, and hold high discourse on Socrates and Plato, on the True and the Beautiful, and on Light and Love. It is discovered that love is the divine element which will infallibly secure the return of every man to a state of favor with God. In ordinary circumstances I would not trouble you with anything like an answer to all this, but it so happens that it is kindly furnished by Mr. Middleton himself in "Earnest." Curiously enough, after promulgating his gospel, he proceeds to construct a creed! And in that creed are decrees! He finds out now that all history is but the record of decree. Page after page he goes on constructing his creed and explaining the necessary place occupied by decrees. It is true he never gets reconciled to the Calvinistic ministers – but what are those lurid flames there? After all, Mr. Middleton cannot get on without a hell in his new gospel. It turns out, however, to be only a purgatory, so leaving room for a universal redemption at long last, for in all these schemes the mere matter of a few scores or hundreds of thousands of millions of years in the purifying flames is neither here nor there! When Mr. Middleton himself has to build up again so much that he had doomed to utter annihilation, we need not trouble ourselves about the rest. The Calvinistic ministers will get on all the better without him.

We return to Mr. Menzies. Here is the passage which follows immediately upon the one already quoted from the article on Massillon: –

569

"Men whose pure and beautiful faith have led them nearest to the majesty of God have seen so much to dazzle them that they have been fain to stand aside and worship with a sevenfold magnified awe. We should prefer if this noble preacher did not seem to affect so close an intimacy with the Almighty's counsels; if when venturing near that sea of glass mingled with fire, he would teach us to look and listen, and not babble of what we do not understand. There are passages in Massillon which we would have given much to have unwritten. Could scepticism desire a more fearful weapon to undermine our faith in God than the unthinking – it must be unthinking – calmness with which Massillon says in the sermon which of all others made him most famous, '*On sait en général que le grand nombre se damné.*' What shadow of Scriptural evidence is there for this fearful affirmation. We trust that if, indeed, in that far off world, he has found it so, it may not be forbidden to shed tears in heaven."

In preaching acceptable doctrine to influential worldlings, there are various ways of dealing with the question of the future. One way is to employ a skilful assortment of spiritual haberdashery, and muffle up the fate of the impenitent in many piles of heavenly draperies. In this way you may gloss over the solemn realities which are both revealable and revealed in the case. But another very satisfactory way is to chasten the heavenly draperies till hosts of the merest worldlings shall take to themselves the comfortable assurance that they are in no danger of going to the place of torment. Unquestionably it must be very soothing to multitudes of careless people who are floating with the current of the world to be assured that the great majority at least of professing Christians are safe for heaven. But as if seeing danger at this very point, the great Teacher sent from God has given his deliverance upon it. Who has forgotten that simple, solemn passage about the narrow way and the broad way, and the announcement that few find the one while many go in at the other? Mr. Menzies asks what shadow of scriptural evidence there is for the assertions made by Massillon that the great number are damned. We have just quoted one conclusive proof, but we need not proceed farther with our proofs.

Mr. Menzies has some notions of his own about the distribution of the human race into heaven and hell. Are we to conclude that if it be so that few are saved and the many lost, and if it happens that when he enters heaven and finds some choice spirits of his liking are not there, he will pout and sulk and give unmistakeable signs of bitter disappointment and dissatisfaction? Mr. Menzies speaks of the unthinking calmness with which Massillon gave expression to a sentiment which is plainly scriptural, but in what state of mind was Mr. Menzies when he penned those ill-advised words at the close of the second extract given above, and with which, too, he closes his article on Massillon? At this point Mr. Middleton has his own characteristic manner of dealing with the matter. His hero, finding that his friends are not in heaven, avowedly forfeits the place, and makes application at the gates of hell for admission. Are we to understand from the language employed by Mr. Menzies that he will accept heaven, but with a grudge in the case supposed? In the name of common sense, is this a specimen of reverent and lowly mysticism and sevenfold magnified awe, and delicate spiritual *timbre,* and teaching to stop and listen and worship, instead of babbling what we do not understand? If certain things are found to be true, Mr. Menzies records his trust that it may not be forbidden to shed tears in heaven. This, too, is close upon the heels of a quotation from that most solemnizing of all books, the Revelation! He refers to the sea of glass mingled with fire, a reference which brings up the song of victory of the redeemed, who sing the song of Moses and the Lamb (Rev. 15: 2-3.) From that same book we are assured that God shall wipe away all tears (Rev. 21: 4.) There

shall be no more death, nor crying, nor sorrow, nor pain. Is Mr. Menzies not content with this? The want of some voices in the song of victory will, perhaps, mar the delicate spiritual *timbre* that he looks for. Is this his formal protest in the matter, duly written out and published to all whom it concerned. Perhaps it is not very wonderful that the "blaspheming journal" of Melbourne has been taking rather kindly notice of Mr. Menzies!

In dealing with such a writer as Mr. Middleton we feel at once the force of our Lord's remark when he said, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." In him we have the untamed self-will and the self-reliance of the creature exalting themselves against God. His hero is very much afraid the Almighty will make some serious mistake, and if he does, "Earnest" is prepared to rectify them. The true character of sin, its far reaching and malignant nature as that which would subvert the very throne of God, as a thing which must be effectually curbed, scarcely rises above the horizon in Mr. Middleton's theology. Hence the grand mistake of projecting the arrangements and influences and carnal considerations which are so powerful here across into the next world. It is a solemn thing that the closest relationships of earth are to be divided for ever by that important line of demarcation which separates sin from holiness. That the righteous will have ground of dissatisfaction, or be in such circumstances under the new arrangements as to experience pain at the final deliverance from all that is sinful, whatever may have been the earthly associations in the case, is miserable doctrine. We may not wonder in the case of Mr. Middle-ton, but it is startling to find such shallowness in the popular Presbyterian minister. After all, if there be much that is abrupt and offensive in Mr. Middleton, does it not arise from the fact that he will not condescend to the dexterous use of the mysticism of the halo and the draperies and the veil? He leaves this stage haberdashery for the successful Presbyterian ministers of the Union. Mr. Middle-ton's beliefs prevented him, as an honest man, from going forward to the ministry in the Presbyterian Church or Episcopalian Church. If Mr. Menzies is to continue the style of teaching which I have been reviewing, ought he not, in common honesty, to follow the course adopted by Mr. Middleton 1

I have had occasion to draw prominent attention to Revs. F. Rae, J. Hetherington, and P. S. Menzies, all three Moderates, and all three inflicting their Moderatism on the colony at this hour. Such a threefold cord is not quickly broken. It has often been asked why import Scottish disputes into a new colony – why revive here the quarrels which raged in the old country? I repeat the same questions. Why was Moderatism so extensively imported? What was the antidote to it in Scotland but the evangelical movement under Chalmers and his predecessors. If you introduce the bane, then surely you should also introduce the antidote. It is surely as reasonable to introduce Free Churchism as Moderatism. The true antidote to error in all its forms and disguises is the Truth, and we have ample warrant for introducing that everywhere.

PETER MACPHERS(3N.

Manse, Meredith, Victoria,
Sept. 7th, 1869.

---

## REMEMBERING ZION.

[HOPING to be able to submit to our readers Dr. Hamilton's tract, to which we referred in our last number, we give in our present issue an introductory portion of it.]

"How lovely is thy dwelling place,
O Lord of hosts, to me!
The tabernacles of thy grace,
How pleasant, Lord, they be!"

When the Israelites were in a city, vast and ungodly, like London, – a city without a Sabbath – they used, when they had op- 570

portunity, to sit down and talk of the fair land and the lovely temple from which they had been wrenched away. "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept when we remembered Zion." Dear fellow countrymen, most of you are so far like the Israelites, that you remember with tenderness the land of your birth, and cannot bear that others should speak of it disparagingly. You like to be reminded of the scenery of Scotland, the summer verdure of its straths and glens, and the polished fulness of its deep blue lakes, its wailing winter torrents, and the snow-laden mountains which feed them. And you love its ancient minstrelsy – the gathering songs, in whose high pulse the hero hearts of the olden time still throb, and those pathetic dirges which were Nat-ure's own anthems, chanted by moorland winds and lonely waterfalls, long before man set them to his music. But there are glorious things of Scotland which you have still more reason to rem- ember; you have not forgotten the schools and sanctuaries, and Sabbath days, which once were Scotland's own; and, perhaps, you will not refuse to listen a few moments whilst we would call them to remembrance. Let us here, in this busy, tumultuous Babylon, sit down for a little and remember our Zion.

You remember the Sabbath days of Scotland. You remember how the Sabbath was wont weekly to set every house in order throughout the land. You remember the Saturday evening's preparation for the Sabbath's rest; the early cessation of labor in the fields and factories, the timely marketing, the lustration of each apartment, the arranging of the household furniture, the fetching home of water from the well, and the storing of fagots for the fuel, – the busy exertions of young and old to anticipate and supersede all Sabbath toil, which resulted in imparting beforehand a look of Sabbatic neatness and tranquillity to the well ordered habitation. You remember, too, the friendly visits which neighbour families were wont to exchange that evening, loath to invade the sanctity of one another's houses on the Lord's own day; but glad to take advantage of this breathing time to cement those friendships which they meant to be hereditary. You remember the Sabbath dawn with its morning orisons, and the prompt preparations for the house of

God. You remember the fresh and wholesome aspect of the mustering population, as they wended slowly through the churchyard: the spectacled matron, with her bulky Bible wrapped in its snowy kerchief, and provided with a fragrant sprig of some favourite herb: the cotter in the homespun suit, which the Sabbath storms of many winters had washed, but had not tattered; and the artisan with his children, whose countenances forgot their weekday toil as they put off their weekday garments. If it were a parish over which a man of God presided, you remember the reverence of their worship and the solemnity of their hearing; whilst one who understood the case of each spoke home to the hearts of all, and their common confessions, and thanksgivings, and supplications, uttered by one voice, were echoed by a hundred hearts. You remember the heart music which you sometimes heard at the uprising of the great congregation, when the burly voice of manhood and the quivering notes of palsy stricken age, "young men and maidens old men and child-ren," praising God, told that He had made their hearts right glad. You remember the Sabbath eve, when the children's tasks were over, and the sermons had been repeated; and with the Bible or the Pilgrim's Progress, or the Four-fold State, each hied away to the barn or the fir plantation, or some one of the thousand cottage oratories, which God knows full well in that land of many worshippers, till the downward sun reminded them that it was time to close these solitary studies, and gather round the household hearth once more.

"O Scotland! much I love thy tranquil dales;
But most on Sabbath eve, when low the sun

Slants through the upland copse, 'tis my delight
Wandering and stopping oft, to hear the song
Of kindred praise arise from humble roofs;
Or, when the simple service ends, to hear
The lifted latch, and mark the grey haired man,
The father and the priest, walk forth alone
Into his garden plot, or little field,
To commune with his God in secret prayer."

We could recall scenes more sacred still, – the solemnities of communion seasons – the hallowed incidents of domestic life, – and the dying testimonies and exhortations of well assured believers. The memory of many a reader can recall the whole, for it is not so long ago since the beauty of holiness adorned many regions of that land: the relic of better days, or the result of a religious revival in these latter times. But there is no need. It is generally conceded, that Scotland was once a religious country – more so, perhaps, than any nation in Christendom; and it is as generally conceded, that in its better days Scotland owed to its Church whatever family or personal religion it possessed. But on such a subject, it is safest to hear a stranger. I therefore quote the words of one who paid a long visit to that kingdom upwards of a century ago, and whose verdict is the more decisive, inasmuch that he was neither a Scotchman nor a Presbyterian: – "When we view the soundness and purity of her Doctrine – the strictness and severity of her Discipline – the decency and order of her worship – the gravity and majesty of her Government: when we see the modesty, humility, and yet steadiness of her assemblies; the learning, diligence, and painfulness of her ministers; the awful solemnity of her administration; the obedience, seriousness, and frequency of her people in hearing, and universally an air of sobriety and gravity on the whole nation; we must own her to be at this time the best regulated national Church in the world, without reflection upon any of the other nations, where the Protestant religion is established and professed." *

---

## DEATH OF THE REV. FRANCIS McBEAN.

We regret that in the notice of Mr. McBean's death in our last issue James was substituted for Francis as his Christian name.

---

## DEATH OF THE REV. ARCHIBALD McGILVRAY OF KEITH, SCOTLAND.

We received with sincere sorrow intelligence of the death of the Rev. Mr. McGilvray, of Keith, than whom no minister of the Free Church more cordially sympathised with the maintainers of its principles in these colonies. To his sympathy with them he gave practical expression in every way in which circumstances admitted of his doing so; and, particularly he opened and maintained a correspondence with them in this colony and elsewhere. The death of Mr. McGilvray we consider no small loss to our cause, for we greatly need such friends in Scotland. In a brief obituary notice the *Original Secession Magazine* bears testimony to "his unbending principle, and his zeal for the truth and honour of his Master, which, conquering his natural caution and timidity, led him to stand boldly up for these, not only in the pulpit, but in the courts of the church and through the press, whenever he judged them imperilled. He had deeply studied," it adds, "the subject of the Atonement in relation to recent controversies, and the able "Review of Dr. Marshall on the Atonement," the second part of which is among the contents of this number, is from his pen. It is his dying testimony on behalf of a great central truth of the Christian system, whose importance he deemed unspeakable, and whose sustaining power and preciousness he felt in life and

---

* Defoe's Memoirs of the Church of Scotland, 1717.



in death. He was a Covenanter in principle, a member of the society for the maintenance of the principles of the Covenanted Reformation in the Free Church, and, we have reason to know, at one with us in all the principles of our testimony. Help Lord for the godly man ceaseth."

---

## A CONVERSATION BETWEEN A MINISTER AND ONE OF HIS HEARERS.

*Minister*. Do you believe the Scriptures savingly?

*Hearer*. Surely I do, Sir. I hope you do not think that I am an infidel.

*M*. Please repeat John 16: 8.

*H*. "When he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment."

*M*. Repeat some portions of Scripture in which the feelings of those that are reproved of sin are stated.

*H*. "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born," Zech. 12: 10. "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Acts 2: 36, 37. "And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? Acts 9: 3-6.

*M*. Permit me to ask, have you experienced, because of sin, something of the mourning, of the bitterness, of the trembling, and of the astonishment, expressed in the passages of Scripture

you have just, now repeated?

*H*. I must confess to you, Sir, that I have not experienced anything of the kind all my days, and yet I hope I know savingly these and other Scriptures.

*M*. Are you really left so much to yourself as to think that you know savingly Scriptures of which you know nothing experimentally. Whoever has a saving knowledge of Scripture, feels and appreciates what is taught in these Scriptures.

*H*. Do you mean to say, Sir, that the saving knowledge of Scripture is accompanied with a soul experience corresponding to that contained in the Scriptures?

*M*. That is the very thing I mean to say. For example, if you are effectually called, you must have felt within you what effectual calling is: if you are a true penitent, you have daily experience of what true repentance is.

*H*. If what you have now stated is correct, the most of those that profess to be Christians in our day are rank infidels at heart, for they ridicule all experimental religion, and laugh and flout among themselves at such as are mourners in Zion. What say you to this?

*M*. The Scriptures, you know, are full of experimental religion – full of relations of the sorrow and the joy of God's people; – therefore, to ridicule the scriptural mourning, or the scriptural rejoicing of the godly, is the same thing as to ridicule the Scriptures, and of course to ridicule the Scriptures is rank infidelity.

*H*. Do all true Christians repent of their sins?

*M*. Undoubtedly they do. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins," Acts 5: 31. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," Luke 13: 3. And let me add, the more any one advances in the Christian life, the more he sighs and cries for his own sins, and for the sins of others. "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes, Job 13: 5, 6. "Then said I, Woe is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts," Isa. 6: 6. "But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom. 7: 23, 24. "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might,weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people: Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodging-place of wayfaring men, that I might leave my people, and go from them; for they be all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men," Jer 9: 1, 2.

"How sweet," says Dr. Love, "is the bitterness of that repentance which is truly divine and gracious! That same light which opens the springs of godly sorrow, also uncovers the fountains of divine joys: For, when is it that the soul repents? it is when God is revealed to it as he is – when the delusive misrepresentation of him, which was the fountain of the love of sin, is withdrawn – then the soul gets a sight of that majesty, holiness, and goodness, which have been profaned by it. This sight opens the deformity of sin; and now the heart delights not in it. But doth it therefore sink into melancholy, because its former delight in sin is gone? Surely not. Why? Because a new beauty hath darkened the charms of sinful liberty. That divine loveliness which opened the vileness of sin to the soul now captivates, cheers, inflames, delights, and solaces it. Anything but the whole heart seems unworthy to be laid out on such glory. Every interruption, every languor of affection, every wandering and stirring of the heart from this God of glory, seems a hell des- erving crime. The least backwardness, weariness, indifference, or rebellion, in walking before this God, appears as it truly is, a criminal treason. If men believed these things, how would this guilty earth be everywhere bedewed with tears, and how would it re-echo with songs of praise to Jesus Christ."


# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 49. SYDNEY, OCTOBER 1869.

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. 49 OCTOBER.

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.
The Token of the Covenant; or, the Subjects, the Mode, and the Nature and Design of Baptism … … … … 573
The Rev. James Cameron's Recent Travels … … … 577
Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria … … … 578
Correspondence: - Sir Alfred Stephens' Speech at Wagga Wagga … 578
Convent Revelations at Cracow … … … … 579
Union Question – Free Church Assembly … … … 580
Popish Statistics … … … … … 583

## THE TOKEN OF THE COVENANT; OR, THE SUBJECTS, THE MODE, AND THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

(*Continued from page* 563.)

49. In this connection it is proper to refer to certain figurative expressions, employed to describe the effects of the inward spiritual baptism, which are adduced as favoring the view that the legitimate mode of baptism is immersion. One of these expressions, "buried with him in baptism," occurs in a passage already quoted and examined. – Col. 2: 12. It is used also in Rom. 6: 4. From this phraseology it is argued, that the mode of baptism must be such that it will impart to the ordinance a resemblance to burial and that immersion alone fulfils this condition. But, in the latter passage, those who are said to be buried with Christ are, immediately afterwards and with reference to the same effect on their character and state, said to be "*planted* together in the likeness of his death;" and no one mode of administering baptism can impart to it a resemblance both to burying and to *planting*. We are thus led to seek

the source of those figurative expressions, not in the direct resemblance of baptism to what they denote, but in the connection of what they denote with what baptism primarily symbolises. Baptism thus symbolises union to Christ. Those who are baptised are "baptised *into Christ.*" Rom. 6: 3; Gal. 3: 27. And then, of course, being united to him, they are associated with him in all the great transactions of his mediatorial history. They are buried with him, they "are risen with him," (Col. 3: 1,) they "suffer with him," they "will reign with him." 2 Tim. 2: 12. Thus it is because they are united to him in baptism, or, in other words because outward baptism symbolises, and inward baptism, accordingly, implies union to him, that they maybe said to be buried with him in baptism.

50. Thus all the arguments in favour of immersion fail, and the examination of them has afforded us ground for regarding as scriptural, if not exclusively scriptural, a different mode of baptism. We shall now advert to one or two considerations, that serve to render it certain, that, at least on some occasions, baptism was administered by the Apostles or with their sanction otherwise than by immersion. On the day of pentecost, "they that gladly received the word were baptised and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." – Acts 2: 41. Thus, on one day, and probably after midday, about three thousand persons were baptised, and thus, added to the church. Peter began his address about nine in the morning, (Acts 2: 15) and the sacred historian, after giving a summary of the apostle's address, adds, "and with many other words did he testify and exhort," (v. 40). The other apostles also, we may feel assured, took part in the proceedings. It would have ill comported with the zeal with which the Holy Spirit had just inspired them, and with the encouragement afforded them by the awakened curiosity of the assembled multitude, and by the profound earnestness of so many of those who composed it, if they had remained silent and inactive. There was, doubtless, much of what Luke calls testifying and exhorting, and we may warrantably conclude that the baptising of the converts could not well have been begun before noon. Now, when all the circumstances of the case are considered, it must, we think, appear incredible that some three thousand persons were baptised by immersion under those circumstances between midday and nightfall. Of course the idea will not be entertained for a moment that they were immersed in their ordinary apparel. Neither will it be supposed that they had bathing clothes with them. They must therefore have gone home for them. Much time would thus be lost, and such an episode would ill agree with the solemnity and earnestness of the proceedings which it would interrupt. But overlooking this, – and we must overlook a great deal, if we would make baptism by immersion fit into the history of the pentecostal revival, – we presume they would not put on their bathing clothes at home, walk in them to the place of baptism, and after they were baptized, walk home in them wet. They would take them with them, doubtless, to the place of baptism; but, having taken them there, where would they put them on? Can our opponents inform us? We apprehend not. It would be no easy matter to accommodate three thousand persons with dressing rooms, in the immediate neighborhood of a place where they could be immersed, and that too in a city to the inhabitants of which everything connected with the intended baptism was very generally offensive. But suppose, – for we may *suppose* anything, and may therefore suppose this, – that the converts found ways and means of putting on bathing dresses, would there be nothing unseemly in men and women 574

appearing in such dresses in the presence of each other and of numerous spectators, some of them, we may presume, not remarkable for the friendliness of their feelings or the delicacy of their deportment?

51. But, passing from the preparation for immersion to the immersion itself, how was water obtained in Jerusalem for the immersion of three thousand persons against whom, as apostates from the national religion and cause, the rulers and the great bulk of the people were incensed? Jerusalem was supplied with water chiefly from cisterns; in which, from their construction, though there were no other obstacle, the converts could not be immersed. There were, indeed, some pools or reservoirs, but these were public property. And though it were not improper to use them for such a purpose, – and we conceive it would be improper, – is it at all likely that the apostles would be allowed to use them for the immersion of their converts? Besides, they were so deep that they did not admit of the operators going down, like Philip, into the water with those to be baptised; and, even though this part of the rubric of immersion were violated, and the operators remained on dry ground at the side, immersion in them, particularly the immersion of so large a number of persons in rapid succession, would be attended with extreme danger. Baths would afford the only remaining resource, and evidently they would afford a very insufficient one.

52. But let us make our escape from the difficulties of procuring water for immersion, and contemplate the difficulties of the operation itself; and these, certainly, are very formidable. The state of the case is this, – there were

three thousand persons to be immersed by some twelve operators, or two hundred and fifty by each operator; between midday and nightfall, that is in seven hours. * Now seven hours for the immersion of two hundred and fifty persons by a single operator, would afford only one minute and rather less than forty-one seconds for the immersion of each. But would this time be sufficient? And, if we allow for interruptions, the time for each immersion would be still less, not more than a minute and a half, and probably not so much. Now, though a vigorous active man might, perhaps, immerse one person in this time, or a few at the rate of one in a minute and a half, could even such a man immerse without intermission, two hundred and fifty persons at this rate, that is to say, could he immerse at this rate without rest or intermission for seven hours? Let us realise the process. The operator stood in the water, or, rather he took the candidate for baptism, and both went into the water; he then immersed, and immediately raised to an erect attitude such candidate, encountering, in some instances, in the first part of the operation an instinctive, involuntary opposition, and having, particularly in the case of females, to guard against unseemly mishaps; and immersion having been effected, both came out of the water. All this, we are required to believe, the operator did without intermission two hundred and fifty times, and each time in a minute and a half. But was it practicable? Could it have been done? And, if it could have been done at all, could it have been done without great danger to the health of the operator? Suppose such an operator as Paul. The great apostle, it seems, was a very little man, and, from the abundance of his labours, and the extent to which they were prosecuted in cold and nakedness, in hunger and thirst, and amid multiplied privations and sufferings, his physical condition

* We might have deducted an hour spent in procuring and putting on bathing dresses.

could not well have been such as would fit him for much muscular exertion. Could such an operator have immersed his two hundred and fifty in seven hours, going through the process we have described in the case of each of them? We believe no operator could have done it; and supposing it practicable, it would certainly have been extremely hard work, work so hard and so much of the character of "bodily exercise" and exertion, that the performance of it could scarcely present the aspect of the administration of a divine ordinance.

53. From this review of the case it does not appear that the pentecostal converts could have been baptised by immersion; and we are, therefore, not only justified in concluding, but shut in to conclude that they were not thus baptised. And this conclusion, if it required, would receive confirmation from the fact that "immersion is liable to many incidents of a distressing kind, so that one wishes that no light minded, irreligious, profane person were ever present" when it is practised; and, doubtless, many such were present when the three thousand converts were baptized on the day of pentecost.

54. All the considerations that have now been urged, as proving that the pentecostal converts were not baptised by immersion, apply with undiminished force to John's administration of baptism, except those derived from the circumstances under which in the former case water was to be procured. We would call, however, special attention to the expense of time, the labour, and the exposure on the part of the operator with which the administration of baptism by immersion is necessarily attended, as proving that John did not baptize by immersion. "There went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptised of him in the river Jordan." (Mark 1: 5). Now, how could a single individual baptise such multitudes with a form of baptism that required so much time, that imposed so much labor, and that was attended with so much exposure as immersion. To imagine that a single individual could do this, or would attempt to do it, is really preposterous, It is not for a moment to be supposed that the crowds that resorted to him could remain for the great length of time he would require to baptise them by immersion; and for some at least of those crowds, it would have been necessary to have remained for the whole of that time, if immersion had been the mode of baptism adopted. We may, therefore, warrantably conclude – nay, we must conclude, that immersion was not the mode adopted by John. He could not have baptised by immersion the multitudes that resorted to him; and, of course, he did not do what was impracticable, – he did not baptise them by immersion. There is nothing in the language employed by the evangelists in the history of his baptism, that in any way implies that he immersed the subjects of it; and the statistics of it are such that the idea of his having administered it by immersion is altogether inadmissible. He could not have done it.

55. But, though the statistics of the case leave us no escape from this conclusion, our opponents will not accept it. To accept it would be to surrender the exclusive claims they set up for immersion, and that they will not do. John must have baptised by immersion whether he could have done it or not. And is it not evident that it was thus he baptised, when we read that he "baptised in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there," (John 3: 2, 3,) while, if he had baptised by sprinkling, he would not have required much water? No, he would not have required much water, but the multitude that "came and were baptised" would. No considerate person would assemble and retain for days such multitudes where wat- 575
er was scarce. And it may be observed here, – although our argument does not need the support this observation may afford that according to the original, Enon, offered the advantage not of "much water" but of "many waters" The word Enon denotes *fountains*, and it may be inferred that a locality bearing such a name abounded in springs. There were thus "many waters there," affording an abundant supply for man and beast of one great necessary of life, but, probably, no facility for immersion.

56. We now leave the doctrine that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism to those who are capable of holding or determined to hold it, not only *without* but *against* evidence. None else can hold it. It has, however, this advantage, such as it is, – it enlarges and extends the external rite; it imparts body and bulk to it, and thus contributes somewhat towards satisfying that craving for the outward and the ritual in religious observances, of the existence and strength of which the past history and present state of the church furnish ample and melancholy proof. To the adaptation to the carnality of the human mind, by which it is thus distinguished, it owes, we are convinced, not a little of the limited acceptance with which it meets. To carnal apprehension a mere sprinkling with water is nothing, and, though you urge that it is the sign of spiritual blessings, this, to carnal apprehension, in no way redeems it; something more operose is demanded, something that addresses itself more largely and powerfully to the senses, some-thing more palpable, more impressive physically, in short the utmost in this direction of which the nature of the ordinance admits immersion. Let us,

however, acknowledge to the credit of those who now make this demand, that they have receded considerably from the demand of some of their predecessors, for these required trine immersion, – not only that the subjects of baptism should be plunged over head in water, but that they should be thus plunged three times.

III. NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

57. The nature and design of baptism have been already incidentally indicated to a considerable extent. But partly to meet a rationalistic objection brought by our opponents against infant baptism, and partly to exhibit the practical bearing of the pedobaptist doctrine and to enforce the obligations that attach to the corresponding practice, we shall now add a few remarks under this head.

58. The objection which we seek to repel is conveyed in such questions as these, – what good does baptism do to infants? What are they the better for it? Do not baptised infants grow up in sin the same as unbaptised infants? We have heard similar questions asked with respect to other ordinances, as for example, what are those who partake of the Lord's Supper better than we who do not partake of it? What are many of those who go to church better than we who do not go to it? Are they more upright in their dealings or more humane, – more just or more generous? Such questions are an appeal from revelation to reason. Revelation prescribes the observances against which they are directed, and this prescription, they imply, is very well, but, still, are the prescribed observances sufficiently recommended to reason? Thus we are fully justified in describing the objection conveyed in such questions as rationalistic; and our opponents in urging it act the part of rationalists.

59. But, if the appeal is to be made to reason, let it be made fairly; and, that it may be fairly made, the point submitted must be, not what effects actually attend the observance of the ordinance against the claims of which the appeal is directed, but what are the effects to the production of which, from

the nature and design of the ordinance, the observance of it is fitted to conduce, and with which, it may be warrantably expected, the due observance of it will be attended. It may be true, and so far as to is true it is much to be deplored, that in multitudes of instances infant baptism is attended with no beneficial results, the subjects of it being as much neglected and growing up as ungodly as any unbaptised infants. But this fact in no way affects the claims of infant baptism; for its claims, as already stated, are determined, not by the actual results in given cases and, in certain circumstances, but by the results to the production of which it is fitted to conduce. From these the actual results may be entirely different, such actual results being due to influences extraneous to the ordinance and antagonistic to its design.

What, then, is the legitimate influence of infant baptism on the spiritual interests of the subjects of it? This is the point to be decided in an appeal from revelation to reason with respect to the claims of infant baptism.

60. We have already seen that baptism signifies and represents spiritual blessings, – union to Christ and participation in the benefits of his death; and, when applied to infants, it signifies and represents such blessings as capable of application to infants, and as tendered to them through their parents or tendered to their parents for them. Will any one say that, as regards design and tendency, it is no advantage to infants that God deals thus with their parents on their behalf, that he calls upon their parents, affords them encouragement, and lays them under obligation to desire and expect for them, – and to desire and expect for them while they are yet infants and incapable of acting for themselves in this momentous matter, – all the blessings of that well ordered and sure covenant of which baptism is the token? Beautiful and beneficent arrangement? How like God, and how grateful to the heart of the pious parent! We seem to hear in it the "Saviour's words, uttered by him anew "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Yea, suffer them to come to the loving compassionate Saviour. Let the Church suffer them to come to him by admitting them to baptism; let their parents suffer them to come to him by bringing them to be baptised; let both suffer them to come by pleading on their behalf earnestly and in faith the glorious promise to which baptism is attached (Acts 2: 39, Gen. 16: 7-10), "travailing in birth until Christ be formed in them" (Gal. 4: 19), and by discharging towards them their respective but concurrent obligations. If parents and the church proceed thus, we shall have fewer impugners of infant baptism, and such as may still impugn it will not venture to represent it as useless.

61. In this ordinance God says to parents "I will be a God unto your children," He thus calls upon them and imposes upon them a solemn obligation to lay hold on this promise on behalf of their children, and, clinging to it, pleading it and expecting the fulfilment of it, to use with diligence and perseverance all the means of obtaining the fulfilment of it which he has prescribed. And, if parents respond aright to this call and discharge this obligation, shall they do so in vain? Will not God, in that case, fulfil his promise, and be indeed a God unto their children? To infants, to whom, while they are yet infants; or subsequently; such a blessing flows from baptism, is baptism useless? But at present we are concerned, with the design of baptism and not with the actual result of the administration of it; and, inasmuch as God, by mode of baptism, deals with parents on behalf of their children in the manner we have indicated, this ordinance, it is evident has the most advantageous 576

bearing on the eternal interests of the infants to whom it is applied.

And God deals in like manner with the church on behalf of infants, and lays it under a similar obligation, when he directs it to administer baptism to them. He requires of it that it give to them the full benefit of its solicitude, its prayers, and its ministrations, desiring and expecting for them the fulfilment of the great promise "that he will be a God unto them." Thus baptism has the most advantageous bearing on the eternal interests of the infants to whom it is applied.

APPENDIX.

62. The advocates of immersion, who hold, let it be remembered, not merely that immersion is a legitimate mode of baptism; but that it is the only legitimate mode of baptism, are in the habit of parading, in support of their dogma, a long list of quotations from some of the most distinguished of their opponents. To this method of maintaining their position there is, at the outset, the obvious objection, on logical grounds, that such quotations, presenting only at the best what uninspired men have said, are not evidence in the case. Though they were fully to the affect that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism, as the adducing of them in support of this position implies they are, they would be no proof that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism, and would furnish no ground for our believing that it is. But they are not to the effect that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism; and, therefore, to adduce them as supporting this view is

disingenuous and disgraceful. What! Such men as Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Hervey, Doddridge, Whitefield, John Wesley, and Chalmers, – and these and others are quoted, – testifying and, therefore, holding that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism, and yet, in the face of this conviction, administering baptism themselves otherwise than by immersion! This is palpably a foul slander. Such men were incapable of acting such a part; of acting it, – and that they did so is the implied allegation, – deliberately, uniformly, to the close of their lives, and in a matter so solemn as the administration of a divine ordinance.

63. But the dishonesty of the procedure on which we are remarking does not consist merely in adducing, as witnesses for immersion as the only legitimate mode of baptism, men who testified by their practice and taught that it is not the only legitimate mode of baptism. The following instances affords painful proof that it is carried still further. One of the witnesses cited is Thomas Scott, the commentator; and his testimony, as quoted, is, "immersion is doubtless baptism." Now, it, is true that Scott uses these words, * but, then, they do not bear the meaning which the immersionist in quoting them expects will be attach- ed to them. Scott does not say that baptism is immersion; that is, that baptism is, always and in every instance, immersion – this and nothing else; and, yet, our opponents adduce him as bearing this testimony. What he says is that immersion is baptism, and this, though we are required by those who quote his words to think so, in no way implies that sprinkling is not baptism. They propose the question "is baptism immersion or sprinkling? and they adduce Scott as testifying that it is immersion, and not sprinkling, while his words even, as quoted by themselves, have, as we have just shown, no such meaning. But what will the reader think when we inform him, – and this is the point to which we wish to call special attention, – that after the words which they quote, "immersion is doubtless baptism," Scott immediately adds, "and so is sprinkling or pouring." This ——————————————————

* Life of Rev. Thomas Scott by Rev. John Scott, p.187. London, 1822.

part of his evidence they suppress, and by a quotation thus garbled, which even when garbled does not assert their doctrine, they endeavor to gain the support of a name deservedly held in high estimation. The cause must indeed be wretched that imposes upon its advocates the necessity – a necessity, however, which ought not to be accepted – of resorting to such expedients.

64. The preceding specimen might suffice; but we will adduce another instance of similar dishonesty of quotation. The following garbled quotation is given from Ewing's Greek and English Lexicon. "*Baptizo,* in its primary and radical sense, I cover with water. It is used to denote, 1st, I plunge, or sink completely under water." By this quotation Mr. Ewing is represented as stating that "the primary and radical" meaning of *baptizo is immerse,* and thus, by inference, that immersion is the only legitimate mode of baptism. But to make the quotation serve this purpose, the omission of a clause is necessary, and, as if a Papist and not a Protestant conducted the operation, the necessary omission is quietly made. The reader is led to believe, – shameful deception! – that Mr. Ewing in defining *baptizo,* expressed himself thus, "in its primary and radical sense, I cover with water," and on this point added no more; but he does add more, and adds what he himself regarded as being, and what really is an essential part of his definition. After the words, quoted, "in its primary or radical sense, I cover with water," he proceeds, "or some other fluid, in whatever manner this is done, whether by immersion or affusion, wholly or partially, permanently or for a moment." Thus, while by the deliberate mutilation and garbled quotation of his definition, he is made to testify that of the Greek word for *baptise* the primary meaning is *immerse,* the testimony which he actually bears is, that *immerse* is *not* the primary meaning of it. To speak plainly, for the case demands plain speaking, can those who thus grossly abuse the confidence which they claim to be reposed in them as faithful reporters of what they profess to quote, and abuse it for such a purpose, be regarded in any other light than as practising deception and uttering falsehood? For our part we emphatically say, "No." And we say further that those who circulate, as we understand some do, publications, in which the vile artifice now exposed is employed, make themselves parties to the deception and falsehood which it involves.

65. This falsifying of testimony presents also other forms. Of one of these we will give an example. At the close of the array of quotations, of which we have just submitted a specimen, it is stated, "the names of Adam Clarke, Burkitt, and a host of others, might be added." Now let the reader judge from the following *bona fide* ungarbled quotation whether Adam Clarke, for example, can be honestly referred to as testifying that "immersion" is "the only christian baptism." We quote from his note on Matt. 3: 6. "In what form baptism was originally administered has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute. Were the people *dipped* or *sprinkled*? for it is certain *bapto* and *baptizo* mean both. They were all *dipped,* say some. Can any man suppose that it was possible for John to dip *all the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea, and of all the country round about Jordan*? Were both men and women dipped, for certainly *both* came to his baptism? This could never have comported either with safety or with *decency.* Were they dipped in their *clothes*? This would have endangered their lives if they had not with them change of raiment; and, as such a baptism as John's, however administered, was, in several respects, a new thing in Judea, it is not at all likely that the people would come thus provided." Farther on he says, "those who are *dipped or immersed* in water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, I believe to be evangelically baptised – those who are washed or sprinkled with water, in the name of the Father, and of 577
the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, I believe to be equally so; and the *repetition* of such a baptism I believe to be *profane*." Such is Adam Clarke's deliberate testimony, and yet, immersionists refer to him as testifying that that "immersion" is "the only christian baptism."

66. The following extract from a pamphlet entitled, "Confessions of a convert from baptism in water to baptism with water," of which a reprint has been recently issued in Sydney, will form an appropriate supplement to Dr. Clarke's remarks on John's baptism: – "Having satisfied myself on this point" – that the population of Judea, at the period which immediately preceded our Lord's ministry; was not less than a million and a half, and that at least one-third of this number, or half a million, were baptised by John, – "I proceeded to compute the period which must have been consumed in their immersion. From having frequently witnessed the practice, I knew that baptism by this mode could not be administered to an individual, with suitable deliberation and gravity, in less time than two minutes, and with the utmost despatch consistent with decorum, that more than thirty could not be immersed in an hour. Assuming this to be the average rate at which John performed the service, and supposing that he thus spent ten hours every day, I was conducted to the conclusion that he might baptise two thousand weekly, or about one hundred thousand in a year: from which it was evident, that had he spent no part of this time in travelling, preaching, or other employments, but continued almost without

intermission in the water, he must have devoted five years of labor to this single work. I was confounded at the result of this calculation, for I knew, from previous thought and reading, that his public ministry could not have exceeded a year, and was probably restricted to a still less period. This enquiry shook my previous faith in the Divine authority of immersion; and it also recalled to my recollection a conversation which I had heard, a few months before, between my uncle and my father on the subject of John's baptism, in which the question was proposed, whether, supposing that John's disciples were immersed, they submitted to this process in their usual dress or naked; or, if not, whether they had brought changes of raiment with them for the purpose, and had constructed sheds or pitched tents on the banks of the river, in which they could privately prepare for the service? My excellent parent perceived the difficulty in which he would be involved by adopting either of these hypotheses; and, therefore, like the Pharisees, when pressed with another perplexing question respecting the same baptism, he prudently replied that he could not tell. My uncle however, would not be satisfied with this evasion, and proceeded to show that each of the suppositions was equally improbable. He added, moreover, what struck me at the time, that as there must have been women as well as men who crowded to John's ministry, nothing could be more unlikely, more contrary to the usage of the country and the people, or more revolting to the feelings and habits of Eastern females, than to have consented to be publicly plunged by a man in the presence of a gazing multitude."

---

## THE REV. JAMES CAMERON'S RECENT TRAVELS.

It is right and proper that a person entrusted with a minion should avail himself of some legitimate mode of communication with his constituents, to give them an account of his diligence and of its results. Of an ecclesiastical mission, indeed, the report should be submitted, in the first instance, to the proper church court; but, still, as the newspaper press could procure for itself, if it chose to take the trouble to do so, information with respect to all proceedings that are not secret, the irregularity of a person in Mr. Cameron's circumstances volunteering to act as its reporter,

and thus incidentally and to some little extent as his own trumpeter, may, perhaps, be overlooked. But while we concede thus much, we must demur to the propriety of such a traveller as Mr. Cameron or, indeed, any traveller acting on the egotistical imagination, that the connection of the most trivial events with his person imparts to them so much importance that they deserve to be recorded and communicated to the public. When the traveller is, for example, a person of the colossal dimensions of Dr. Sam-uel Johnson, we are glad to be supplied with even minute details of his movements, and still more of the conversations in which he took part and, of course, almost always the principal part. But, if even the great lexicographer had acted for himself, – and it is something of this kind Mr. Cameron does, – the part that James Boswell acted for him, with more assiduity than self respect, we should have been disgusted at his egotism, while we valued the information with which it supplied us.

In Mr. Cameron's account of his visit to the Manning, the following passage occurs: – "Mr. Laing and I had arranged to start for Port Macquarie on the Thursday morning, and ere we had finished an early breakfast, the Episcopal and Wesleyan ministers were both in the room with us, to bid us goodbye and God speed; and while the Wesleyan brother commended us and our mission to the care of our Heavenly Father, the Episcopal minister, with true brotherly kindness, went some six or eight miles with us to take us by the best route to the main road." And then he adds – "In the midst of this interdenominational cordiality, I could not but feel it to be a strangely incongruous thing, that the only ecclesiastical antagonism which seemed to have existence on the Manning was that of Presbyterian v. Presbyterian." But the cordiality which Mr. Cameron records is not what he designates it, "interdenominational cordiality," but "cordiality" shown by individual ministers of different denominations, – a widely different thing. And, then, on what ground is it alleged that the "ecclesiastical antagonism" of "Presbyterian *versus* Presbyterian" is "the only ecclesiastical antagonism" which seems to have any existence on the Manning? Two Presbyterian churches have each of them a minister on the Manning; but, if this fact gives rise to the "ecclesiastical antagonism" of "Presbyterian versus Presbyterian," how is it that the similar fact, that the Wesleyan body and the Episcopal Church have each of them a minister in the same district, does not give rise to corresponding ecclesiastical antagonisms? If we are not mistaken, it is the same Episcopal minister who acted as Mr. Cam-eron's guide that a friend of ours heard teach his people that they could not understand the Scriptures without the aid of the church's interpretation of them; and is there no antagonism between the church of which Mr. Cameron is a minister and the teachers of this wretched unProtestant churchism? Then as regards the Wesleyan minister on the Manning, we presume he is orthodox according to the creed of his own church, and therefore an Arminian; and again we ask is there no antagonism between the church of which Mr. Cameron is a minister and Arminian teaching. And in addition to the ecclesiastics already referred to there is, we believe, a popish priest on the Manning; but, still, if we accept our traveller's representation of the state of things, no "ecclesiastical antagonism" of Protestant versus Papist exists there, and he seems to rejoice that it does not. This is the true unionist spirit, which ever treats men's relations to the truth as of little importance, and their relations to each other as entitled to almost exclusive consideration.

The union in this colony was reached by a compromise, and the church which originated in it has hitherto manifested a corresponding disregard of the claims of divine truth. One of its ministers has taught publicly that, from the constitution of the human mind 578
and the character of the revelation which God has given to us, diversity of belief on religious subjects is inevitable and not undesirable; and, of course, therefore, the entertaining of erroneous views which on the part of some such diversity implies, is not sinful or even to be regarded with regret. And, though this doctrine strikes at the very root of the obligation under which we lie, as having the Bible in our hands, to know and embrace the truth, he has never been called in question for it. Another of its ministers, a co-presbyter, we believe, of Mr. Cameron's, has enunciated on the fundamentally important subject of the atonement views which deviate widely from the teaching of the Scriptures and of the Confession of Faith, and, yet, neither Mr. Cameron nor any other, so far as the public is aware, has brought the matter before the courts of the church. Mr. Cameron may therefore rejoice, as he is disposed to rejoice in such things, not only in the all but universal absence of ecclesiastical antagonism which he thought he observed on the Manning, but also in the absence within the church of which he is a minister of that antagonism between the sound and the unsound in which the exercise of discipline originates.

But, as regards the "ecclesiastical antagonism of Presbyterian *versus* Presbyterian" on the Manning, who, pray, introduced it? The Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia had several congregations on the Manning long before the union was effected. Immediately after that defection was consummated, strenuous efforts were made by the newly formed union church

to induce the people to withdraw from the church with which they were connected. We should like to know from Mr. Cameron if this was not the "ecclesiastical antagonism of Presbyterian *versus* Presbyterian" under its worst form. And in other cases the same policy was pursued and the same disgraceful "ecclesiastical antagonism" exhibited. Yet, in the face of these facts, and though himself a party to such proceedings, Mr. Cameron deplores the existence on the Manning of the "ecclesiastical antagonism of Presbyterian *versus* Presbyterian." His professing to do so we cannot regard as honest. What he really deplores is that the Presbyterians on the Manning, who have refused to abandon their principles or surrender their testimony, – and they are the flower of the Presbyterian population of the district, – have not allowed themselves to be absorbed into the union.

In course of his travels, Mr. Cameron called on a young minister of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, a liberty which he had no right to take any further than the consciousness of friendly feelings, and a conscious desire to cultivate friendly relations entitled him to claim it. The sequel however does not seem to indicate that he was actuated by such motives. In the published account of his travels he mentions his visit to our young friend, and closes his reference to it with the remark, "his utterance, it is said, is not equal to his ability." Now what is this but to seek friendly intercourse with a stranger, and to take advantage of that intercourse when obtained to do him an injury. Such conduct we are constrained to pronounce as unmanly and base, and we sincerely regret it should have been exhibited by Mr. Cameron. If Mr. Cameron is disposed to exercise censorship, he has ample scope for doing so among those in whose character and official qualifications he is more immediately interested than he is in those of our young friend; but, as we have already seen, he does not exercise it in that direction. Viewed in the light of this fact, and, indeed, apart from any such illustration of its spirit, his censorship can only be traced, as exercised in the case on which we are remarking, to the very antagonism which our traveller professes to lament. If the minister visited had been a minister of his own church, however defective his utterance might have been no mention would have been made of its defectiveness.

FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF VICTORIA.

The new Free Church at Meredith has been opened for divine service. Rev. P. Macpherson, minister of the congregation, officiated on the occasion (5th September), and preached, in ordinary course through the Gospels, from John 6: 28-29 – "Then said they unto him, What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent."

The building is of bluestone, the architecture Gothic, with buttresses at all the angles and between the windows. The main building measures thirty-six feet by twenty-one internally. All the windows are lancet headed, and in addition to those in the side walls of the main building there are two (mullioned) in the front gable, and two in the porch. All the gables (i.e. of the main building) and porch are surmounted with a massive coping, terminating in a roll forming the apex. In the main building the apex is about thirty feet above the base course. The roof, externally, is slated; internally is open-timbered, with all the woodwork varnished. The lining of the roof is yellow deal; that of the floor, white deal. Ventilators are placed in the base course, floor, windows, and roof. The porch has buttresses, coping, &c., to correspond with the main building. The main door is Gothic headed, stained and grained, with ornamental hinges and handle. In the porch gable above the door is set a Barrabool Hill stone, with the inscription, "Free Presbyterian Church, 1869." All the weatherings are of "axed" work, which relieves considerably the hue of the bluestone. The corbels in the porch and main building form a prominent feature in the structure. The whole building is supplied with spouting.

The total cost hitherto has been £541 11s. 6d., but as the walls are unplastered, and the old seats are in use, it is probable that fully £100 more will be required to complete the building. There was a large assemblage on the occasion of the opening, and the collection on behalf of the funds amounted altogether to nearly £10. The building is erected on a reserved site of two acres. Some ornamental shrubs have been planted about the new building.

The old wooden structure, in which the congregation has assembled for upwards of ten years, has been sold and removed.

The Rev. Alexander McIntyre has been officiating at Hamilton and throughout the neighbourhood for several months. The whole of the district about Hamilton has been extensively settled by Highlanders. A short time ago application was made for a site in the township for a Free Gaelic Church, and according to last accounts building operations were likely to be commenced.

# Correspondence.

SIR ALFRED STEPHEN'S SPEECH AT WAGGA WAGGA.

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

Sir, – I take the liberty of calling attention to, and animadverting upon, through your valuable periodical, certain statements reported to have been delivered by Sir Alfred Stephen at the laying of the foundation stone of the Presbyterian Church at Wagga Wagga. The statements contained sentiments contradictory, unsound, and highly dangerous, and, as proceeding from one occupying such an influential position, will be all the more productive of injurious effects. As a sample of their contradictoriness, we give the following sentences: "It is impossible for us being Protestants to regard with equal favor the ministrations of our Roman Catholic brethren. We wonder how any man once blessed with that which alone is to us truth and light should ever become a recreant from it. But neither wisdom nor charity is exhibited, whatever the strength of our convictions, in denouncing 579

with sectarian vehemence the doctrines or systems from which we dissent; as if we alone were necessarily infallible or nothing alien could be looked at except from our point of view." Now surely any intelligent Protestant, not only "cannot regard with equal favor," but, according to the very name he bears, is bound to protest against and oppose, as dangerous and deadly error, the system of Popery. But, according to Judge Stephen, we are not warranted to do anything of the kind, because we have no right to determine that others, who hold views diametrically opposite to ours, may not after all be in the right. So then it comes to this, that it is a matter of uncertainty whether Protestant or Popish doctrines are "truth and light." Again, the Judge says, "That religion is the most pure, which is the most peaceable." So he says. But an inspired Apostle speaks very differently, "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable." Which are we to believe, Sir Alfred Stephen, or the Apostle James? According to the statement of the latter, we would infer that the religion which has most of scriptural purity has also most of scriptural peace, at the same time waging war against error and ungodliness. From another statement in his address, it is evident that the peace he advocates as the test of purity is a peace that lets error of every kind alone. He says, "The only things against which we should array ourselves, and with which we may lawfully wage incessant war, are vice and crime." How easy for any one who has read the scriptures with ordinary intelligence to answer such a grossly objectionable statement. Were vice and

crime the only things against which "the old Testament Prophets" arrayed themselves? Were these "the only things" against which Christ and his apos-tles "waged incessant war?" How frequently we find them wag-ing war against prevailing errors of various kinds. But according to Judge Stephen's *ipse dixit* that was an unlawful warfare. Had the reformers held and acted on his views, instead of Protestant light and truth, Popish darkness and error had remained unbroken. The objectionable statement on which we have been animadverting evidently implies that men's religious beliefs have nothing to do with their moral conduct. But the well known fact, according to the scriptures, is that a sound religious belief is high-ly conducive to morality and good citizenship, and that a false religious belief is greatly productive of vice and crime. The truth of this is abundantly attested by a comparison of Popish and Protestant countries. We would now conclude by remarking that the address on portions of which we have been making these observations rendered a very equivocal honor to the minister and building committee of the Presbyterian congregation at Wagga Wagga.

Yours, &c.

PRESBYTER.

19th October, 1869.

---

## CONVENT REVELATIONS AT CRACOW.

The Austrian *Presse* says: – "On Tuesday, the 20th July, an anonymous notice, apparently written by a female hand, reached the Criminal Court at Cracow, to the effect that in the Convent of the Carmelite barefooted nuns, one of the order, named Barbara Ubryk, has been forcibly kept in close confinement in a dark cell for a long number of years. The Vice-President of the Criminal Court, Ritter von Antoniewicz, immediately laid this information before a Judge of inquiry, who, in company with the public prosecutor, repaired to the Bishop von Galecki, with the request to permit them to enter the convent. Heir von Galeoki, though not generally very agreeable or yielding towards the secular authorities, showed in this instance great tact, and gave practical proof that

he was not inclined to identify such a horrible deed with the tenets of the Christian religion or Church discipline, or even to

excuse it. He suggested to the Judge that the notice might have arisen out of a false report, but when the officer of justice urged him to give him an ecclesiastical assistant, he declared that he would grant the request in his capacity as Papal delegate, and sub-delegated the Papal prelate Spital, a very intelligent and worthy priest. In his company and that of his actuary, Kwial-kowski, the judicial witnesses, Stanislaus Gralewski and Theophil Parvi, the Judge drove to the Convent. The latter, which is one of the strictest female orders, is situated in one of the most beautiful suburbs of Cracow, the so-called Wesola, in the vicinity of the botanical garden and observatory, and by the side of a splendid avenue, which is one of the favourite walks of the inhabitants of Cracow on a summer's evening. Thousands of people passed these sombre cloister walls without even suspecting the fearful tragedy that was being enacted within for twenty-one years. The convent was first entered by Father Spital, followed by the members of the judicial commission, to whom the portress attempted to refuse admittance, and she allowed their entrance only when Dr. Gebhardt, with the confirmation on the part of Father Spital, referred to the permission he had received from the Bishop. The Judge then informed the portress that he had come to see and speak to Nun Barbara Ubryk, which information made a terrible impression on the portress. She staggered a few paces backwards asseverating that it was impossible to satisfy his demand, and at the same time endeavoured to get away with another nun. The Judge, how-ever, prevented this, and ordered the two sisters to be detained, forbidding them in the name of the law to move from the spot. The Commission thereupon went to the upper corridor, foll-owed by the nuns, one of whom showed the Judge the cell of sister Barbara. This cell, which was situated at the extreme end of the corridor, beyond the pantry, close to the dunghole, had a walled-up window and a double wooden door, in which there was a movable grating, through which very probably food was handed in. Through a very small open window niche some rays of light could now and then penetrate into this dismal dungeon. The cell, seven paces long by six paces wide, was opened, but it is almost impossible to describe the view this piece of inquisition of the nineteenth century presented. In a dark infected hole adjoining the sewer, sat, or rather cowered, on a heap of straw, an entirely naked, totally neglected, half insane woman, who, at the unaccustomed view of light, the outer world, and human beings, folded her hands and pitifully implored: – I am hungry, have pity on me; give me meat, and I shall be obedient . . . . This hole, for it could hardly be called a chamber, besides containing all kinds of dirt and filth, and a dish with rotten potatoes, was deficient of the slightest decent accommodation. There was nothing – no stove, no bed, no table, no chair – it was neither warmed by a fire nor by the rays of the sun. This den the inhuman sisters who called themselves women, spiritual wives, the brides of heaven, had selected as a habitation for one of their own sex, and kept her therein in close confinement for twenty-one years – since 1848. For twenty-one years the grey sisters daily passed this cell, and not one of them ever thought of taking compassion on this poor outcast prisoner. Half human, half animal, with a filthy body, with thin knocked kneed legs, hollow cheeks, closely shorn dirty head, unwashed for years, came a horrible looking being forward, such as Dante in his wildest imagination was unable to picture. With her deeply sunk eyes staring on one spot knelt this wretched victim in her cell in the convent of the Carmelites. The judge instantly ordered the nun to be clothed, and went himself for Bishop Galecki. The Bishop was deeply moved, and, turning to the assembled nuns, he veh-580

emently reproached them for their inhumanity. 'Is this,' he said, 'what you call love for your neighbour? Furies, not women, that you are, is it thus you purpose to enter the kingdom of heaven?' The nuns ventured to excuse their conduct, but the Bishop would not hear them. 'Silence, you wretches!' he exclaimed! 'away, out of my sight, you who disgrace religion.' The Father Confessor Planikiewicz, an old priest, who was present, dared to observe, [and in doing so, we have no doubt, stated the truth,] that the ecclesiastical authorities were aware of this scandal, whereupon the Bishop and Prelate Spitol, denied his assertion, and at once suspended the father confessor, and also the Superioress, who is descended from an honorable Polish noble family. The Bishop ordered Nun Barbara Ubryk to be brought into a clean cell, and there to be dressed and nursed, which the lady superior obeyed, very reluctantly. When the unhappy nun was led away, she asked anxiously whether she would be brought back to her grave, and when asked why she had been imprisoned, she answered: 'I have broken the vow of chastity, but,' pointing with a fearfully wild gesture, and in great excitement to the sisters, 'they are not angels.' The investigation has commenced, but its progress is much impeded by difficulties on account of the strict rules of the order of the Carmelites. Entrance into the convent can only be obtained with great difficulty, and the nuns are so thickly veiled, that the Judge never knows to whom he is speaking. The lady superior declared that Barbara Ubryk was kept in close confinement since 1848 by order of the physician, because of her

unsound mind. But this physician died in 1848, and the present physician, Dr. Babraynski, who has been practising in the convent for the last seven years, has never seen Barbara Ubryk. Such treatment, in the opinion of the doctors, is sufficient to drive a person mad. On account of the importance of the case, the Attorney-General has taken the matter in hand. The exasperation of the people knows no bounds. It is stated that the Bishop intends to dissolve the convent."

---

## UNION QUESTION – FREE CHURCH GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

We gave in a previous issue the motions submitted to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland on the subject of Union and the result of the division. The amendment, which was to the effect that Union negotiations on the present footing should be abandoned, was moved by the Rev. Mr. Nixon, the Moderator of the previous Assembly, in an able speech of which the delivery occupied fully three hours. The following extract presents the grounds on which the minority objected to the Report and the articles embodied in it.

The first year of our conferences looked remarkably well. There were a number of drawbacks, it is true, particularly as our United Presbyterian brethren drew up a distinctive article, and we had to prepare a counter article ourselves to which I have almost as much objection as to the United Presbyterian article. In the second and third years, instead of carrying out these discussions, which we ought to have done, we referred to other subjects, and in the fourth we returned to the first head of the programme. And I must say that during that year my views got very much altered with regard to the likelihood of our getting any satisfaction with reference to the views held by ourselves and by our United Presbyterian brethren respectively. I will tell you of some of the causes which brought about this result. Dr. Candlish, in 1863, told us that we were called upon by God to go forward. I thought we had made our exodus in 1843, and I was not aware that we are now called upon to escape from that position. He said we would grieve the Holy Spirit if we took any

any other course in the matter. I thought that, in a matter of that kind, we should take God's Word, and not be dependent upon the word of any one man or any dozen men. I felt at the moment that it was a kind of prejudging the question. There was coercion put upon us. I said nothing about it at the time, but I did feel very much put about that Dr. Candlish should have made these statements. I am sure it was the last thing in Dr. Candlish's intention to injure us, but I cannot help stating the effect it produced upon me. I mentioned to one of the members of the committee at the time that our distinctive article looked very much like a Voluntary manifesto. The United Presbyterians refused to have anything to do with the expression which spoke of Jesus Christ under the title of "Governor over the nations." Again, the members of the Free Church Committee had agreed to bring nothing before the Joint Committee until we had agreed on the subject ourselves; but that understanding was broken until we had no more confidence. Indeed, some of our own committee showed more favor towards the views of our United Presbyterian friends than towards those held by some of ourselves. We were even prevented from asking any explanations about the distinctive articles. Some members were just to be allowed to pronounce an opinion, and it was not to be questioned. Then there was the shelving of the question of education. There was a public meeting in 1866 to get up the steam; but it failed. Its object was to bring a kind of pressure to bear upon us. And there was a demand by the United Presbyterians that our Assembly should determine whether there was any bar to union under the first head. I run over these things to show that in my mind there were great grounds for distrust in the way the committee acted. My object is to show that these articles are not entitled to the confidence of the Church. In regard to the general principle of Establishment, there has been the greatest injury done to us by misrepresenting our real views. I agree with the definition of the United Original Secession body of 1827, which expresses it as the duty of nations and rulers not only to permit but also to recognise and give countenance to true religion. Or, I assent to the definition of Dr. Cunningham, which says it is incumbent upon nations and their rulers in their official capacity, or in the exercise of their control over civil matters, to aim at the promotion of the truth of God, the welfare of true religion, and the prosperity of the Church of Christ. Now, the Articles of Agreement could not be interpreted into expressing any such views, but they express the opinions of the United Presbyterians on the subject This can be proved by noticing what Dr. Harper and Mr. Ker had said. We see in their writings that the articles are viewed by them as teaching Voluntaryism pure and simple. What do we mean by Voluntaryism? We are not meaning that civil rulers should not be Christians. We do not mean that they should go to work without taking their Christianity with them. Yea, we know that they hold that rulers should take their laws from the great law of God. But what we say is this, the position they hold was – that the civil magistrate cannot notice the relations, responsibilities, and duties of man to God. They have told us that the rulers of the land have nothing to do with the first table of the law of God. – (hear, hear) – that they have nothing to do with any transgressions of the Divine law as sins against God. They have told us that religion is beyond the province of the civil magistrate, that the sole duty of rulers is to protect people in their religion, whatever it might be; and they have given us to understand as plain as words can do it that even the laws of the second table are to be embodied in the civil code of the country without any sanction from the first, and by the sanction only derived from temporal conditions. The foundation prin- 581

principle by which our United Presbyterian brethren interpret the Articles of Agreement is their distinctive principle. No doubt under a new arrangement that principle no longer bristles distinct from ours; it is quietly buried under a paragraph of a narrative statement, but it is there; and it does not signify where you meet a snake if you do meet it – a snake in the grass is more dangerous than if it bristles up where there is no grass to hide it. (Laughter.) I hope I am not speaking disrespectfully – if I am, I would at once withdraw it – ("No, no") – but I just mentioned it to illustrate what I mean. (Laughter.) The application of the Articles of Agreement, by the showing of our brethren, ends in Voluntaryism, because the application of a principle is the carrying of it out. But, on the other hand, the narrative tells us they lead to Free Churchism. What is that but telling us that they have two meanings? – that they mean one thing to the United Presbyterians and another thing to us. Therefore our business is, if you will act like truthful men, servants of Christ for the truth's sake, to decide the question as to the real meaning of these Articles of Agreement. I pray the Assembly to note what this distinctive article of the United Presbyterians means. As it now stands, it just means that it is not competent for the civil magistrate to legislate as to what is true in religion at all. Mr. Ker says, in that beautiful pamphlet of his, that the civil magistrate is not to touch on the sphere of man's relations to God; he has only to do with the civil sphere of their relations to each other as members of society. Dr. Harper, in his pamphlet, says that the civil magistrate is to perform all his official functions according

to Christian principle, and he quotes Dr. Wardlaw to show that the province of the civil magistrate in relation to religion is to have no province at all, (Laughter and applause.) I suppose I may not be contradicted when I tell the Assembly that in the course of our discussion in the committee it was again and again put to our brethren, but they refused to say, whether the law of the civil magistrate ought to bear any marks of his Christianity. I put it to them myself I said – Take two shoemakers, for instance, one a Christian and the other an infidel. They both make a pair of shoes, but you cannot tell from the appearance of the shoes which pair was made by the Christian and which by the infidel. (Laughter.) I asked our United Presbyterian brethren if they thought the laws of the civil magistrate should be like the shoes; but we could not get an answer to the question. (Applause.) They refused to allow the civil magistrate to do what all other men are entitled to do – namely, to acknowledge the truth, and aid in supporting it. Any other man is to be allowed, he is hailed, with all his resources and all the helps he can give to further religion. This is the meaning of the United Presbyterian distinctive article. I say the articles can be construed in a Voluntary sense and also in a Free Church sense, and our ministers and people will see that if they master the subject. Our leading doctors say the Bible is to be our standard. Unitarians say the same thing. I suppose, however, that our United' Presbyterian brethren are just as sound generally as we are. (Hear, hear.) But they say that the civil magistrate is precluded from officially concerning himself about religion – that he is precluded by the Bible from making legislative recognition of the very Bible which he owns as his rule, or supporting the means for spreading the knowledge and worship of God. Now, the Articles of Agreement is pure Voluntaryism. I must again refer to our article. As it was first drawn out, it gave Christ the title of "Governor over the nations." They insisted upon this being eliminated, and they at last excluded this glorious title of our Lord. The phrase "having all power in heaven and on earth" was substituted; but it does not convey Christ's Headship over the nations as the expression we expunged did. I said little about it at the time, for I was modest enough to take

little part in the proceedings at first. I had, however, had occasion to battle with a great many Voluntaries on that very subject. They would not even admit that magistrates, like other persons, should use the power they possessed on behalf of religion. Then, as to the Sabbath question, the article first spoke only of the example of the disciples and apostles; but Dr. Begg got the Fourth Commandment also specified. We said it is the duty of the civil magistrate to legislate for the outward observance of the Sabbath, so as to prevent its being openly desecrated. Our United Presbyterian brethren thought the civil magistrate should legislate with the view of protecting the people in their observance of the Sabbath. People who don't look closely into the matter may think there is no difference; but there is a great difference. I asked them, for example, whether they would not put down theatres and places open for amusement and gross indulgence on the Sabbath? And the answer was, "Yes, if they were among Sabbath keeping neighbours." I said to them, by way of testing what they hold "Supposing that the people in a district had agreed, every man and woman alike, to break the Sabbath, and nobody was offended would the Christian magistrate tolerate that?" and to this hour they refused to give us an answer to that question. (Hear, hear.) They determinedly refused every effort on our part to create the impression that it was the right and duty of the civil magistrate to prevent the desecration of the Sabbath. Even in the form it now stands their definition runs that it is the magistrate's duty to legislate in the matter of the external observance of the Sabbath – to protect the people if they wish to keep it. The expression "in the matter" does not say whether for or against it, and lest it should be interpreted in our direction, there was a hard battle to get it removed. Well, then, I think I have said enough to show that their view of the Sabbath differs essentially from ours. (No.) I believe it does so far at least as has yet come out. Then again the expression that it is not within the province of the magistrate to invade the rights and liberties which Christ has conferred on His Church, and which accordingly all powers on earth ought to hold sacred – a great deal, as we are aware, is made of that clause, but what does it amount to? It is all the powers on earth whose duties are laid down, and that very plainly proves that the duty must be gathered from the light of nature, since one-half of them have not the light of revelation. Again, what does non-invading and holding sacred mean? Neither more nor less than this, that they are not to interfere with these things. They are to let them alone; they are to protect them from intrusion as you protect Popish worship from intrusion. That is the whole. They say "the rights and liberties which Christ has conferred on His Church," but you will observe it is not said "because Christ has conferred them on His Church." Dr. Buchanan interprets that clause as if it said "because," but it is only said, "the rights which Christ has con-ferred,?" so that the reason of holding them sacred is not their origin as from Christ, but their nature as things belonging to the spiritual and unseen; and in the same category would we place rights belonging to the Roman Catholic religion and other anti-Christian bodies in the world. All kinds of religion are to be held equally sacred. When our excellent friend Dr. Brown writes pamphlets and speaks a good deal, to show us that what we hold about rulers to the Church is conveyed in that article, he fancies he sees a castle where any other body can only see a windmill. (Laughter.) Another thing is said in the articles of which much is made. It is stated that "it is the duty of the civil magistrate to further the interests of the Lord Jesus Christ among his subjects in every way consistent with its spirit and enactments." Now, we know very well what we mean by that language. We mean that the magistrate is formally and avowedly to give official prefer- 582
ence and official support to the true as distinct from false religions. But our United Presbyterian brethren mean no such thing. What they mean is, that the civil magistrate is so to spread throughout the land, by a wise civil government, outward order and civil virtue, so as to give an opportunity to true religion to thrive more than any other, because true religion will better thrive in a well ordered commonwealth than a false religion would. I presume that is the length they go – very much as if a lecturer on total abstinence would urge, as a very powerful reason for putting down intemperance, that religion would have a better chance if that were done. I believe it is precisely in the same way that the magistrate, according to the United Presbyterians, is to further the interests of the Lord Jesus Christ among his subjects. I quote Dr. Harper's words on this subject – "So far as concerns the relations and duties of the people to God, the official duty of their civil rulers is exhibited by simply protecting them alike, and not interfering with their spiritual interests at all, even with the view of advancing them." Then Mr. Ker says in his pamphlet – "If the magistrate consults the Bible rightly he will leave the domain of religion between man and reference untouched and undamaged. In reference to the relation between man and man, the Word of God is there to guide him in legislation and administration." Now, I put it to my brethren and to the Church if we do not here learn the precise meaning our United Presbyterian brethren attach to the language of the clause referred to. Then there are the questions of the marriage law, thanksgivings, and oaths. The marriage law is simply enforced as a civil arrangement, and not

as founded on God's Word. How is the civil magistrate to appoint days of thanksgiving? We are told expressly by Mr. Ker that he is to do so when the people feel the necessity and want of them. The civil magistrate is to act as the registrar of the will of the people. We say that the civil magistrate ought to recognise the creed and jurisdiction of the Church. Our United Presbyterian brethren say the opposite – that he is not to recognise the creed and jurisdiction of the Church. That is the position in which, after years of manipulation, these articles present themselves. They have manifestly two meanings. And yet today, and on all other occasions, some are in the habit of striking the note of eulogy, and they are followed in a similar strain by a number of smaller musicians. (Laughter and applause.) I would not give two clauses of the Second Book of Discipline and that short passage in the Confession of Faith for ten thousand such articles. As soon as they are buried by their makers down in a deep grave it will be better for all. I have a remark to make about State aid. The way in which we have been misrepresented on this point is such as to make our views odious even to ourselves. To prove that their views on the subject were not new, he read from the Second Book of Discipline, after which he continued – I only wish our fathers got greater justice done to them. They knew the Bible better than we do, or entered better into the spirit of it. (Applause.) Now, our United Presbyterian brethren quite differed from us, because the way they put the article contradicts their own practice. What do I find from a letter from one of our missionaries in Africa? He says: – "The United Presbyterian mission in this country receives lands from Government for their mission. Land is money. One, if not two, of their stations hold more land from Government than any of ours. One of their stations has got 500 acres of land surveyed and none of ours have more than 180 acres. I mean 500, not to the people of the station (they have their own), but to the mission – to the United Presbyterian Board. Two of their stations receive money for schools direct from Government – hard money for mission schools – I believe two, but am certain of one." Well, does anybody wonder at it? I don't. What I contend

for is this, that they ought to formulate their articles in accordance with their practice. I oppose their article being present in any form of agreement because of the dishonor it passes upon our fathers. More than that, I oppose the presence of that article because it would have been an entire obstacle to the work we have to do now – an effectual obstacle to the work which we must continue more and more to do if we are to become a really united and powerful Church. In a thousand directions, as I endeavoured to show on Thursday, there is work lying for us to do. Without any connection with the State, such as the connection we have given up finally, I will never consent to an article which would be there frowning upon us, which would raise up continually, if men chose, objections to our going on with the work that in the future lies before us in this direction. (Hear.)

Mr. Mitchell, a Glasgow elder, seconded Mr. Nixon's motion. There was a time, he said, when the glory of this Church consisted in this, that she refused to remain an Erastian Church or to become a Voluntary Church; she would be content with no other character than that of the Free Protesting Church of Scotland, protesting against the errors of Erastianism on the one hand, and of Voluntaryism on the other. Erastianism had not changed, And Voluntaryism had not changed; but the times had changed and men had changed. To the origin and progress of that change he was not there to refer – the evidence of it lay in the report now on the table, and the statement therein, out of the elements of which it was proposed to form a basis for union with Voluntaries. The Assembly occupied a perfectly different position from what they did two years ago, The question then was argued with reference to a report which was not completed, but now the full report was before the House, and they were entitled to say whether or not they considered it such a report as they could send down. It had hitherto been understood that all articles of agreement were only of value in so far as they set forth the subject under discussion in the clearest possible manner, and in language that could not be misunderstood, that was perfectly unambiguous, and that could not admit of double senses or double interpretations. But that one party should call them noble and beautiful because they put their own interpretation upon them, and that another party should call them noble and beautiful on the ground of a perfectly different construction, was to throw contempt upon all such articles. He thought these remarks applied directly to the condemnation of the report now before them, and to the statement of principles therein contained. He was prepared to maintain – and he might say that many friends in Glasgow, office-bearers and others, were of the like opinion – that the character of these articles was most unsatisfactory. He maintained – and he believed he was speaking the mind of a very large number, though not the majority of his brethren in Glasgow – that they were indefinite, defective, misleading, ambiguous, and contradictory. They were decidedly indefinite, for there was not a single term defined. Of course they were told that certain terms were used in the same sense as hith-erto; but they were nowhere told that the negotiating Churches were agreed upon that sense. Having argued that the paragraph which had been introduced into the report, standing second on the tenth page – the object of which was to set forth the views held by the Reformed Church of Scotland as to the duty of the State to religion and the Church – was misleading and defective, he went on to give one illustration of the ambiguous and contradictory nature of the articles. They were told in the second section, under first head of programme, that it was the duty of the civil magistrate to be ruled in the making of his laws and the administration of justice by the religion of Christ; but 583
they were now told, for the first time, that this religion was to be understood as it had always been understood in the Confession of the negotiating Churches – in other words, the creed of this religion lay in the Confession of Faith. But they were told in the distinctive articles that it was not competent for the civil magistrate to sanction any creed in the way of setting up a civil establishment of religion. Now, if one religion so defined in the Confession was to be the religion by which laws were to be made and justice administered, did it not become the religion of the state and of the nation? Was it not thereby, to all intents and purposes, established? These two articles were so utterly contradictory of one another, that it was perfectly impossible to understand them. If he liked the articles little, he liked the advocacy of them just as little. He did not refer to the personal aspect of the question, but simply to the advocacy upon its merits; and he said that the advocacy which was ready to abandon an important fundamental principle of the Church was not an advocacy of which he could approve. It was an advocacy ready to maintain that all that was vital and essential in that fundamental principle had been departed from and buried in the Disruption of 1843. It was an advocacy ready to retract and explain away all the important declarations of their Church in former years up to 1863, connected with this great principle. It was an advocacy which made it necessary to believe that all the Reformers and the leading men of the Church had been mistaken and misguided. In the closing year

of his life Dr. Chalmers wrote: – "Internal Voluntaryism will not of itself do all, and with all the vaunted prosperity of the Free Church, I do not find that external Voluntaryism will make up the deficiencies of the former, or still less of itself do all either. We rejoice, therefore, in the testimony of the Free Church for national Establishments, and most sincerely wish she shall never fall away from it." The advocacy of the union movement was an advocacy ready to turn its old hereditary, time honored principle out of the Confession in order to suit present exigencies. He would say in conclusion, that faithfulness to the principles of their Church, and the truest patriotism alike forbade that they should form an incorporating union with those who openly held that the kingdom of Christ was a kingdom with the active and practical maintenance of which the State had nothing to do. It was on these grounds that he very cordially seconded the motion made by Mr. Nixon. (Applause.)

(*To be continued*)

---

## POPISH STATISTICS.

It appears (says the *Daily Review*) on an examination of the new "Roman Catholic Directory," published *permissu superiorium,,* and under the sanction of Archbishop Manning, that there are thirty peers of the three kingdoms and fifty baronets who profess the Roman Catholic faith, and also thirty-eight members of the House of Commons. There are now thirteen Roman Catholic "dioceses," including the "archdiocese" of Westminster, all which, taken together, form the "province" of Westminster, with Archbishop Manning at its head. His twelve "suffragans" are Dr. Ullathorne, of Birmingham; Dr. Brown, of Menevia and Newport;. Dr. Grant, of Southwark; Dr. Turner, of Salford; Dr. Brown, of Shrewsbury; Dr. Rosskell, of Nottingham; Dr. Goss, of Liverpool, Dr. Vaughan, of Plymouth; the Hon. Dr. Clifford, of Clifton; Dr. Amherst, of Northampton; Dr. Cornthwaite of Beverley; and Dr. Chadwick, of Hexham. During the past year there have been no less than sixty-three Roman Catholic priests ordained in England and Wales, fifty-six belonging to the regular and seven to the secular clergy. There are nineteen Roman Catholic chaplains to the forces, including three "on half pay." The total of Roman Catholic priests in England and Wales is given as 1489; the number of churches, chapels, and mission stations as 1,122; the monasteries, or convents of men as 67; the nunneries, or convents of women, as 214; and the colleges as 18 in all, including some "preparatory colleges," or, as we should term them, schools. Of the chapels in England and Wales, no less than about 640 are registered for marriages, and therefore, the *Directory* says, "may be regarded as parochial" The Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, it appears from the same authority, is presided over by four Bishops, and geographically divided, not into "dioceses," but into "districts." These are three in number – the eastern, the western, and the northern. These "districts" number 201 clergy, who serve 207 chapels and "mission stations." Besides these, there are in Scotland 18 convents for women and two colleges. The list of Roman Catholic Peers of the three kingdoms is as follows: – The Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Denbigh, Buchan, Fingall, Granard, Bonmare, Orford, Dunraven, and Gainsborough; the Countess of Newburgh; Viscounts Gormanstown, Taaffe, and Southwell; Lords Beaumount, Camoys, Stourton, Vaux of Harrowden, Petre, Arundell of Wardour, Dormer, Stafford, Clifford of Chudleigh, Herries, Lovet, Trimleston, Louth, Ffrench, How-den, and Bellew. To these must be added the Marquis of Bute, who apparently "seceded" after the sheets of the *Directory* were sent to press. It may be interesting to know that the list of Roman Catholic peers in 1769, just one hundred years ago, included eight English and six Irish peers – viz.: the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Shrewsbury, the Lords Stourton, Petre, Dor-mer, Teynham, Langdale, and Arundell, in the peerage of England; and Viscounts Taaffe, Molyneux, Fairfax, and Barnswell, and Lords Cahir and Baltimore. At the time when Roman Catholic emancipation was granted, now just forty years ago, the list stood as follows: – The Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lords Stourton, Petre, Arandell, Dormer and Clifford, in England; the Earls of Newburgh and Traquair, in Scotland; and the Earls of Fingal and Kenmare, Viscounts Gormanstown, Taaffe, and Southwell, and Lords Trimleston and Ffrench. The Roman Catholic Baronets are given as follows: – Sir Robert T. Gerard, Sir Francis Vincent, Sir Henry A. J. Doughty-Tichbourne, Sir Bouchier P. Wrey, Sir Charles M. Wolseley, Sir Nicholas W. Throckmorton, Sir Edward Blount, Sir John D. Acton, Sir Henry Webb, Sir George Bowyer, Sir Henry P. Bedingfield, Sir Charles F. Smith, Sir Rowland S. Errington, Sir Edward R. Gage, Sir Pyers Mostyn, Sir Paul W. Molesworth, Sir Robert Gordon, Sir Wm. D. Stewart, Sir Wm. B. Codrington, Sir John Button, Sir Reginald A. Barnswell, Sir John Esmonde, Sir Joseph Burke, Sir Gerald D. Fitz-Gerald, Sir John V. Bradstreet, Sir John St. George, Sir Arthur E. Rumbold, Sir Vere E. DeVere, Sir Richard H. Pollen, Sir Charles Nugent, Sir Thomas John, Bourke, Sir George Goold, Sir Rowland Blannerhasset, Sir Archibald K. Macdonald, Sir Charles C. Domville, Sir Thomas Clifford-Constable, Sir John Simeon, Sir Edwd. Vavasour, Sir Pelroy Nugent, Sir Colman M. O'Loghlen, Sir Henry Grattan-Bellew, Sir Humphrey De Trafford, Sir John Lawson, Mr Henry W. Barron, Sir James Power, Sir Patrick O'Brien, Sir Dominick J. Corrigan, Sir John Ennis, and Sir Charles H. Tempest.


# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 50. SYDNEY, NOVEMBER 1869.

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. 50 NOVEMBER. Vol. 1

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

The Duty of Ministers – Watching for Souls … … … 585

The Annual Meeting of the Synod of Eastern Australia … … 587

Ordination … … … … … … 591

Mr. John Anthony Stuart … … … … 592

Correspondence: - Mr. Grant's Opening Address … … 593

Union Question … … … … … 594

## THE DUTY OF MINISTERS – WATCHING FOR SOULS.

"They watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief." Heb. 13: 17.

[Substance of the opening sermon delivered by the retiring Moderator, the Rev. William S. Donald, in the Synod of Eastern Australia.]

There are among the unthinking and ignorant very erroneous ideas entertained concerning the nature and duties of the holy ministry. Some, who are as careless as they are ignorant, look upon the office of the ministry not as a position of solemn trust, but as a position for securing worldly ease or emol-ument. They contrast the duties of the minister of religion with the duties of the man of business, or with the employments of the sons of toil, and they do not hesitate to assert that the secular far surpasses the sacred both in the nature and extent of the responsibilities involved. Those, however, who entertain such ideas concerning the ministerial function, prove themselves to be altogether unacquainted with it. When rightly understood it may safely be affirmed, that there is no office, be it what it may, which entails greater responsibilities, or requires more energy, painstaking, and care in the discharge of its duties than this does. It must be an all important office which has for its object the stewardship of the mysteries of God, and that man has indeed a weighty trust committed to him who has been appointed to feed the flock of God, and who is called upon so to conduct himself that he may be clear from the blood of all men. It will be observed that in the passage under consideration the ministerial office is presented under a twofold aspect.

I. It is viewed in regard to its duties – ministers are to watch for souls, and

II. It is viewed in regard to its responsibilities "as those who must give account"

I. The ministerial office is here viewed in regard to its duties. It will be observed that it is stated here as well as elsewhere, that it is mainly with the spiritual and eternal interests of their people that ministers are called upon to deal. It is true, no doubt, that ministers under the influence of enlarged Christian sympathies are expected, and rightly expected, to lend their aid in promoting such schemes as have for their end the doing of good to their fellow-creatures, even although these schemes have only respect to time. No one thinks it out of place, on the part of Gospel ministers, to be ready to act the part of general philanthropist, and as far as their influence goes, to help forward any properly conducted enterprise which has for its object the ameliorating of human misery, or the advancement of human improvement. It cannot be otherwise with them, if they have the same mind in them as was also in Christ Jesus. He fed the hungry, he healed the sick, he wept with the mourning, he comforted the bereaved, and those ministers who have most of the spirit of their Master will not fail to be forward in doing the same. Still the great object which is to occupy the attention of those whom God hath put into the ministry is the spiritual and eternal interests of those committed to their charge. That this is the case is set forth in very impressive terms in the passage under consideration. It is here said concerning them that they "watch for souls." This language is peculiarly expressive. It indicates that the one great object which ministers are to have in their minds is the soul welfare of those amongst whom they are placed as watchmen. So comprehensive indeed is this expression "watch for souls," that it indicates that those who are put in trust with the Gospel, are both most anxiously to desire, and also most assiduously to labor that the souls of their people may be fitted for, and in due time received into the rest of God. In looking, then, at the passage as setting forth the duty of ministers of the Gospel, the question arise how shall they best perform that duty, in what manner shall they watch for souls, so that through the divine blessing they may be the means of guiding them to their rest? In attempting to answer this question, all that we can do is to indicate a few of those things which fall to be attended to in carrying out the duty of watching for souls. And

1st. Those who watch for souls must warn them. It seems obvious that it must be part of the duty of those who watch for souls to warn them, in order that they may be preserved from the evils with which they are surrounded. This is shewn very forcibly from the declarations of the Holy Scripture whether in the Old Testament or in the New. For example, in the book of Ezekiel, God is represented as saying to the prophet, "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel; therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way to save his life, the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand." In like manner, also, in the Epistle to Timothy, it is said to the same 586

effect, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, preach the word, be instant in season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." From these passages it appears, that both the inspired prophet and also the inspired apostle were instructed to declare, that warning those to whom they were called upon to address themselves was to form an essential part of the work of ministers. It is true that it may not be a pleasant part of ministerial work to have to warn, still it is a necessary part. No man, in the language of the prophet, can fulfil all his duty as a watchman to the house of Israel unless he warn the people from God. And peradventure there never was a time in the history of religion in which faithful and affectionate warning was more needed than it is at present in the professedly Christian world. There are evil influences at work which, like so many nets for the feet, are ready to entangle and ensnare even those who

would desire to go forward steadily and honestly in the right way. In the business community, for example, there are vast numbers who allow themselves to be so hurried along in the pursuit of wealth, and who become so deeply immersed in the affairs of time, that they are led to overlook altogether, or attend but slightly to the higher inter- ests of eternity; and surely it would be anything but out of place for those who are appointed to watch for souls, to warn those who are so engrossed with the things that are seen and temporal as to neglect the things that are unseen and eternal, that they are in danger of bringing ruin upon themselves by such a course. But not only are there many of the business community who require to be warned against allowing themselves to be too much engrossed with the affairs of time; there are others who require to be warned, and warned earnestly against yielding to those corrupt and dishonourable, not to say fraudulent and dishonest, practices which so notoriously, so flagrantly, are found to prevail in commercial transactions. Without doubt it becomes those who are set as watchmen to blow the trumpet of alarm loudly in regard to these things, lest those for whose souls they watch become inveigled in so prevalent an evil, and be undone. For the getting of treasures by a lying tongue is a vanity tossed to and fro of them that seek death. But again in these latter days there are multitudes who show themselves in various ways lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. There are the crowds which in every community frequent the racecourse, and find, as would seem, the highest gratification in its exciting but demoralising attractions; there are the numbers which sit around the gaming table with their attention all alive to the object in view, and are becoming day after day more confirmed in the vice of gambling, and hastening with rapid strides on the high road to ruin, both as regards time and also as regards eternity. And what shall be said of the multitudes who night after night fill our theatres and dancing saloons where every spark of piety must from the nature of things be quenched, and where hardness of heart and vicious propensities must be fostered and developed. And what shall be said of that abounding profligacy and licentiousness, both amongst men and women, which with such a brazen and unblushing front, stalk abroad upon our streets. And what shall be said of other descriptions of iniquity which are manifest and rampant both among the high and the low, both amongst rulers and ruled. Surely when all these things are kept in view it will appear that those whom God hath been pleased to appoint to watch for souls, and from whom he will require an account, have ground and warrant for warning those to whom they are called upon to address themselves, to beware of falling into the perpetration of

such abominations. But farther, not only have those who are put in trust with the Gospel to warn against such things as these; they have to warn against other things, which, though less thought of by many, are not less ruinous to souls. They must warn them against letting go those principles of our most holy religion, which are surely held amongst us, and against adopting errors and delusions by whomsoever maintained and advocated. In these times it is thought by not a few, inconsistent with an age of such enlightenment as the present to stand on the ground of that uncompromising principle, which will not resile one hair's breadth from whatever it believes to be according to God's testimonies, in conformity with God's truth. In this age of progress it is thought much more judicious, and a commendable exhibition of Christian expediency to enter into compromises, to allow principles to lie in abeyance, – not to be over scrupulous in adhering to certain doctrines, and not to be too particular in condemning various worldly practices, nor to rub too roughly against sundry prejudices; nor to bind up too tightly those who profess religion, lest it drive them to tear themselves to pieces, and abandon it altogether. Now it need not be said that it is incumbent upon those who watch for souls, and desire to present their account with joy and not with grief, to give warning against yielding to such inconsistencies. It may be that in adopting this course the watchmen who faithfully issue these warnings may subject themselves to contumely and reproach. They may be counted illiberal and denounced as bigots. Their enemies amongst themselves “may laugh and flout” at what they call their narrow mindedness. “The proud may hold them greatly in derision” for condemning what so many sanction; still, all this ought not to move them. It is not to men but to God that they have to give an account of their stewardship. It is not their fellow servants, but the Master who will reckon with them for the employment of their talents, and it will be a blessed return for their diligence, if He, say, “Well done good and faithful servant, ye have been faithful in a few things, enter ye into the joy of your Lord.” So much then for one part of the duty of those who are appointed to watch for souls. They must warn those over whom they watch against yielding themselves to the practices of sin, or to the delusions of error. And how should those to whom these warnings are given receive them? Should they resent them as if they were an impertinent interference with matters with which it did not belong to the watchmen to intermeddle. Should they give themselves up to anger and kick against reproof? Certainly not. They should receive the warning in the same spirit in which it is given. They should obey and submit. They should attend to the warning in a spirit of meekness and obey it, by keeping aloof from, by carefully avoiding the evils warned against, inasmuch as they are contrary to God's word, and will prove injurious to their own souls. But we remark

2nd. That those who watch for souls must be able to instruct and guide those over whom they watch. It is no doubt unhappily true that there are many who require to be warned, but it is also true that there are some who require to he guided and instructed. It would be a deplorable consideration if there were none of those, to whom ministers were called upon to address themselves, anxiously feeling after the Lord that they might find him earnestly seeking the way to Zion with their faces thitherward. It is cause peradventure for lamentation that there are so few of these; still, when such there are, it falls to those who watch for souls to be able to direct them to the Saviour, and to point out to them the way in which they may find rest. Those who occupy the position of ambassadors for Christ are called upon to be guides to the blind, light to them that sit in 587
darkness, instructors of the foolish, teachers of the babes They ought to be able rightly to divide the word of truth. They ought to be in a condition to speak as the oracles of God, that they may be the means of saving such as hear them. They ought to be able to do thus at all times, but more especially when those, who occupy the position of sincere inquirers after truth, are troubled and perplexed in their minds with the plausible but dangerous opinions which cause so many to err, which delude them from the path of duty, and land them in false security or indifference. It is even so those who watch for souls have a difficult task to perform, and they would require to be endowed with great spiritual discernment in order to perform it aright. They would themselves require to be scribes well instructed in the Kingdom of God, in order that they may be able to help weak and feeble inquirers to finding peace in Jesus; and also that they may be in a condition to direct believers in Jesus through the snares and dangers which beset their path. Seeing then that these things are so, how earnest should all, who have

been charged, and who have charged themselves with the doing of this work, be, that they may be graciously enabled to do it, so that God may be glorified and souls saved. The watchman will have to descend from his watch tower some day, and will have to give an account of how he has fulfilled his trust. The minister will have to leave his preaching, and his visitation, and his study, and be reckoned with as to how he has executed his office as a ruler in the house of God. How blessed then would it be, in the prospect of all this, if rulers over the house of God, when they had studied their last text, and preached their last sermon, and paid their last visit, could with some measure of confidence humbly say, we have endeavoured to declare the whole counsel of God, to warn the unruly, to comfort the feeble minded, to support the weak. And how farther blessed it would be if from evidence of their success they could anticipate the giving in their account to their master with joy and not with grief, and say, "Here are we, O Lord, and the children that Thou hast given us." But alas, it is a mournful circumstance that those who watch over souls and whose earnest desire it is to lead inquirers to the Saviour, and build up such as are in the faith, see but comparatively little evidence of success. How rarely do inquirers wait upon them for guidance? How seldom do believers appear to be advancing and making progress in the divine life? May the time soon come when greater life and earnestness shall be seen pervading our congregations, when many shall be found exclaiming, "What shall we do to be saved!" and when like Cornelius the Centurion, and those who were with him, they shall be present with longing hearts to hear the words commanded of God.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SYNOD OF EASTERN AUSTRALIA.

The Synod of Eastern Australia met in St. George's Church, Sydney, on Wednesday, the 3rd inst., at 7 o'clock p.m. The Rev. William S. Donald, the retiring Moderator, preached an appropriate and impressive sermon from Hebrews 13: 17, and then constituted the Synod. The roll having been made up, the Rev. William McIntyre was unanimously chosen Moderator, and delivered the following address: –

"In entering on the duties which you have now assigned to me, I will venture to submit a few remarks on the relations of the Church to the truth, conceiving that this is a subject to which, as we may afterwards indicate, recent ecclesiastical history and existing ecclesiastical tendencies very urgently call attention. And, besides, it is specially necessary that we do not overlook the nature and importance of those relations, for it is for the very purpose of preserving them undisturbed, that we maintain the distinctive position which we occupy as a Church.

The relations of the Church to the truth are twofold. The truth is the mould, from which the Church derives, or ought to derive, its entire form and character; and the Church is the special divinely instituted Agency, to which the proclamation, maintenance, and application of the truth have been entrusted. To the preservation undisturbed of the former of these relations it is evidently necessary that the Church be wholly guided by the truth in the admission and expulsion of members, both official and non-official. The truth specifies the qualifications which members should possess, and requires that none be admitted to the position of members but such as appear to possess them, and that none with respect to whom it becomes evident that they do not possess them be allowed to retain that position. The qualifications comprehended in a certain profession of religion, in a profession which, at the very least, so far as appears, may be genuine, or, as it has been expressed, an uncontradicted profession, are required on the part of all members. Accordingly, when persons who make no profession of religion, or whose profession, though such as might, if uncontradicted, be accepted as credible, is so decidedly contradicted by their conformity to the world or otherwise, that it is not credible, are admitted to membership or not expelled from it, the Church so far divests itself of the character which in respect of its membership the truth requires it should bear; and its relations to the truth are so far and most grievously disturbed. When a Church, in the respect now indicated, rejects the guidance of the truth, and divests itself so far of the distinctive character of a Church of Christ, it practically proclaims that such as do not even appear to be members of the Church are members of it, that, for example, frequenters of the theatre, the ball-room, and the racecourse, – those who participate in all the frivolities and amusements, to which those who are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God betake themselves, and who even take the lead in them, – are, if not all that it is desirable, at least all that it is necessary, that members of the Church should be, it thus lowers the standard of personal religion, or, rather, substitutes for the reality of personal religion a base and worthless counterfeit, and, by doing so, gives distinct sanction to the self deception which all are naturally prone to practice, and which multitudes actually practice to the ruin of their souls.

In the case of official members the qualifications implied in the lowest profession, that, being uncontradicted, can be accepted as credible, ought not, I conceive, at least ordinarily, to be regarded as sufficient. A more decided profession of religion – a profession supported by more positive and convincing evidence, or exhibiting such ought – to be required. And, of course, in addition to the qualifications implied in such a profession, office-bearers should possess, in some satisfactory measure, official qualifications – that is, they should not only possess, in a decided form, the qualifications required in members of the Church, but should possess further the qualifications which constitute the fitness and competency of office-bearers for the discharge of official duty.

Of the various forms of contradiction by which a profession of religion may be invalidated, Church censure is the most decided and pronounced. Nothing can well be more monstrous, more thoroughly subversive of the very idea of the Church as a society of approved members, than the admission to the privileges of a member, or the status of an office-bearer, of a person lying at the time and known to be lying under Church censure, and even under the censure of the Church so admitting him. This particular violation of Christ's law has, I presume, been seldom exhibited. It was exhib- 588
ited, however, in this colony. It was deliberately resorted to for the purpose of facilitating the union subsequently effected. This fact alone would have justified, and indeed rendered imperative our refusal to enter into that union, and our maintenance of the position which we occupy. Nor was it only the monstrous character of the step itself that forbade our concurrence in it. It was also an important consideration that a Church that originated in such a proceeding could not be expected to manifest faithfulness in its subsequent history. It could not with any consistency even profess concern to maintain the purity of its communion.

In the case particularly of teaching elders it is a necessary qualification that they be sound in the faith – that in doctrine they show uncorruptness. At the time of their admission to office they ought to be required to give full satisfaction on this point; and if, subsequently, they adopt unsound views, they ought to be promptly and faithfully dealt with, that if possible they may be reclaimed from the error into which they have fallen; and, if this attempt fail, they should be deprived of an office which they are no longer, even in appearance, qualified to exercise. When a Church,

for the sake of peace or from whatever motive, tolerates decidedly unscriptural teaching, it seriously obliterates in its own case that conformity to the truth which ought to constitute its distinctive character. This, however, the Union Church does, continuing, as it might have been expected to do, the unfaithfulness in which it originated.

And, while the Church should be wholly guided by the truth in the admission and expulsion of members, both official and non-official, it should be guided by it also and equally in the formation of its testimony. It should admit nothing into its testimony except on the authority of the Scriptures, and it should admit into it and retain in it all that Christ in the Scriptures has committed to it as its testimony. This was the principle on which the Scottish Reformation was effected; and it was the application of it, fully and faithfully carried out, that imparted to it its thoroughness. The adoption by the early, that is the post-apostolic Church, of certain views and practices, affords the modern Church no warrant to adopt them. The early Church had no right to adopt – it acted in violation of its duty in adopting any views or practices not sanctioned by the Scriptures; and an adoption of them, thus unauthorised and even blameworthy on its part, would not, of course, form a precedent by which the Church of any subsequent period should be guided. It would rather constitute, especially when viewed in the light of the ultimate development of the views and practices adopted, a beacon by which it should be warned. Such traditions have no more authority as bearing on the testimony of the Church and by its testimony I understand all that it holds and declares – than was possessed by the traditions of the Elders which the Scribes and Pharisees alleged on behalf of their peculiar views and practices in the time of our Lord.

And, if tradition should not be allowed to modify the testimony of the Church, quite as little, certainly, should the spirit of the age, that is, the present phase of the tendency and activity of the world, be allowed to modify it. There are those, however, who allege that the spirit of the age should be allowed to modify it; that, for example, the testimony enunciated in the Westminster standards is now, to a certain extent, antiquated, and that a revised and briefer testimony, adapted to the alleged requirements of the age, should be substituted for it. Some even urge that the testimony of the Church should be recast and remodelled for every community into which it is introduced; that, for example, it should be so recast and remodelled for this community, that, as the result of the process, we might have 'an Australian Church for Australia,' that is, of course, a Church that should be Australian, not as occupying Australian territory, for all our Churches are Australian in that sense,

but as exhibiting Australian peculiarities, although what these may be it is hard to conjecture.

For the purpose, we presume, of effecting this adaptation of the Church to times and circumstances, the use of instrumental music and uninspired hymns in the public worship of God is beginning to be introduced among Presbyterians both here and in the mother country. On the subject of these innovations, the Union Church in this colony has adopted the utterly unpresbyterian deliverance that congregations may do with respect to them as they please, that is, that as regards these matters the Presbyterial government of the Church is suspended or abolished. In opposition to this innovating spirit, or, perhaps I should rather say, unassailed by it, we adhere, and I trust will always adhere, to the use of the inspired psalms, and to the Scriptural mode of worship which has been transmitted to us.

It is not, however, in the direction of an unauthorised extension of the Church's testimony that Presbyterians have of late been moving, but in the direction rather of reducing it within narrower limits than the Scriptures assign to it. This latter is the favorite process for effecting unions. It is the process by which the union in this colony was effected. All that is distinctive in the respective testimonies of Erastians, Free Churchmen, and Voluntaries was suppressed, and what is common to them retained and adopted as the testimony of the Union Church. Accordingly, each of the parties who accepted this curtailed testimony, accepted a more limited testimony than that which they previously bore, a more limited testimony therefore than it was their unbiased belief had been committed to the Church. To this curtailment of the Church's testimony we refused to be parties. We held, and still hold, that the Church ought to bear, in its whole extent, the testimony which it appears from the Scriptures Christ committed to it, resisting every inducement that may be presented to it, whether the prospect of union or any other, to suppress or surrender any portion of it. Under the influence, and in practical application of this conviction, we maintained, and continue to maintain the position we occupy as a Church. If we had become convinced that our testimony was in excess of the teaching of Scripture, we should expunge the portion of it that constituted this excess; but we are satisfied that our testimony is not in excess of the teaching of Scripture, and we therefore declined, and must still decline to reduce it within narrower limits. If we subjected it to such a process it would then be so far determined by our own devices and our own views of expediency, and not, as it ought to be, by Divine revelation.

The unionist compromise cannot fail to be the more baneful in its influence, from the fundamental character of the doctrine which so far as its operation has extended, it has erased from the Church's testimony, and the vital and perversive bearing of the fact which that doctrine sets forth. The doctrine in question is that of Christ's headship; and, while the Church is entirely dependent on his headship for all that constitutes its prosperity or conduces to it, it cannot be expected that he will exercise his headship in conferring prosperity on a church that refuses to bear a full scriptural testimony with respect to it.

The moment that a Church claims for itself or, at least, exercises a right to add to the teaching of Scripture and to diminish from it in forming its testimony, it becomes incapable of valour for the truth. It cannot deny to others the right which it arrogates to itself, to whatever extent they may carry the exercise of it. How, for example, can it challenge the Church of Rome for adding to the teaching of Scripture and diminishing from it, when it does the same thing itself? It may not, indeed, do it to the same extent to which it is done by that apostate Church, but it does the same thing in kind; and if the teaching of Scripture may be set aside, it *may* be



set aside; if it may be set aside to a certain limited extent, it may be set aside to any extent: It is only in association with entire confidence in Divine revelation and loyal adherence to it, that valour for the truth can be exercised or even exist."

The further treatment of the Church's relations to the truth the Moderator reserved for his closing address, which, as being a continuation of the opening address, we introduce here. It was to the following effect: –

"As the special organisation and agency Divinely appointed to apply the truth to the purposes which it is its direct office to serve, to maintain its integrity and purity, and to assert its claims, the Church is under obligation to exhibit the truth clearly and fully in its testimony. By discharging this obligation it may, and probably will, render its communion inaccessible or unacceptable to many who would otherwise join it, and, so far as it does so, it will prevent or obstruct the increase of its own numerical strength, and subject itself to the consequent disadvantages. But is it at liberty to protect or relieve itself from those disadvantages by curtailing its testimony, or expunging from it certain portions of the truth? The answer to this question returned by the union effected in this

colony, and by similar unions is that the Church is at liberty, and, indeed, under obligation, to curtail its testimony for the purpose specified. But is this the right answer to it? Most decidedly not. All admit – all with whom we are at present concerned – that it is the duty of the Church to bear witness to the truth. But this is an admission that it is the duty of the Church to bear witness to the whole of the truth. If it is its duty to bear witness to the truth, it is its duty to bear witness to all that falls under that designation, and into that category – to all that is the truth or that is comprehended in it. The two statements, that it is the duty of the Church to bear witness to the truth, and that it is its duty to bear witness to the whole of the truth, are exactly equivalent statements. They differ somewhat in expression, but not at all in meaning. 'The truth' in the one, and 'the whole of the truth' in the other, mean precisely the same thing. The former represents the truth in its whole extent, and the latter does no more, only it contains an 'interpretation' term, as we may call it, by which it is expressly intimated that it is in its whole extent that the truth is presented.

Accordingly, when Unionists admit – and they will not venture to deny – that it is the duty of the Church to bear witness to the truth, they must use this language in a 'non-natural' sense, meaning by 'the truth' not the whole of the truth, but only a portion of it; for their distinctive doctrine is, that, for the sake of union, the Church may exclude a certain portion of the truth from its testimony, or may cease or decline to bear witness to a certain portion of it. But, on the supposition that the Church may exclude a certain portion of the truth from its testimony, how is it to be ascertained or determined what portion of the truth may be subjected to this disparaging treatment? It will not be pretended that the Scriptures in any way indicate, with respect to any portion of the truth, that it is not the duty of the Church to bear witness to it.

The idea that the Scriptures should teach a doctrine, and should, notwithstanding, relieve the Church from the obligation to include it in its testimony, or, in other words, that they should communicate a doctrine to the Church as a portion of the truth which they teach, and should, notwithstanding, authorise the Church to dislodge and degrade it from the position which they thus assigned to it, is altogether monstrous. It is utterly incompatible with any just conception of a supernatural Divine revelation, that it should in any instance cancel and abolish its own authority; that it should teach a doctrine, and, yet, should not require that the Church should receive and hold it; should, indeed, leave the Church at liberty to exclude it from its testimony, that is, to reject it. It is thus evident, that

the Scriptures not only do not point out, but that it would be wholly inconsistent with their character and office that they should point out any portion of the truth as a portion of it that the Church might exclude from its testimony. Accordingly, if the Church is at liberty to subject any portion of the truth to this treatment, it must be at liberty to determine for itself what portion of it it will subject to it; in other words, it must be at liberty to form for itself an *index expurgatorius,* and to put in that *index* any portion of the truth it pleases. But is it conceivable that the Church is at liberty, that is, that it has authority from Christ, to deal in such a manner with any portion of the truth? or, in other words, to revise and modify the testimony which, in the exercise of his prophetic office, he has himself committed to it? If it had authority to exclude or expunge from its testimony any portion of the truth, of which it might be desirous or might deem it expedient to relieve itself, it would have authority equally to give this treatment to any other portion, and thus to the whole of it. If the fact that God has revealed and committed the truth to it, has not laid it under obligation to bear witness to the whole of the truth, it has not laid it under obligation, and it is not under obligation to bear witness to any portion of it. It is under obligation to bear witness to the whole or to none of it.

It is thus evident that the Unionist doctrine, which I am combating, is subversive of the claim which the truth has, on the ground that it is taught by God in his word, and is the truth, to be received and held by the Church, and is therefore infidel in principle. It is, in fact, an outcropping, to a comparatively limited extent, but in its genuine character, of the infidel disparagement of dogma, that is, of the truth in a definite form, which constitutes a marked and unhappy characteristic of the age. And, while the infidelity involved in the Unionist allegation, that the Church is at liberty to reduce its testimony within narrower limits than those assigned to it by the Scriptures, though prevented from extending itself any further, still bears the character and will exert the blighting influence of infidelity, it cannot be prevented from extending itself further. The further extension of it is, indeed, already discernible and in progress.

And, while the Church, in excluding or expunging from its testimony any portion of the truth, violates the obligation which its relation to the truth imposes upon it, it sins grievously by such mutilation of its testimony against its own interests. For the efficacy of its operations, the Church is entirely dependent on the Div-ine blessing, or the gracious exertion of the Divine power in connection with them. In every direction, and particularly as regards the accomplishment of the distinctive objects of the Church's lab-ours, 'power belongeth unto God.' – Ps. 62: 11. Whoever 'may plant and water,' whatsoever operations the Church may conduct, and by whatsoever agency, it is 'God that giveth the increase.' –1 Cor. 3: 7. And in imparting efficacy to the operations of the Church, the Divine power is exerted in connection with the proclamation, maintenance, and carrying out of its testimony in its operations, and in its attitude and proceedings throughout. Its commission is: – All power is given unto me in heaven, and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach [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; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' – Mat. 28: 18-20. Here Christ, as its head, commits a testimony to it, – the testimony which he himself, as 'the faithful and true witness,' bears with respect to sin and salvation, and with respect to his own claims and requirements. This testimony he commands it to proclaim in every land, labouring to secure from all the cordial and practical reception of it, and, at the same time, on its own part, faithfully adhering to it, and proceeding upon it under all circumstances, and in the face of all temptations to surrender or compromise it; and he prom-590

ises to it that, in connection with its devoted performance of this great duty, but in this connection only, 'he will be with it alway,' blessing it, and, as regards the point with which we are at present immediately concerned, imparting efficacy to its labours, and making it a blessing,

From the place thus occupied by the testimony of the Church, and the connection. which obtains between the bearing of it, and the communication of the Divine blessing both to the Church itself, and by means of it, it is evident that the true prosperity of a Church and the efficacy of its labours depend greatly, and, indeed, as regards the conditions of them on the Church's part, depend entirely on the fulness and purity of its testimony, and its zeal and faithfulness in bearing it. Hence to whatever extent a Church's testimony is unscriptural, and to whatever extent a Church fails to be imbued with the spirit of its testimony so far as it is scriptural, and fails therefore to bear it in faith and with devotedness and fidelity, to a corresponding extent its spiritual prosperity, and the success of its labours as regards spiritual results, must be obstructed. And it claims special attention, that, when a Church has

declined from previous attainments, or, with the view of obtaining or preserving outward advantages or any advantages, has more or less compromised or bartered away its principles, the consequent defects or corruptions of its testimony, as having had such an origin, will affect its interests and its efforts far more banefully than they would otherwise have done.

Having embodied the truth and proclaiming it in its testimony, the Church should further give it in charge to the proper office-bearers to apply it faithfully, without curtailment, and without admixture, to 'every creature' to whom they can extend their ministrations. And, having taken them bound to perform this duty, it should use all proper and prescribed means to prevent the violation by them, under any form, and especially by unscriptural teaching, of the obligation which it has thus imposed on them, and which, by accepting office, they have assumed.

I have already adverted to the grievous shortcomings of the Union Church in this direction, though one of its ministers has publicly enunciated unscriptural views on the subject of the atonement, and another of them, the radically infidel doctrine, that from the constitution of the human mind, and the character of the revelation which God has given to us, diversity of religious belief is inevitable, and ——————————————————————

The following is an extract of the treasurer's accounts: –

ABSTRACT OF FINANCIAL REPORT, FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st OCTOBER, 1868

| Congregations | Sustentation Fund | Ministers Scheme & Church Extens. | Missions to Heathen | Synod Fund | Congregation Funds | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sydney, St George's | | £10 0 0 | | | £634 15 4 | £644 15 4 |
| Sydney, North Shore | | 6 2 4 | | | | 6 2 4 |
| Bombala | £168 0 0 | 8 12 6 | | 1 11 0 | 265 0 0 | 443 3 6 |
| Manning River | 176 11 0 | 2 5 9 | 1 8 0 | 0 12 0 | 52 18 6 | 233 15 3 |
| Raymond Terrace & Ahalton | 97 0 0 | 2 10 1½ | 1 12 6½ | 1 5 9 | 41 18 11 | 144 7 4 |
| Raymond T. & Doribank Sabbath Schools | | | 1 6 0½ | | | 1 6 0½ |
| Maitland | 65 12 0 | 1 8 3 | 1 10 0 | 1 12 7 | 17 4 10 | 87 7 8 |
| Maitland Sabbath School | | | 2 6 0 | | | 2 6 0 |
| Inverell | 57 0 0 | 10 0 0 | | | | 67 0 0 |
| Clarence R., Grafton | | | | | 150 0 0 | 150 0 0 |
| " Rockymouth | 205 0 0 | 8 12 0½ | | 2 2 1 | 225 2 5½ | 440 16 7 |
| Hastings River | | 105 17 0 | 6 13 0 | 3 0 0 | | 115 10 0 |
| Barrington River | | 20 10 0 | | | | 20 10 0 |
| Clarence Town | | 10 13 0 | | | | 10 13 0 |
| Seaham | | 2 11 4 | | | | 2 11 4 |
| Donations | | | | | | |
| Mr. G. Mackay Dungog | 2 0 0 | | | | | 2 0 0 |
| Rev. Jas McCulloch | | 25 0 0 | | | | 25 0 0 |

that the existence of it is not undesirable; neither of them, so far as is known, has been dealt with by the Church Courts to which he is subject. The leaven deposited in the body of which I am speaking, by the compromise in which it originated, is thus in active operation, and, if its activity be not arrested, if it be not itself cast out, it must ultimately, and at no distant period, 'leaven the whole lump.'

But it is not enough that a Church bear a full and scriptural testimony; in order that it may be truly prosperous, it must be under the power and, in the character of its members, and thus in its own, bear the impress of the truth embodied in its testimony; it must feel and exemplify its transforming and practical influence."

THURSDAY, 4TH NOVEMBER.

The committee on sites reported that they had had frequent communications with the Government, and, as regarded the application from Grafton, had obtained the site applied for. They further stated that the Government manifested, every disposition to meet their wishes. The report was adopted, and the committee re-appointed. The committee on procuring ministers and church extension reported that they are in communication with four young men who are desirous to study for the ministry, and who appear to the committee to be all of them promising; two of them have already made considerable progress. The report was adopted, and the committee re-appointed. The committee on correspondence with sister Churches was re-appointed. After transacting some routine business, the Synod, at half past 7 p.m., engaged in devotional exercises, conducted by the Moderator, Rev. W. S. Donald, and Rev. John McLeod.

FRIDAY, 5TH NOVEMBER.

A call from the district of Port Macquarie in favour of Mr. McLeod having been referred to the Synod by the Presbytery of Maitland, the Synod, after deliberation, resolved to ordain Mr. McLeod as a minister at large, believing that this course was the best adapted to promote the interests of the district, and the most advisable on every ground. The Synod then took Mr. McLeod on trials and examined him on Greek, after which he delivered a lecture on John 1: 1-5, which the Synod sustained as a part of his trials. Circumstances preventing the Synod from proceeding with Mr. McLeod's trials, it remitted the whole matter of his ordination to the Presbytery of Maitland, which, having been authorised to meet in Sydney, concluded the trials, and ordained Mr. McLeod.

MONDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER.

After some routine business, the attention of the Synod was directed to the destitution and claims of Grafton and its vicinity. Sympathising deeply with the Grafton congregation, the Synod referred it to the Presbytery of Maitland to do all that may be practicable for it to supply ministrations to that congregation. The Synod appointed that at its meeting in November, 1870, addresses on the state of religion in our congregations, and throughout the land, and on the speculative, religious, and moral tendencies of the age shall be delivered, the former by the Rev. Allan 591

McIntyre, and the latter by the Rev. Colin R. Greig. The session of the Manning River congregation was authorised to ordain, if it see cause, an additional elder for the Port Macquarie district. The Synod appointed the following collections to be made during the next twelve months – viz., for church extension in January; for the New Hebrides missions, or for missions to the Jews, in March; for church extension in June; and for the Synod fund in September. The treasurer's accounts, which had been audited and found correct, were then read; and the thanks of the Synod conveyed to the treasurer for the zeal and efficiency with which he rendered his valuable and gratuitous services. The attention of the Synod having been directed to the intelligence which had recently reached the colony of the death of the Rev. Donald Morrison, late missionary to the New Hebrides, it resolved to convey to Mrs. Morrison an expression of its deep sympathy with her, and also to transmit to her the sum of £25.

The Moderator then delivered his closing address, which has

already been given in an earlier part of this report, as a continuation of his opening address. The Synod adjourned to meet on the first Wednesday of November, 1870, at 7 0'clock p.m.

---

## ORDINATION.

The Presbytery of Maitland met in St. George's Church, Sydney, on the 14th instant, for the ordination of Mr. McLeod and other business. Sederunt, Rev. James McCulloch, Moderator; Revs. W. S. Donald and William McIntyre, Ministers. The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved of. The Rev. Mr. Donald preached from John 21: 15. The Moderator having given a narrative of the circumstances which led to Mr. McLeod's ordination, proceeded to put the requisite questions, which being satisfactorily answered by Mr. McLeod, he was set apart by prayer and the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery to the office of the Holy Ministry, and received the right hand of fellowship from the brethren present. The Moderator then proceeded to address Mr. McLeod on the duties and encouragements of the ministry to the following effect. Having been appointed by the Presbytery to address you in connexion with the solemn event which has just taken place, I would direct your attention to the important and appropriate exhortation of an aged apostle to a young minister. "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." You perceive that contained in these words, heedfulness to himself (as a Christian Minister) is placed in the foreground of the exhortation. In proportion as a minister attends to this, he is faithful and successful in performing his work. Neglecting to take heed to himself he will have cause to adopt the lamentation. "They made me keeper of the vineyards of others, and mine own vineyard have I not kept." A minister is in great danger of such neglect. How great the danger of substituting mere professional dealings with divine things for experimental and practical dealings with them, – taking heed so far to his studies, his preaching, and other ministerial duties, and at the same time greatly heedless as to the state of his own soul! Speaking of heedfulness in this respect, we observe that a minister needs to be heedful as to the existence of spiritual life in his soul. It has been remarked that others are very apt to take the personal piety of a minister for granted. To whatever extent they may excused for this, a minister is wholly unjustified in acting thus towards himself. Yea, that very fact renders it all the more necessary that he see to his being a subject of personal godliness. The indispensable necessity of this, to a true minister of Christ is abundantly evident. Such spiritual work requires a spiritual workman. How can any one rightly engage in proclaiming truths the reality, importance and powerful influence of which he has never experienced? The connexion between personal Christianity, and the work of the Christian ministry, is much insisted on by the inspired penman. In proof of this take the following passages: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself, and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation; we preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord. 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." Farther, as ministers we require to take heed to the state of our spiritual life. We need to see to it that that life be in a healthy and growing condition; that our souls are frequently anointed with fresh oil, so that the mind may be brightened and the heart enlivened and inflamed for the Lord's service. Without this how dry and barren our studying, and how ineffective our preaching. Again attention to the condition of our spiritual life is essential to our being proper examples to our flocks. What believing hearers need, is not an example of spiritual life in a low and unhealthy, but in a vigorous and healthy condition. Without this advantage they are apt to become more languid and dwarfish still; in connexion with this it may be observed that, as ministers, we need to pay special attention to the cultivation of the Christian character; an increasing manifestation of a vigorous and growing spirituality in our whole deportment. We have to see to it that we exemplify a Christian spirit in its various aspects, that we live Christ as well as preach him. In regard to this Paul could appeal to the believing Thessalonians: "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily, and justly, and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe." And again, he says to the saints at Corinth: "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." On this he insists much, especially in his epistles to Timothy and Titus. Titus he thus charges, "In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works." Who can sufficiently calculate the importance of a conversation becoming the gospel of Christ, on the part of a Christian minister? How forcibly the truth taught is commended by its practical manifestation: "Let your light shine before men, that others may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven." On the other hand what a great obstacle to the conversion of sinners, when the truth taught in the pulpit is dimly exemplified or practically denied. As Richard Cecil has well said, "men observe how ministers act out of the pulpit, that they may learn what they mean when they are in it." And the world is not slow to detect practical deviations from or contradictions to what they teach. Once more, speaking of personal heedfulness, a minister must take heed to the motives by which he is influenced in the discharge of his sacred duties. Deep searchings of heart as to motives is highly necessary at the commencement of a course of study, with a view to the ministry. Still more are such searchings necessary at the entrance on the ministerial work. And they are no less necessary throughout the whole of our ministerial course. Without the right motives our work is an abomination in the sight of the Lord however creditably and acceptably we may acquit ourselves in the eyes of men. We need to see to it that a desire to please God, to honour Christ, and to save souls be the great motives by which we are influenced in all our labours.

Further, heedfulness is to be exercised in reference to the minister's work. Of this one great department is specified "doctrine," or teaching. With preparation for, and the actual performance of, this

work, a minister is to be greatly occupied. He is, like Paul, to "teach publicly, and from house to house." And he is to take heed how he fulfils this work both as to the matter and the manner.

As to the matter of Gospel teaching, it is summed up in one word "Christ" – "Christ, *whom* we preach." This of course does not imply that ministers are to be always speaking directly of Christ, his person, or work. There must be a declaring of the whole counsel of God. But, whatever we preach, it must have a bearing upon, or be drawn from Christ and his cross. He must be the beginning, the middle, and the end of our preaching. To be faithful Gospel preaching, it must answer to the apostolic description: –

"In doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech that cannot be condemned; that he who is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you." Ministers are to draw their matter from the great fountain of truth, and to beware of mixing it with human fancies and inventions, whether their own or other men's. But, farther, a minister must take heed to the manner as well as the matter of his teaching.



The truth proclaimed by the living voice with plainness, clearness, fervency, faithfulness, and wisdom, has a prodigious advantage over reading. A minister requires to use plainness of speech in setting forth Divine truth. There needs to be an avoidance of words and phrases which are unintelligible to a great portion of his hearers. Pure Saxon words and simple composition are much more suitable, especially in congregations of different classes and ranks. Some of the best speakers and writers have been in the habit of using these freely. If it be great cruelty on the part of the physician to address his patient regarding his malady and the proper remedies in unintelligible language, how much greater the cruelty of the preacher who preaches over the heads of dying sinners. Again, ministers need to take heed to clearness, both in conceiving and expressing their ideas. If views of Divine truth, however sound, be expressed confusedly or indistinctly, how can they fail in producing erroneous or indistinct impressions.

How serious the consequences of such indistinctness! "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who can prepare for the battle?" But, in addition to soundness of matter, plainness of speech, and clearness of

expression, there must be earnestness of delivery – such a deep sense of eternal realities as will make the preacher a burning as well as a shining light. In requiring fervour, we do not allude to mere natural animation – to loud and vehement speaking. There may be much of these where there is little or no spiritual fervour. And on the other hand, there may be much of this fervour with but little of these accompaniments. We speak of such earnestness as arises from a deep realisation of the nature of the gospel message, and the solemn issues involved in its proclamation. How highly important to aim at and press after such earnestness. Furthermore, speaking of the manner of teaching, there must be faithfulness and wisdom. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." "Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?" What need to beware of unfaithfulness to the truth and to souls, speaking in a general and pointless manner, avoiding the saying of those things which we know to be offensive to some of our hearers How we ought to follow the example of the great apostle, "who *shunned not* to declare the *whole counsel* of God," – "who *kept back nothing* that was profitable." We need to cry aloud and spare not, to show unto Israel their sins, to bring the truth to bear pointedly on different classes and practices of our hearers, making them to feel that "the word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." But even faithfulness must be coupled with wisdom. As the apostle "warned every man," so he also "taught every man in all wisdom." We need to consider the different classes and cases of our hearers, and to present the truth accordingly, – to address them suitably as dead or alive, as openly wicked, or as formalists or hypocrites, to speak to them according to their attainments in the divine life, – as babes or strong men, – as children, young men, or fathers – thus giving "them their portion of meat." Lastly, our teaching should be characterised by affectionateness. The souls of our people should be very dear to us – their being so, leading us to speak the truth in love; yea, we are to cherish love even when disliked and opposed by them, saying with Paul, "and the more will I love you, though the less I be loved by you."

The last point in the apostolic injunction we are considering is continuance in such heedfulness of one's self, and of the teaching. There is much from within and without to make us remiss and heedless, both as to ourselves and our work. Hence, there needs to be a constant and persevering heedfulness. And, to stir up and encourage such painstaking, he adds the important and precious considerations "in doing this, thou shalt save thyself and them that hear thee." The Apostle points out the connection between faithfulness and success. That success includes, first, a minister's own salvation. By this the Apostle evidently

teaches that in his ministrations a minister is to keep in view the ensuring and promoting of his own salvation, and that this is accomplished

through taking heed to himself and to his teaching. "And this I do for the Gospel's sake, that I may be partaker thereof with you and them that hear thee." A minister is to make common cause with his hearers, regarding their salvation as important as his own. This he is to look forward to and desire. He is not to be contented with gathering them into the congregation, and seeing them impressed so far and reformed.

Nothing less than their salvation, yea, the salvation of all of them, is to be the object of his care in regard to himself and his teaching, "that I may present every man perfect in Christ." He is to realize that he is sent to be the instrument "of opening men's eyes, of turning them from darkness to light, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith which is in Christ Jesus."

What a great encouragement to one who realizes the value of his own soul and the souls of his fellow men! What an abundant recompense for the sufferings, difficulties, and labours, through which he has to pass. "He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." "Let him know that he who converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins." But the converse also holds true. He who neglects to take heed to himself and his doctrine will lose himself and them that hear him, at least there is no probability that they will be saved by his ministry,

Mr. McCulloch concluded his address with pointing out the solemnity, difficulty, and momentousness of the work of the Gospel minister, – a work involving such care and such consequences as his own salvation or damnation and the salvation or damnation of his hearers. He also reminded the people present of the duties devolving on them, to give all, encouragement to those who have the charge of their souls, by prayer, sympathy, and otherwise.

At the close of the services, Mr. McLeod signed the formula and had his name added to the roll of the Presbytery. The Presbytery adjourned to meet at Raymond Terrace, on Tuesday, the 14th December next. At a previous meeting of the Presbytery Mr. McLeod was appointed to continue his labours at the Hastings, and Mr. McInnes was appointed to preach at Grafton on as early a Sabbath as he could.

The consideration of farther supplies for this and other vacant places was deferred until next meeting of the Presbytery.

---

### MR. JOHN ANTHONY STUART.

On the 8th instant, a letter from Mr. John Anthony Stuart, probationer, who had been appointed to labour as a missionary on the North Shore, resigning his connection with the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, was read in the Presbytery of Sydney; the ground on which he tendered his resignation being, so far as the Presbytery was able to ascertain, that he was not left at liberty to adopt the innovation in public worship afterwards referred to. The Moderator stated, with reference to this resignation, that Mr. Stuart had, previously to his tendering it, used or sanctioned the use of instrumental music in public worship, as conducted by him; and that he had continued to do so in the face of a remonstrance addressed to him by the Moderator; and, further, that, since he tendered his resignation, he attempted and still attempts to retain possession of the North Shore, to the exclusion of the Church under whose authority and at whose expense he was labouring there. After deliberation, the Presbytery, while strongly disapproving of Mr. Stuart's conduct in the instances above specified, deemed it the most advisable course to bring his connection with this Church to a close by accepting his resignation, and it accepted it accordingly.

---

## Correspondence.

### MR. GRANT'S OPENING ADDRESS.

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

Sir, – I have no doubt you have seen the opening address of the Moderator of the late Assembly of the Union Church in this colony. The last part of that address contains a good deal that is interesting and instructive. But the first part of it is rendered nauseous by the egotism in which it abounds. The speaker was much occupied with the honour and



eminence to which he was elevated, and his unworthiness and unfitness to occupy such a position. He could not account for the choice they had made, except on the ground of seniority and the flourishing of the almond tree. And yet, that could not form the ground of selection, for, said the speaker, "there are several in our Church my seniors both in office and in years." Hence the inference, that his brethren must have seen qualifications in Mr. Grant which he was too modest to take notice of. But what we wish specially to call attention to are those sentences uttered by the Moderator regarding his connection with different Churches. This, he stated was unknown to many in that Assembly, and hence it could not have constituted a reason for electing him to fill the Moderator's chair. But we rather think that most, if not all, in the Assembly were aware of the important fact. It is only about four years since the speaker made the same announcement at a public meeting –

the same being recorded in the public news of the day. But this may be forgotten. The statement in regard to Mr. Grant's connection with other Churches is as follows: – "I am the only minister of this Church, and in all New South Wales, I believe, who has occupied as a minister a position in the three branches of the Presbyterian Church of our fathers, which I am now to name. I was an ordained and beneficed minister in the established Church of Scotland, holding a place and taking a part in all its Courts up to the General Assembly. I was ten years a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, and I have been now sixteen years a minister in the colonial Church."

There is something strange in the mode of classifying the Churches referred to. The time was, we believe, when Mr. Grant viewed the matter in this way – that the Free Church of Scotland was the same Church as the established Church before 1843 – minus state establishment and emoluments – the same Church but in a different position, and that the present Scottish establishment is quite a different thing from that which existed previous to 1843.

But now Mr. Grant has learned to speak of the present Scottish Establishment and the Free Church as co-branches of the Presbyterian Church of our fathers. This perhaps is to be accounted for by the admission he makes in an after part of his address. "The writer, in looking back on a public career of thirty-three years, is sensible that on some occasions he could have been with great advantage more liberal minded and more enlarged in making allowances for variety of mental vision on the same important subjects."

We have no doubt that in the process through which Free Churchmen have passed in joining and adhering to the ecclesiastical coalitions formed in 1864 and 1865, they have become wonderfully liberalised in regard to what they once strongly proclaimed as vital truths. But as Mr. Grant's classification of home Churches has something strange in it, there is something no less strange in his mode of speaking of colonial Churches. He speaks of only one colonial Church with which he has been connected, and yet, he has been connected with two, namely, the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia and the Union Church. Is he ashamed to refer to his connection with the former? or does he imagine that his present Church is only the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia in a new position? Let him distinctly avow this in the presence of Dr. Fullerton and Co. and of Mr. Adam Thomson, and he will very soon be taught a different lesson, to the endangering of the blessed harmony of which he spoke so much. He knows well that, in the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, there are elements which can find no place in the Church to which he now belongs.

According to the views held, at one time at least, by Mr. Grant, the classification of Churches referred to would run thus: At home, the Church of Scotland, both in its established and disestablished condition; in the colony, the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales – the one of these (P. C. of E. A.) being in a state of protest against the present Established Church of Scotland; the other (P. C. of N. S. W. ) as much connected with the established as with the Free Church, applying to, and receiving supplies from the one as easily as from the other.

But we must pass on to what Mr. Grant says about the basis on which the union of the different elements in his Church was effected. "A large communion, comprising various branches of the Presbyterian Church, collected and now happily united on a sound and satisfactory basis of union, without violence to the conscientious convictions of any." This is a statement of a very mysterious and perplexing character. Can a basis be sound and yet satisfactory in the estimation of parties holding opposite views on important truths? Is the basis of the Union Church equally satisfactory to Mr. Purves, who holds and proclaims to the world that Free Churchmen hold Popish principles, and to Mr. Grant who held that Messrs. Purves and Co. were Erastians because of their identifying themselves with the position and principles of the Scottish Establishment, and declaring their approval of the same. A basis, that is sound and satisfactory, and does no violence to the convictions of parties differing so widely on important truths, must be expressed in very ambiguous terms, like some of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, which are signed by parties differing widely in that Church. Mr. Grant lauds the basis, because on it parties united without violence to the conscientious convictions of any. Well then, Mr. Purves's convictions are, that Free Church principles are Popish, and, yet, Mr. Grant, who holds these principles, and used to glory in being rebuked by the Court of Session for acting on them, praises the basis because it does no violence to the convictions of the man who characterises his (Mr. G.'s principles) as Popish. In this connexion we would commend to Mr. Grant's perusal certain sentences in a pamphlet published by Mr. Purves, his brother and predecessor in office, not very long before the consummation of the union. They are as follows: "Of course if they (Free Churchmen) really believe that we deny the headship of Christ, or homologate any virtual denial of this important tenet of the faith by the Church of Scotland, with which we stand connected, according to the denunciations, of the fervent Free Church orators of a few years ago, it would be monstrous for them even to contemplate union with us." In these statements we entirely concur. Well, how does the matter stand? All the ministers, Mr. Grant included, and other office-bearers of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, by their position, declared that they regarded the Established Church of Scotland as virtually denying the headship of Christ, and the Synod of Australia in connexion with that Establishment as homologating that virtual denial of it. The protests of 1843 and 1846 implied all this, and, indeed, expressed it. And none could be intelligent and consistent office-bearers or members of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, unless they approved of these protests. Hence, according to Mr. Purves's sound reasoning it would be monstrous in such men to contemplate union with his Synod. And, yet, this is the very union that the Moderator of the Union Assembly so greatly exulted in. We do not know to whom Mr. Purves refers as "the fervent Free Church orators of a few years ago," unless they were the Revs. William McIntyre, Alexander Salmon, and William Grant who spoke, we believe, pretty frequently and pretty strongly on the subjects referred to by Mr. Purves. The first is still with us, the second is in eternity, and the third is united with Mr. Purves and his brethren, – a position which, according to Mr. Purves's reasoning, involves something monstrous. In reasoning with Free Churchmen, still adhering to the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia after the union, Mr. Grant, we believe, expressed himself to the effect that he did not go over to the Moderates but that the Moderates came over to Free Churchmen, or to Free Church ground, referring to the basis. To such a happy state of things he does not even allude in his opening address. He knew well that he could not, in the presence of Messrs. Purves and Co., venture to assert that they came over to Free Church ground. All that he could say in their presence on the subject was, that the union was effected "on a basis sound and satisfactory without violence to the conscientious convictions of any," that is to say, on a basis sound and satisfactory both to himself and Mr. Purves, and doing violence to the conscientious convictions of neither, and yet these convictions widely different, and that too in regard to vital and important truth.

Yours, &c.,
PRESBYTER.

17th November, 1869.

594

## THE UNION QUESTION.

We continue and conclude our extracts from the debate on the Union Question in the Free Church Assembly. The following extracts are from Dr. Horatius Bonar's speech: –

I appear not as a disunionist, but as one who has all along acted in favor of what I believe to be Christian union upon true Christian principles. I object in the strongest way to being set down as an opponent of union simply because I am an opponent to this present union scheme. (Hear, hear.) We have by many, even in our church, been called unscrupulous, because we wish to carry out our own theories of union. I think instead of being called unscrupulous we should be called very scrupulous – we scruple about many things – minutes, proceedings of the past General Assembly, and this report. I scruple as to the articles of union. I cannot accept them,

nor ask my people to accept them, because, first of all, they are indefinite – indefinite articles. (Applause and laughter.) Yes, sir, grammarians tell that we have but one indefinite article in the language. But here we have not only one but many, and, I may add, each one more indefinite than its neighbour. (Laughter.) I object to them farther, because they contain in them the seeds of future discord. (Hear, hear.) They contain in them the seeds of present discord among ourselves – (hear, hear) – and they contain in them the seeds of future discord in the United Church. (Hear, hear.) It is, sir, discord that these articles are sowing now, and it is discord, in the prospect, they are sowing for the future Church. I object to them on these grounds; I object to them because, in so far as they are indefinite, they are thoroughly imperfect, they do not contain a full statement of that principle on which we have, as Free Churchmen, stood since 1843, not to speak of days farther back. They look more like statements wrung from unwilling witnesses; they look like articles, every word of which has been pared and pared till it suits some special purpose and bears some special meaning, so that their imperfection, apart from their indefiniteness, is sufficient to prevent me at least from accepting them or offering them for the acceptance of others. "But," you say, "why do you oppose, as objectionable, such a motion as Principal Fairbairn's? We want you to take these articles, and at least to let your people see them." But observe the position in which they would place me. If I accept that motion, I accept the responsibility of recommending these articles. (Cries of No, no.) At least, if I did accept that motion, I would tell my people – as most assuredly I shall do – that these are thoroughly imperfect, thoroughly indefinite and unFree Church articles. (Hisses and applause.) Moderator, it is time that some of us should speak out. (Hear, hear, applause, and hisses.) We have long enough been sil-ent – (hisses, and cries of "Proof") – and it is time that we should let our brethren know, and let our people know; and let the whole community know, what we think, what we feel, and what we are prepared for. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Sir, if these articles are accepted, if a new Church is based upon them, I for one can form neither a minister nor a member of such a Church. (Applause.) They exclude me – and I speak, I dare say, for others; but they exclude myself certainly. If I am a Free Churchman – If I maintain Free Church principles, which I have all along done, I would, on no earthly consideration, form a minister of a Church based upon such articles as these. In a real and true union there are three things that we require: there is life, there is love, and there is truth. We must have the three. The life may carry us a considerable length; the love may carry us a considerable length also; but it is only the truth that can carry us the whole length. (Applause.) The most unsatisfactory part of the report and the articles is that relating to the civil magistrate. I lay stress upon this point; it is not a minor one, in so far as the Church is concerned, still less is it a minor one in so far as the world is concerned. It is a great principle of the word of

God, and I would remind the Assembly of one passage in the 82nd Psalm – "God standeth in the congregations of the mighty ones" – (magistrates) – "He judgeth among the Gods." That seems to me to settle the question. With regard to the case Dr. Wylie put respecting

Italy, I would say, "Suppose the Government Protestant, and the people had become Protestant, what would our Voluntary friends advise them to do? That is the pinch of the question. (Laughter.) I have no difficulty in answering his question, either, about Italy. They (the Voluntaries) could do nothing – they are helpless, but that does not alter the case – (hear, hear) – and if it should come to be that the whole country are on the side of the Protestant rulers, and not against them, I ask – "Is not the Christian magistrate bound to do what our forefathers did in the days of Knox? Ah, it is not merely lawful for the magistrate to do so-and-so; he is *bound* to do it. (Applause.) One of the worst words in the articles is the word "lawfulness." "Lawful" to keep the Sabbath day! "Lawful" for the civil magistrate to fulfil his duty to Christ! No, if I am to state the magistrate's duty, I must state it with the words "he is bound to do it."And I maintain that the word "lawful" leaves us far short of the great truth of God, and far short of the great principles of our Confession, and far short of what we, as Free Churchmen, adhered to at the Disruption. The truth of which I speak is specially important in these last days, for it is written that in the last days perilous times shall come. I believe they are coming, if they have not come already, and it is just because of this that I am so strenuous in resisting what I believe to be one of the perils of these last and perilous times. It is just because of these days of evil, when principles are undermined, and when the special principle of Christ's Government of the world is undermined, that I feel the necessity of maintaining them in their fullest integrity; and besides, I am satisfied it is upon these Free Church principles that, come when it may, or come how it may, the future of a happy world is to rest. I believe it is just the development of these principles that is to be the fulfilment of the predictions of ages long past, that "a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall decree judgment." (Applause.)

From Dr. Gibson's speech, we can only give the following detailed extracts: –

I shall not yield to anything that requires me to be unfaithful to the great principles which I hold, and which I have sworn to maintain. (Applause.) And I frankly tell this House that there are not in that report – as I could prove – materials of agreement. I am prepared to show that there is agreement in appearance, but no substantial agreement. On the subject of the civil magistrate, on which so much has been said, I can show you from a statement by Dr. Harper that he holds and he declares that Dr. Cairns and Dr. Thomson also hold – that you can have no law about religious matters, because it implies coercion. Then, sir, it is no use to tell me that you are agreed. It is printed here, and if my word is not taken I shall read the passage. (No, no, and applause.) We differ fundamentally in regard to the province of the civil magistrate, for we hold that it is within his province, and it is his duty to enact laws in favor of true religion and the Church. Dr. Harper emphatically denies that I entirely subscribe to the perfect accuracy of the statement of Mr. Nixon in regard to what was said on the question of the Sabbath in the committee. These Articles of Agreement are not Articles of Agreement at all – for the reasons that have been mentioned. It appears to me that a great part of this discussion has been carried on this evening on what I consider not a ground for any Church to take – by endeavouring to balance difficulties in regard to the civil magistrate, and endeavouring to balance difficulties on a great variety of points, and in a great variety of ways; but I must say that I have been sorry to hear so little said about the duty of holding by the truth of God, that truth in which we believe.

595

We conclude with an extract from Dr. Begg's speech: –

It is very remarkable, he said, that our excellent friend Dr. Candlish, a number of years ago, held the very principles in regard to union for which we now contend. I shall read a notice of motion. (Cries of "No, no," and interruption.) In the Assembly of 1867, Dr. Candlish begged to give the following notice of motion in connection with the overtures anent resolutions as to union with the United Presbyterian Church: – "The General Assembly, while they find that it is unnecessary and inexpedient in present circumstances to discuss the proposal to which the overture relates" – (that was the time, I think, when I was a great unionist on right principles – laughter) – "think it right at the same time to declare the duty of this

Church to welcome and promote any movement in the direction of union among the Presbyterians in Scotland that is consistent with the principles this Church was called to maintain in her recent contendings, and the position which, at the time of her separation from the State, she was so led, in the providence of God, to occupy as the Free Protesting Church of Scotland." (Hear, hear.) That I think is a sound deliverance on the subject, ("Hear, hear," from Dr. Candlish.) We have been challenged to show that this is a principle to which we are bound as office-bearers of the Church – I mean the principle in regard to which we differ decidedly from the United Presbyterian Church. I could prove that in a great variety of ways, as by the fact that an elder was deposed instanter because he countenanced a Voluntary meeting. I could prove it, because the Act for Incorporating Seceders with the Church, which won't allow of the Barrier Act, and is therefore in the standing laws of this Church, expressly declares that the principle of Establishment is a principle of this Church. I could prove it by a great variety of evidence. I do not refer to the Articles of Agreement, for I think, in regard to them, that there are three things to be said.

1. Though you allow us to interpret them in our own way, and they have much that is good in them, yet they are undoubtedly capable of two interpretations. 2. The Articles of Disagreement neutralise them. And 3. I have always dwelt on this – the United Presbyterian Church has given no deliverance in regard to them, and it is a purely gratuitous statement that is made in this report, that these are articles about which the negotiating Churches are agreed. There is no evidence of that whatever. But, in regard to the matter of disagreement, I have always been anxious – and I think it was a great hardship (Dr. Candlish speaks of tyranny) that we are not allowed to discuss these articles of disagreement; but that, under a threat, our General Assembly resolved to swallow in 1867 the whole of these differences, without their being discussed in the slightest degree. Now, what does that amount to? I feel bound, as Dr. Boner does, to hold the principle that nations should honor and serve Christ, even with their substance. I hold that as a portion of Bible truth; I cannot make light of it, and I cannot allow any one else to make light of it, so far as my influence goes; and when you say you make an open question of it, I say – Who gave you a right to make an open question of it? And if the United Presbyterians hold the opposite view is a part of God's truth, as I believe they do, who gave them a right to make an open question of it? But what do they mean by an open question? This is a matter that would require explanation. Is it meant that we are to be allowed to hold contrary opinions, and to express contrary opinions; or is it to be understood that any minister of this Church may act on that opinion, and take an endowment if he can get it, or if he is disposed to accept it? If the meaning of open question is merely that we are allowed to think as we please, why, inquisitors would give you that liberty. They cannot take that liberty from you, for the power of thinking remains. No doubt the power of speaking is given here, but this was little more than was given by the Popish Church in the days of the Inquisition. We are allowed to speak what is thought to be sinful, but not to act what is sinful. When it becomes an actual trans-

gression it is culpable, but not in thought or word. This is a new theory in morals which requires to be considered – for the Apostles object as much to unsound opinions as to unsound practices. They say, "If any man cometh to bring any other doctrine, he that biddeth him God speed is a partaker of his evil deeds." On that ground I say we are anxious that we should come to close quarters upon that question, and let the Bible decide who is right and who is wrong. We cannot both be right, and it is impossible to slur over the matter in this way. There are to be considered the questions of education and finance, and upon the whole it does not seem to me that within the compass of that report there are the materials out of which to form any union to which I can be a party, and I hold that, by assenting to the motion of Principal Fairbairn, I would be wholly committed on these questions – and holding that, within the square of that report there are the elements upon which union might be founded of which l might form a part, I am not prepared for that Dr. Candlish may call it a threat, but I do not mean it as a threat. We must be frank with one another. I made up my mind in 1867 to proclaim it from my own pulpit without hesitation. I proclaim it to the world. I never will abandon those principles for which we struggled and suffered at the Disruption, come what will. (Applause.) Now, you say you will not do anything during the year. I beg to say we have had two versions on that subject. In the morning it was not only strongly expressed that much was to be done during the year, and we were challenged to say whether we would not allow the matter to be sent down amongst our people. I have no fear of our people. I think you would perhaps find your people in this matter sounder than yourselves – (laughter) – and perhaps if we had the opportunity of meeting you before your people (it would be a painful necessity if it should exist), you might find the people as sound at least as we are ourselves. At all events, we are bound by two things, and I think they are most reasonable things. In the late union between the Relief and Secessions, they made two most wise resolutions. One was that they would not go into union if there was a matter of Bible truth about which they might disagree, and the other was that they would not go into union if by means of union either Church was divided. These were two most sensible resolutions. Now, I say I hold it is our duty to conserve the principles of the Church and to conserve the peace of the Church, and I will not do anything to throw abroad a document which is not approved of even by ourselves. You talk of cowardice! I say it would have been a more manly thing to have taken the opinion of this House on the report and prepared a basis of union upon it. You speak of delay when it is simply hanging a sword over our heads. I feel every day of this delay is a great hardship. Why, Dr. Candlish says we are pressing him. We are not pressing him. He is in the Free Church, and no one is attempting to interfere with his position or principles in the Free Church; but there is an attempt made to concuss us into an abandonment of our principles which we have sworn to. (Laughter.) Is that not tyranny? (Applause.) Yes, it is. (Loud applause.) I trust that it may not assume a more serious form; but, at the same time, I have come through past events of a trying nature, as we have all done, and I should feel it to be an honor to stand up for this great truth, which I believe with Dr. Bonar to be the present truth – a truth which nations are disowning – a truth in connection with the maintenance of which we may expect a signal blessing from our exalted Head – viz., that truth, that all nations are bound to serve him, and that the nation and kingdom that will not serve his Church shall perish and be utterly wasted.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 51. SYDNEY, DECEMBER 1869.

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. 51 DECEMBER.

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Duty of Ministers – Watching for Souls … … … | 597 |
| Sabbath Desecration and Sight Seeing … … … | 600 |
| Congregation at Hamilton, Victoria – Its Position in respect of ministrations and its reasons for separating from the Union Church … | 601 |
| The Testimony and Policy of the Union Church … … | 603 |
| Moderatism in Victoria … … … … | 604 |
| Remembering Zion … … … … … | 606 |
| Popery and Ritualism… … … … … | 606 |
| Traffic in Masses … … … … … | 607 |
| Obituary: Mrs. McInnes; the Rev. D. Morrison … … | 608 |
| Presbytery of Maitland … … … … | 608 |

## THE DUTY OF MINISTERS – WATCHING FOR SOULS.

(*continued .from page* 587.)

3rd. That those who watch for souls are called upon to pray for them, to bear them upon their hearts at a throne of grace. It is laid down as an acknowledged truth, that unless the Lord keep the city, the watchman watcheth in vain. The watchman on the city walls may be and ought to be continually on the alert. But nevertheless all his endeavours would be to no purpose, unless that the Lord was to crown them with success. If then the blessing of the Lord is required in order to make the efforts of those who watch a city successful, how much more must that blessing be required to make the labors of those who watch for souls successful. With this truth the Apostles in earlier, and all faithful ministers in later times, were deeply impressed. Faithful Ministers in all ages have recognised it as a standing ordinance in the economy of the Gospel that while it was Paul's duty to plant and Apollo's duty to water, it was the Lord's prerogative to give the increase. The Apostles therefore first, and all who have been of an apostolic spirit since, have seen and felt their dependence upon the divine blessing in order to their being successful in watching over souls. Under the influence of this feeling they have been led while giving themselves to the ministry of the word, to give themselves also to prayer. Those who have the care of souls, in giving themselves to the ministry of the word, could not give themselves to it with too much zeal and earnestness. They could not be too diligent in this great work with which the Great Head of the Church has put them in trust. It might truly be said concerning those who watch for souls that they could not study, nor preach, nor visit with too great zeal, inasmuch as these are the appointed means for converting sinners and edifying saints. Still it is possible that they might forget, amid the stir and bustle of their abundant labours, that the planting and watering would produce no saving effect, unless that God were graciously pleased to countenance them and vouchsafe his blessing. Now, if those who are put in trust with the Gospel were to forget, amid their abundant labors, that it belonged to God to crown these labors with success, then they might, while constantly preaching and visiting, be led to neglect and overlook praying. If this were so it might lead to the most disastrous consequences. Their diets of visitation, their meetings for worship, their classes and public services of all sorts might be attended to with faultless regularity, but unless they were accompanied with heartfelt supplications that the Divine blessing might come down upon them, they might be of but little account. All who are good stewards of the mysteries of God are careful to avoid this neglect of prayer in carrying on their ministerial work. In going upon their master's business they do not attempt to go at their own charges. They feel that their usefulness must depend upon God's blessing, and so they do not fail to ask that blessing. They often and again bow their knees to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that he would own them in their work, and make them his instruments in awakening, converting, and saving souls. And here it may not be out of place to bring this matter home to ourselves, in order to stir up our minds by way of remembrance. We all acknowledge in so many words that all our sufficiency in this matter, as well as in every other, is from God. We all reverently acknowledge that it is the Spirit that quickeneth, and the flesh profiteth nothing. Let us therefore never fail to go forth to his work seeking his aid and depending upon it. Let us enquire of ourselves whether we enter upon our studies, humbly looking for the guidance of the Holy Spirit to enable us to prepare for speaking to the people all the words of this life. Let us examine ourselves as to whether, when we ascend the pulpit to proclaim unto the people all the words of this life, we do so depending upon the ever Blessed Spirit to bring these tidings home to the hearts of those who hear them. Let us recall to our remembrance whether we have been impressed with these and such like considerations, and whether we have sought devoutly and earnestly to pray that our message might prove effectual to the end for which it was sent. All who are put in trust with the Gospel and who engage in the solemn and awfully responsible work of watching for souls may rest assured of this, that those who honor God most by reposing dependence upon him, are most likely to be honored by him with success in their labors. It has been truly said that if ministers would pray more, they

would preach better, and that many good sermons are lost for lack of being followed up by earnest prayers. A barren ministry very often is 598
occasioned, not for want of faithful preaching, but for want of fervent praying. “Here, perhaps,” as one says, “is the cause why ministers have not more success in their ministry, and why they are not more frequently and more heartily gladdened by the conversion of souls to God. They seek to be men of the pulpit merely, and are not sufficiently men of the closet. It is a mystery in God's moral government that he should make the communications of his grace for the salvation of sinners dependent in any degree upon the prayers of others, yet he does, and we ministers know it; and yet, knowing it, how little have we been affected by it, and stirred up to prayer on this account? The activities of the age which require us to be much in public may furnish some mitigation of blame, if not an excuse for the too little time spent in the fervour of private prayer. Still with this palliation we are verily guilty, for we do not pray, as if we believed we were sent to save souls from death, and that we could not be successful in a single instance with-out the grace of God.” So much then for this part of the duty of those who watch for souls. In watching for these souls with a view to their salvation, there is not only an attempt to warn and guide them, but there is earnest fervent prayer to God that he would be pleased to render successful the warning and guiding. And what effect should the knowledge of this have upon such as are warned and guided? What effect should the knowledge of the circumstance that those who attempt to warn and guide them make them also the objects of secret and earnest prayer, have upon those individuals who are warned and guided. It ought to awaken them to offer up prayers and supplications on their own behalf, that they may be enabled to lay to heart the things of their peace and apply themselves unto wisdom. It is a blessed thing for a congregation to have a prayerful minister, and it would be a mournful thing for a minister to have a prayerless congregation. But what result might be expected if both pastor and people abounded in prayer and watched unto the same with thanksgiving. In such circumstances it would be sooner or later seen that the sons of Jacob did not seek God's face in vain. But we remark

*In fine,* that those who watch for souls must be careful to be ensample to them in their whole manner of life and conversation. It is not only the duty of those who have been appointed to watch for souls that they give themselves to the ministry of the word and prayer, but it is their duty also to be ensamples to the flock. It is part of the duty of those who watch for souls that they should exhort and comfort and charge every one as a father doth his children; but it is another and equally important part of their duty that they should behave themselves holily, justly, and unblameably among them that believe. Ministers must take heed to themselves, as well as to their doctrine, if they would save them that hear them. It is true indeed that God in his dealings with the souls of men can convert sinners, and carry out his purposes of grace by any instrumentality of whatever kind. As one says, “He can convey grace by them to whom he gives none.” He can cause men to carry this treasure who have no share in it. We may send those to carry the letter who yet may not themselves know what is in it. But although God may thus sometimes make use of a Balaam to bless Israel, – although he may sometimes make use of a careless minister to turn a sinner, still that is not the ordinary way in which it pleases God to work in the gathering in or building up of souls. Ordinarily, those ministers whose labours are owned of God to the saving of souls are those who are reconciled to God themselves, and who are keeping under their bodies lest they be castaways It is both scriptural and natural

to expect that this would be so. It is not to be supposed that if ministers did not show that they cultivated piety and holiness themselves, they could induce others to cultivate them. It is not to be imagined that unless those who denounce sin in their sermons renounce it in their lives, they would pay any attention to their denunciations. So far indeed are those ministers who are unsanctified in their lives from being likely instruments for arousing the wicked from their wickedness, that they are more likely to confirm them in the practice of it. In point of fact, many instances of this have been actually known to occur. But how different has it been with those who have conducted themselves in a manner becoming their office. The piety, purity, and blamelessness of their lives commends that religion which they preach to those to whom they address themselves. They can rebuke, warn, and exhort with an authority which those who do not act in the same manner could not do. It is a deplorable spectacle to see men consecrated to the service of God giving themselves up to sinful, vain, and worldly practices, which are calculated to bring their office and their teaching into contempt. In such a case as this, those who hear them are more likely to set at nought all their instructions than to receive them and lay them to heart; but it is different with those whose lives correspond with the requirements of their office. Those that hear them, seeing that their precept is enforced by their practice, will be more ready to give heed to those declarations which are addressed to them. How careful, then, should those who watch for souls be to let their light so shine before men, that others seeing their good works may glorify their Father which is in heaven. That blessed servant of God, the apostle Paul, was well aware of the vast importance of those who watched for souls preaching by example as well as by precept. Hence, he again and again urges upon the attention of those to whom he addresses himself as ambassadors for Christ, to show that they were entitled to bear the name by pureness, by knowledge, by love unfeigned, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left. God's prophets should most manifestly neither be light nor treacherous persons. It would ill become those who have been anointed with God's holy oil for the New Testament priesthood to allow themselves so far to desecrate their office as to be willing to secure popularity by amusing their audiences by exhibitions of buffoonery, or please them by winking at the vain, silly, and sinful indulgencies to which such multitudes resort, or even going along with them to these indulgences. To every one who occupies the ministerial office, the solemn charge which Paul gave to Timothy is eminently suitable in regard to such things: – “But thou, O man of God, flee these things, and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. I give thee charge in the sight of God, that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Such are some of those things which ought to enter into the right discharge of the duty of those who watch for souls. They must warn those over whom God has given them the oversight against sin in all its forms; – they must teach them and guide them in the way of salvation; – they must, realising their own helplessness, to do this with success, be instant in prayers for the divine blessing; and they must be found following up by a pious ministerial carriage and example what they inculcate by precept. In looking at these and such like things as devolving upon those who watch for souls, it may well be said, who is sufficient for them? But if there are solemn and responsible

duties which devolve upon those who watch for souls, there are 599
also duties which devolve upon those whose souls are watched over. If it is the pastor's duty to watch for souls, it is the duty of those amongst whom he is placed to watch for their own souls. Both those who watch and those who are watched over have to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and severally give account of the deeds done in the body. If those who watch be found to have been unfaithful then, the blood of those who have perished through their neglect will be required at their hand; but if those over whom they have watched have refused to give heed to their warnings – have refused to lay to heart their teachings, or follow their example, then their blood will be upon their own heads. But let us look for better things though we thus speak. Let us anticipate a happier judgment day than this. Let us who are watchmen strive to give in our account with joy, and let those who are watched over strive also to be of those whom the Lord shall call his own in the day that he makes up his jewels. But this brings us to advert briefly to the

II. Aspect under which the ministerial office is viewed in the passage; viz., in regard to its responsibility. They watch as those who have to give *an account*. Those who occupy the position of ministers are not to look upon themselves as lords over God's heritage, for they are nothing more than servants, and accountable for the manner in which they fulfil their trust. There is a great Chief Shepherd to whom they as under shepherds have to render an account as to how they have fed the flock which He has entrusted to their care. Now the thought of this accountability weighs with great solemnity on the minds of conscientious ministers. So awful indeed have the responsibilities connected with the ministerial office appeared to some, that they have shrunk from undertaking it at all; or they have, upon coming in contact with its difficulties and requirements, felt a strong desire to lay it down as beyond their powers and capabilities to discharge. Those who enter into the priest's office for a piece of bread, – those who, like the Levite in the book of Judges, merely hire themselves out to be priests for the consideration of an annual living, might not feel any of these difficulties surrounding the office. They might imagine their duty accomplished if they performed the ordinary and expected services; if they preached the stated number of sermons and went through the common amount of visitation, so that the people were pleased and no complaints made. It is, however, altogether different with those who have taken the oversight of any portion of the flock of God not from constraint but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. In their estimation it is a light thing for them to be judged of men or of man's judgment, they feel that He who judgeth them is God, and it is therefore God that they long and labour to please in executing their office. It is to Him that they have to give an account, so they keep that in view and desire to be enabled to make it their aim and object to give in that account with joy; – with joy that they have through grace been enabled with some measure of faithfulness to do the work of evangelists, and make proof of their ministry; with joy that they have been enabled in some degree to warn every man and teach every man in all wisdom that they might present every man perfect in Christ Jesus; with joy that they have been privileged to see those amongst whom they have laboured, taking their warnings, listening to their instructions, and living to God. These are considerations which ought to stimulate those who are put in trust with the Gospel, to take heed to themselves and to all those over whom the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, that they may both save themselves and them that hear them. There is, however, another most weighty consideration which might stimulate them to the same exercise. That consideration is the possibility of having to give in their account with grief; – with grief that they themselves have not endeavoured with humble dependence upon divine aid to do their part, or with grief that those to whom they had to address themselves refused to lay to heart their instructions and so perished. Let these and similar considerations have due weight with those who are in the ministry. Let these considerations stir them up to preach and pray, and live as in the view of eternity. Let them then be moved by such considerations to travail in birth till Christ be formed in the hearts of their hearers. Let them weep ever between the porch and the altar on account of those who live careless, irreligious, godless lives, and let them use all the means within their reach to gather in the ungathered and to build up such as are in the faith. But are none interested in this day of account rendering but ministers. Is the reckoning to take place only in the case of such as watch, or will those who have been watched over have to appear also at the bar of judgment to be tried? They will. When the Son of Man shall come in the clouds with power and great glory every eye shall see him, and he shall render to every man whether watchman or watched according to his works. Let us all, therefore, in the view of our Lord's coming, whatever be our position in the Church, whether office-bearers or people, hold fast our profession without wavering. But to conclude: Let us not be found unfaithfully declining from God's testimonies, either in those principles which we profess to hold, or in that line of conduct which we profess to follow. Let us not cease, for example, to maintain those principles which were so long and so earnestly contended for in its best days by that Church from which we have our origin; viz., the Church of Scotland. History tells how the faithful ones in that Church in bygone times, at whatever cost, neither could nor would decline to acknowledge the claims of their Lord and Saviour, whether as King of Nations or as head over all things to his Church, and history tells moreover how these worthies even when wandering amid deserts and mountains, and sheltering as outcasts in the dens and caves of the earth, so greatly enjoyed their Master's presence, that they looked forward with the utmost confidence to a coming day when the Lord would return to his Church, and make the place of his feet glorious, and when he would vindicate his title to be acknowledged as King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. Now as those faithful witnesses could not be driven by the fires of persecution to renounce their principles, it would ill become us who profess to be their descendants, to permit ourselves to be induced either by any inconveniences to which we may be subjected, or by any apparent advantages which might be held out, to give up our testimony to these principles so honouring to our Divine Head, and which he has so often honoured by manifesting his favour to them who maintained them. But again while it is our duty to maintain these principles, and honestly and openly to avow them when occasions requires, let us not forget that it is not less obligatory upon all office bearers in the Church, whether ministers or elders, to bear it upon their hearts, that it is their duty in present circumstances to guard and caution those over whom they watch, and especially the young and inexperienced against the errors and delusions of the Church of Rome. When so many in these days of spurious liberalism and false charity try to gain popularity by time serving sentimental talk about the beauties of peace, and the evils of religious dissension in communities, and all this with the view of letting alone this degrading superstition; there is a loud call for those who occupy the position of watchmen upon the walls of Zion, to expose the

evils of the system, that those over whom they watch may not be enticed or 600
entangled by it. Let us, therefore, as Protestants not cease to protest against that counterfeit system of religion called Romanism, which enslaves both the minds and bodies of men, and does such fatal damage to their souls, and which the Lord has declared that he will one day destroy with the breath of his mouth.

Furthermore, as office-bearers in the Church, and therefore occupying the position of those who watch for souls, let us neither look with an unconcerned nor unobserving eye on the numerous causes of ruin, especially to those who are entering upon the world, which are so prevalent throughout the land. As every reader of the public prints is aware there is scarcely a week passes without some of our youth placed in responsible situations, being charged with or being convicted of a betrayal of trust, and thus being hurled from a position of respectability to the position of criminals and outcasts. Now there must be some causes at work which lead to these melancholy exhibitions of dishonesty and embezzlement. These causes are not far to seek nor difficult to find. In the case of some, it is a love of display, and a vain desire to live in a style far beyond their incomes, which induces them to appropriate to their own purposes those means with which they are entrusted. In the case of others, the billiard room and the racecourse, the wine party; and theatre, with its accompanying licentiousness and debauchery, are the causes which hurry their victims into arts of dishonesty, in order to supply the wherewithal for betting and gambling, and the other adjuncts characteristic of fast or flash life. Now if it is not in the power of office-bearers in the Church to legislate for the suppression of these and other causes of ruin to our youth, it is in their power to warn our youth in various ways of their dangerous tendency, and endeavour by persuasion to induce them to be on their guard against them. Once more let us as office-bearers of the Church, and occupying the position of those who watch for souls, endeavour according to our opportunities to bear a decided and faithful testimony against that degrading sin of intemperance, which has hurried, and is hurrying, and will, it is to be feared, yet hurry, thousands to the depths of misery while they live, to premature graves when they die, and, alas! to an undone eternity when they are dead. If we love our Master; if we have respect to the purity of the Church; if we regard the happiness of families; and if we desire the welfare of our fellowmen, we will not fail in carrying out our duty of watching for souls to point out the evils of this deadly vice, and labour to promote sobriety in its highest forms, in those communities where we are placed. But we have done; it is true that it may seem to many the day of small things with us as a Church; it is true that as office-bearers we may be few in number, but that ought not to hinder us to magnify our office, and execute our commission of watching for souls with a zeal corresponding to its requirements. Let us all therefore labour, and let our people join with us in labouring under the divine blessing for the promotion of the Lord's cause, and we will not fail to be blessed in our deed.

---

## SABBATH DESECRATION AND SIGHTSEEING.

The following report, which we copy from the *Herald* of Monday the 13th, records a glaring case of Sabbath desecration, in which multitudes of our population, it seems, took part.

"Shortly before sundown on Saturday evening a telegram from Kiama announced that at 5-30 p.m. the Flying Squadron was in sight, fifteen miles to the S. E. The intelligence spread rapidly through the City, and fears were expressed that the interest attached to its arrival here would be marred if the fair wind then prevailing continued during the night, and enabled the gallant Admiral to make an unostentatious entrance to Port Jackson at

an earlier hour than was previously expected. This feeling was dispelled yesterday morning by signals. being shown at Fort Phillip, indicating the Squadron in sight to the southward. There was a light north-east breeze during the forenoon, which hardened as the day advanced, and enabled the fleet to take their position. Many persons who proceeded overland to Watson's Bay and other places along the coast, had a fine opportunity of witnessing the splendid sight exhibited by six first-class men of war under all plain sail. From 1 o'clock until 4, steamer after steamer, and yachts innumerable, fully freighted with passengers, might be seen proceeding towards the Heads to welcome the visitors. The Government steamer Thetis, commanded by Lieutenant Gowland, and bearing Commodore Lambert's pennant, and Mr. Cuthbert's steam yacht Fairy, in which our representative was courteously afforded a passage, were the first to reach the Heads. About 4 p.m., a signal from the Admiral, "Follow in line," was promptly attended to, and the admirable manner in which each vessel took her allotted position was the subject of general rem- ark, both by landsmen and those more versed in nautical matters. As the vessels reached in for the Heads the spectacle afforded was imposing in the extreme." After some further description of the movements and handling of the ships, the report proceeds: "They brought up at single anchors off the Quarantine Ground in two divisions, the leading vessels being well in towards Manly. The flag officers of the two yacht clubs, and a number of the yachts under their respective commands, together with the Fairy, sailed round the Squadron, saluting the Admiral's pennant, and afterwards exchanging similar compliments with the other vessels. The view presented was as imposing as it was novel, and will be remembered as one of the events connected with the service of the British navy in Australian waters. Those who missed the spectacle of yesterday will be glad to learn that an opportunity will be afforded them today of seeing the Squadron getting underway and sailing up to their moorings in Farm Cove."

The writer of this report seems to regard with approval the Sabbath desecration which he relates. He not only expresses no regret at the occurrence of it, or at the extent to which it was carried, but seems fully to sympathise with the feelings which prompted to it, and with the means that were used to gratify them. The following language we regard as indicating such sympathy: "Those who missed the spectacle yesterday, will be glad to learn that an opportunity will be afforded to them today of seeing the Squadron getting underway, and sailing up to their moorings in Farm Cove." But, though the narrative before us were open only to the censure, that it expresses no disapproval, the censure would by no means be light. It will, we are aware, be urged that it is the duty of the secular press to record such occurrences as the entrance of Flying Squadron into our harbour, and that its duty extends no further; that it does not lie within the range of its office, to take any notice of the accordance or non-accordance of such proceedings, as it may have occasion to relate, with the requirements of religion. But, if proceedings are related at all, the account given of them should be faithful; it should present them under the character which they actually bore. Now of the proceedings of Sabbath the 12th, so far at least as the contribution made to them by the sightseers from Sydney was concerned, nothing whatever was more characteristic than the open disregard of the fourth commandment which they displayed. No delineat-ion of them, therefore, could be faithful, that failed wholly to exhibit this the most prominent feature of their character. Besides, when such proceedings are reported without the slightest

expression of disapproval, the implication is that, as they are not visited with condemnation, they do not merit any, and that there is no reas- 601
on why the example set in them should not be followed. Thus the public recognition of duty and its obligations is seriously impaired, both in respect of accordance with scripture and of practical power. And, surely, it will be admitted that, to whatever extent it may be supposed we are at liberty to abstain, in certain circumstances, from positive efforts to advance the Redeemer's cause and the eternal interests of our fellowmen, we are never at liberty to act a part, that, from its character and tendency, must be injurious to both.

But the reporter did more than merely sanction, at least virtually, by the tone and character of his report, the Sabbath: desecration which he records. He took an active and prominent part in it. On the Lord's Day he proceeded to the Heads in the steam yacht Fairy, to procure materials for his report If the procuring of those materials was not a work of necessity, he was, clearly, guilty of desecrating the Sabbath, in adopting on that day such means or any means to procure them; and we presume that no one, who knows what a work of necessity in relation to the observance of the Sabbath is, will pretend that the work in question was a work of necessity. It was not in any respect necessary to the welfare of the community or of any portion of it, that it should be known on the morning of Monday the 13th, that the Flying Squadron had come to anchor on the previous evening off the Quarantine Ground. No necessity can be discovered in the case, if it be not a necessity imposed by the requirements of the pecuniary interests of the *Herald.* But, if we hold or admit that secular work may be done on the Lord's Day, whenever the doing of it is necessary to enable us to make more money than we could make otherwise, we virtually abolish the distinction between the consecrated and the unconsecrated portion of our time.

In his desecration of the Sabbath the reporter sustained the character, – so he intimates – of the "representative" of the *Herald.* What he did, therefore, he did, we presume under the *Herald's* instructions as well as in its service, and the *Herald* did it by his agency. It is much to be desired that the proprietors of the *Herald* would seriously consider the position they occupy in relation to the Sabbath; and that they would honestly determine whether the secular work they do and have done for them on that day is a work of necessity in such a sense that God authorises them to do it during consecrated times.

But, while we cannot but strongly condemn the contribution of the *Herald* to the Sabbath desecration of the 12th, and its virtual approval of the contribution of others to that desecration, we fully recognise the difficulties which the proprietors of that paper would encounter in bringing their arrangements into harmony with the law of God with respect to the Sabbath rest; but, all difficulties whatsoever notwithstanding, they ought to bring their arrangements into harmony with that law. God says, expressly and peremptorily, "on it thou shall not do any work," and this prohibition applies to all works, except those of necessity and mercy. It applies, therefore, to such work as that of the reporters and printers of the *Herald,* which, clearly, is not work of this kind.

For the sight seeing Sabbath desecraters of the 12th no semblance of apology can be framed. To gratify an idle curiosity and a craving for excitement, they trampled upon the law of God. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, *from* doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking *thine own* words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father : for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken *it*." Isaiah 58: 13, 14.

It is much to be deplored that parents foster, as so many of them do, a craving for excitement on the part of their children; that they habituate them so much to do certain things – many things – for the purpose solely of procuring for themselves the pleasure that the doing of them will afford them. The place they thus assign to pleasure they ought to assign to duty. They ought to train their children to do always and only what they honestly consider it is their duty to do, – to do it on the ground that it is their duty to do it, to do it, that is, in obedience to God, and with a view to his glory; and at the same time, to teach them to recognise that all the enjoyment, that is desirable or safe for them, – purer and more abundant enjoyment than could accrue to them otherwise, – will result in their experience from their proceeding thus. If the character of our population had been formed by such training, the idlers, who rushed to Watson's Bay and the South Head on the 12th, would have been otherwise and more profitably employed.

Since the above was written, the following public announcement has been issued; – it appeared in the *Herald of* Saturday last: – "The ships of the Flying Squadron will be open to visitors on Sunday (tomorrow) morning, the 19th instant, and will remain so between 9 a.m. and sunset." This announcement is an invitation to the public to desecrate the Lord's Day, for no one, whose views on the subject are worthy of the least consideration, will regard the visiting the ships of the Squadron on that day in any other light. And it is such an invitation given, not by a citizen as such, but by one who, in his official acts, – and the making of the announcement under consideration is such an act, – exercises authority entrusted to him by the State, that is, the very authority of the State itself entrusted to him under certain limitations; in other words, it is an invitation given by one who acts in giving it as the organ of the State. The act thus acquires public significance and importance; and the nation cannot remain guiltless, when its servants, acting by its authority and, therefore, in its name, are permitted to set at nought a divine command, and to encourage and promote disobedience to it.

In the paragraph, in which the announcement on which we are remarking is conveyed, we observe the following further intimation: "Divine service is held on board all the ships on Sunday, from 10 to 11-30 a. m., to which visitors are admitted." This mixing together of Sabbath desecration and Sabbath ministrations is very offensive, and cannot fail to convey the impression that the former is in no way incompatible with the influence and requirements of the truth which the latter should exhibit.

We pity the chaplains. If they are faithful men, they have a painful duty to perform, in circumstances which render the performance of it no small. degree difficult, – the duty of condemning and reproving Sabbath desecration sanctioned by the authorities of the Squadron; and, if they do not perform this duty, they reduce the exercise of their office to a mere form.

---

## CONGREGATION AT HAMILTON, VICTORIA, – ITS POSITION IN RESPECT OF MINISTRATIONS, AND ITS REASONS FOR SEPARATING FROM THE UNION CHURCH.

A meeting was held in the Free Presbyterian Church, Hamilton, on the 15th ult, for the purpose of taking into consideration the present circumstances of the congregation in that place, and the best way of obtaining a suitable minister. The congregation consists principally of Gaelic speaking families, many individuals, especially among the more aged members, being unable to profit by, and some unable to understand in any measure, a sermon in English. Some time back the people

composing the congregation applied to the Free Presbyterian Synod for recognition, and some measure of ministerial supply, but the exceedingly 602
enfeebled state of the Synod as regards number of ministers united with the great distance of the congregation from Melbourne to render any such supply all but impossible, however warm the Synod might feel in the matter. Latterly, however, the Rev. Alexander McIntyre visited the district, and since his arrival in it the face of affairs has materially altered. The Highlanders of Hamilton have warmly appreciated Mr. McIntyre's ministry, sharing in the feeling prevalent wherever Mr. McIntyre appears among his countrymen in Victoria. The Sabbath services in Hamilton itself and in Branx-holme, seventeen miles distant, are well attended, and the congregation at either place is anxious to see these ministrations in connection with the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria permanently settled among them. This would be a happy termination to the long patience which the people have exercised, as well as a consummation to which Mr. McIntyre would gladly desire to conduct, if it were possible, his present labours. But the accomplishment is beset with difficulties. The marvellous persistency, with which the Free Church of Scotland has laboured to exterminate her own name in the Australian colonies, forces itself very regretfully on the attention when the situation of such a congregation as that of Hamilton is considered. It is well known that the Free Church of Scotland has given long continued approval to the Union in Victoria, and has, through her leading men, industriously disseminated prejudice and disfavour against those ministers in the colony who have hitherto maintained a Free Church profession. One most lamentable result of this deliberate and persevering policy has been to leave congregations such as that at Hamilton destitute of religious ordinances. They cannot, as they openly declare, profit by the ministrations which they receive under the withering influence of Unionism, and they are barred by the prejudice raised against them in Scotland from any direct, and almost from all hopeful, means of obtaining a minister for themselves from home. Surely it is time that some of the ministers in Scotland, who have begun to see and dislike the leadings of the union principle, should lay to heart the evil perpetrated in this colony, in which they have inadvertently (we sincerely believe) though formally, made themselves accomplices. Is it impossible to receive at least a re-hearing of the case which the Unionist leaders in Scotland gave against us, when such men as Dr. Horatius Bonar, Mr. Nixon, Dr. Begg, and Dr. Julius Wood are nobly fighting their way out of the Unionist snare. We have no desire to hamper those whose hands are full with their own conflict; but surely such men will not stand by and leave a congregation like the Highlanders of Hamilton to be spiritually frost bitten by Unionist Moderatism without a word of sympathy. And a word from them would be good news from a far country.

The meeting which we have at such length introduced to our readers was opened with religious exercises in Gaelic by the Rev. Alexander McIntyre, who presided as chairman. Mr. L. McLean officiated as clerk. The Chairman stated the object for which the meeting had been convened, and called on the Rev. A. Paul, of St. Kilda; who was present, to address the congregation.

Mr. Paul said he felt glad that he had accepted the invitation of Mr. McIntyre, and come to Hamilton. Having given no warning of his visit, he had the advantage of seeing matters exactly as they stood, and from all he had seen he was impressed with the opinion that the spirit of the congregation was resolutely set on the settlement of ordinances in their own language, and in association with the Synod of which Mr. McIntyre and himself were ministers. As representative of the Synod, he had much pleasure in co-operating with the congregation to procure the grant of a site from the Government, and the laying open of the ground for the foundation of a solid church was a witness to the spirit and energy of the congregation. As regarded the means of ministerial

supply at the command of the Synod, he felt grateful that small as they were as a church organization, they had such a minister among them as Mr. McIntyre, whose labours among his countrymen both in Victoria and New South Wales had been most abundant, and he believed, blessed; and he trusted these labours might be continued until such a congregation as that at Ham-ilton was past the initial stage of organization. If he referred to the Union Church, with which most of them had been associated in times past, it was not with the intention of disparaging any individual person; but he occupied a public position aside from that Church, and he was not ashamed to give his reason at any time for not belonging to it, and never having given any countenance to the movement which developed it. He believed the congregation then present could also give good reason why they no longer desired to hold communion with that church, and he would seek to give expression to their reasons of dissatisfaction rather than to his own. He desired to be corrected if he mis-stated any facts or misrepresented their views. There were three distinct objects embraced in the organization of the Church of Christ which the Union had totally failed to fulfil, so far as the Gaelic speaking people of Hamilton were concerned. One of these objects was the preaching of the Gospel. When the Christian Church was first organized by the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, the most striking effect of his presence was the publication of the message of salvation to every man in his own tongue wherein he was born. From which first movement of the Christian dispensation it was surely not too much to conclude that the great Head of the Church has it in his will that all barriers of language in the way of proclaiming the unsearchable riches of God's grace should be carefully avoided by the Christian Church, and that, so far as may be possible in the circumstances of any church, that church is bound to remove any such impediment to the preaching of the Gospel. Now, if a church that boasts of its abounding wealth, and has numbers of ministers capable of reaching the Gaelic speaking portion of the population in their own language, deliberately and habitually ref- uses ministrations in that language, it is not too much to say that it violates the spirit and the lesson of that Pentecost miracle. If any church, having men and means at command and boasted of, yet refuses to preach the Gospel in a language that can be understood, be it to Parthians, Medes, or Elamites, or dwellers in Mesopotamia, or Victorian colonists from the Highlands of Scotland, surely it is no unfounded deduction to say that such a church, in that matter at least, displays little of the presence of that Spirit whose advent marked the Christian and Gospel age. But such a deliberate dereliction of Christian duty had been laid at the door of the Union Church by the Highlanders of Ham-ilton. And besides, there had been superadded on the neglect of the people's spiritual interests, the aggravation of a deliberate and shameless breach of faith. He had been shown what he was informed was a copy of a minute, taken at a meeting at a very early stage of their congregational history in Hamilton some twelve or more years ago. According to that minute, no minister was to be settled at Hamilton except one who could afford ministrations in Gaelic as well as English. On this footing subscriptions were asked and obtained from many of the Highland residents, and the funds so raised erected the Union Church in Hamilton. But long ago, as he was informed, the preaching of Gaelic had been discontinued in that church. Clearly such a course was in breach of the legal trust, if the

minute was as described. But the legal wrong was only a phase of the far more serious guilt, which a church incurred by refusing edification to a large number of its adherents, and that after taking subscriptions 603
under conditions to supply it. Besides the preaching of the Gospel it was an object committed to the Church to maintain purity of communion. But he had been informed that flagrant immorality had been tolerated at the Lord's table in the Union Church at Hamilton; that all remonstrances on the part of the people had been disregarded, and that the ministers, in conjunction with leading ecclesiastics in Melbourne, and especially with the Rev. D. McDonald, of Emerald Hill, had shielded the scandalous person and sustained him unchallenged in the participation of the communion and also in office. He understood that the offence created by this shameful neglect of discipline had never been removed; but while an offending elder was maintained without challenge in communion and in office, the disapprobation shown by the Highlanders at these proceedings was made an occasion, first, for a partial, and, finally, for a total discontinuance of Gaelic preaching in the Union Church, which the Highlanders so strongly complain of.

And then there was the freedom of internal administration which a Christian Church ought strenuously to maintain, and which it was the very distinction of the Free Church to have suffered for. All offices in the Church of Christ ought to be held under the suffrage of those who are governed. It was part of the freedom wherewith Christ had made his people free, that all government in the body of the Church took place through office-bearers elected by the members. Now, this principle had been set aside in recent settlements of ministers of the Union Church really, though not, it may be, formally and ostensibly. The Highlanders, both in Hamilton and at Branxholme, complained distinctly that the Union ministers in both these places were installed contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Presbyterian people, and that the extent of the opposition was well known to the ministers who conducted the settlement. In the latter case the name of the Rev. D. McDonald, of Emerald Hill, has been associated with this exercise also of ecclesiastical management and oppression. The Highlanders at Hamilton were held to have disfranchised themselves, because they had been scandalised by the presence of an immoral character at the communion, and had forbore to come to the Lord's table, so that, under this truly moderate management, they had had the option of desecrating the most sacred ordinance of the Church, or finding themselves without a voice in the election of a minister when a vacancy occurred. These statements he made in their own hearing. He had received them from themselves.

Now, with such statements made to him he felt he had no need, at least among the Highlanders of Hamilton, to justify the course which the ministers of the Free Presbyterian Synod had felt it their duty to take with reference to the Union. They had always maintained that the principles which oppressed the Church of Scotland during last century were involved in the Union, and that in due time their operation in one form or other would be apparent. But he would now take leave of that part of the subject and turn their attention to the practical steps which might be open to them to take for the settlement of a minister holding Free Church principles in their integrity. Mr. Paul then advised the preparation of a letter to be addressed to some minister in Scotland likely to enter into the feelings and views of the congregation – the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church being at the same time asked to accompany the letter with their recommendation.

Mr. Hector Morrison moved that such a letter should be prepared, which was seconded and carried unanimously.

Trustees to hold the site granted by Government, were then nominated, and the meeting was closed by Rev. A. McIntyre with prayers and the benediction.

## THE TESTIMONY AND THE POLICY OF THE UNION CHURCH.

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

DEAR SIR, – I need scarcely say that, without just and fixed principles, and strict adherence to those principles, it is impossible for any man or any organisation of men to pursue the path of duty and integrity. While this is true of all men, and of all organisations and communities, it is true in an eminent degree of Churches, that are called after him who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. But when Churches have no certain and fixed principles to guide them in a given course of action, and when principles and doctrines of vital importance are left open to caprice, prejudice, and even the enmity of their members and adherents, to wrest and pervert them as they please, surely such Churches cannot be said to be walking in a safe path; yet such is the path which the Union Church in this colony treads. It undermines the very foundation of Presbyterianism by giving to the major number of a congregation the right of finally deciding most important questions, *e. g.,* the organ and hymn question. This is Independency and not Presbyterianism; it is leaving the public worship of God to be regulated by those who have a morbid craving for aesthetic worship and prefer shallow soulless songs to the songs of inspiration. Further, the essential doctrine of the Headship of Christ over nations and over the Church is compromised by all Unionists, and stoutly denied by a large number of them. But O, say Unionists, we want to be liberal, we want to become all things to all men, as the Apostle says, that we may win the more. We want to conform somewhat to Episcopalianism in countenancing the use of organs in our Churches, in order that some of them may come over to us. We want also to conform somewhat to Independency, and to preach now and again an Arminian sermon, and perhaps wisely too to cast a shade of doubt over some of the claims of inspiration, in order that we may gain the more as the Apostle says. Apostate, hear. "I determine to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified;" and "Be not conformed unto the world;" and "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me."

The theology and policy of the Union Church may be illustrated by stating to you a few of the doings and sayings of a dep- utation sent to this district by that Church with the twofold object, of raising funds in aid of St. Andrew's College, and of doing every possible injury to the cause of Christ as our Church endeavours to further it in this district. This deputation, which consisted of the Rev. Mr. J. Cameron and the Rev. Mr. Laing, made their appearance here with great pomp. Mr. Laing the first night he came called a meeting of all the inhabitants of the district. I had not the pleasure of being at the meeting, but I was informed by a friend who was there, that it consisted of twelve persons, children, of whom there was a large proportion, as well as adults being all told. Mr. Laing particularly exhorted Unionists to hold prayer meetings amongst themselves, though, by the way, we endeavor to hold prayer meetings as often as we can throughout the district. The earnest orator of the previous night proved his sincerity in the exhortation to hold prayer meetings, by shouldering his musket next morning and by spending the day, while his brother deputy was lecturing in the district, in killing poor innocent birds. Mr. L. further proves the sincerity of his appeal by the fact that he does not hold prayer meetings among the poor people over whom he is placed. One of his elders told a friend of mine, "that he tried to shame Mr. Laing to hold

prayer meetings;" how-ever, Mr. L. would not be "shamed" to do so. Mr. Cameron kind-ly visited me, and we had a good deal of pleasant talk on the necessity of working together, though we could not unite, in further-604
ing the cause of Christ in this land. But what do you think my oily friend of the morning did when he got some of the people together, and on the previous evening, though I did not hear of it when we were speaking together so pleasantly? He told them that they should not subscribe a shilling towards the erection of a Church, which we Free Churchmen contemplated to erect. Some of the people, when they heard Mr. Cameron give this advice, notwithstanding his fine speeches, left the meeting with disgust and indignation. There is a rumour that Mr. C. came here with the intention of getting Mr. White of Singleton settled in this district, so that a vacancy might be created at Singleton, &c. Be this as it may, it is a fact that he recommended Mr. White on the ground especially that he has a salary from Government. While Mr. Laing was traversing the country with his musket, Mr. Cameron nearly turned the heads of honest farmers here with flaming speeches about St. Andrew's College, and with kindred promises and overtures. Mr. C. said, for example, though he knew St. Andrew's College must be a thing of the twentieth or twenty-first century, that all farmers who might wish to send their sons to it, and who could not very well afford to pay for their education, would get them educated in it as lawyers, doctors, or ministers, free of charge. Some of the people formed a different opinion of these assurances, but others, in their simplicity, received them with entire confidence.

In a discussion, which had somewhat the character of a public one, Mr. Cameron, the deputy of the Union Church, and, I presume, therefore, a fair representative of that Church, furnished a clear illustration of the wretched position of that body in respect of testimony. After discussing the Erastian and voluntary principles of the Union Church, Mr. C. endeavoured to show that the current idea, that the Established Church at home is Erastian, is merely an inference which the Free Church draws. The deputy also endeavoured to show that the voluntaryism of the present day is perhaps consistent with the history of the human mind; and that there is therefore a moral necessity in it. You would fancy, when Mr. C. was discussing these points, that he was a disciple of Compte or Newman. At all events you could see that he was dabbling in the positivism of the one and into the development theory of the other. We don't know whether Mr. C. was at his wits end when be made the startling assertion that there was no use of preaching on the Headship of Christ in these colonies? This assertion he made in the presence of more than one. "What then shall be preached?" said his opponent. "Common Christianity." "Christianity without a head?" *Yes*; preaching on the Headship of Christ should be confined to the home Churches. This doubtless is the practice and theory of the Unionist ministers. They neither believe in the Headship of Christ nor preach on it, though they dare not come out as boldly as their deputy. Need I say what the Headship of Christ means? It means that according to the basis of the eternal covenant made between the Father and the Son, the Father, in consideration of the work which Christ as Mediator was to perform, made the Son heir of all things , *i. e.,* that all power in heaven and in earth was given to him, and that he has sole and immediate right, in virtue of his mediatorial office, to all things in the universe, and that every creature in the universe is subject to him. So Heb. 1: 2. God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he has appointed *heir of all things.* All things include the Church and the State. The Church therefore is subject to Christ and he is its head, Eph. 5: 23. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church, "and Christ is head *over all things* to the Church." Again the State being included in all things, it must be subject to Christ, and Christ must be its head. It is in duty bound, therefore, to recognise Christ as its head, and to defend and assist the cause

of Christ on earth. Is. 49: 23, "And Kings shall be thy nursing fathers and Queens thy nursing mothers," and "I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession." But, you see, the Union deputy and his party say that these passages should not be preached in these colonies – we believe they do not preach them, but practically hold that if they are to be preached at all, they should be confined to Scotland; in other words, they say virtually that Christ should have no throne, no dominion, – that he should be dethroned, in these lands.

The Union deputy tried to bring all the odium he could upon this Church to which he once belonged himself. He did so particularly when he had occasion, as he often had, to allude to his late visit to Scotland. He seemed to glory in telling people that we are utterly disowned, though he is owned! by the Free Church at home.

One remark more and I have done. Hypocrisy is hateful in any man, it is more so in a minister. The following is a specimen of clerical hypocrisy, which is by no means an uncommon thing in the Union Church, and, also, in many other Churches. In the September number of the *Christian Herald* there is a column and a half devoted to "Suggestions on the state of religion, submitted to the Presbytery of the Hawkesbury by a committee appointed by that Court to frame said suggestions." Mr. Cameron was convener of the committee. Suggestion the seventh is to the following effect: – "And the importance of discountenancing by precept and example, not only manifest immoralities, but also such social habits, customs, and amusements, as are found injurious to the moral health and spiritual life of the community." Surely Mr. Cameron, in his social as well a his official intercourse with his fellows, should remember and try to practice this suggestion, of which he probably was the writer. Did he act in accordance with this suggestion during his sojourn amongst us? Let the fact that, if not directly, certainly indirectly, he countenanced promiscuous dancing, furnish an answer; for surely promiscuous dancing is one of the amusements which he condemns in his suggestion to the Presbytery.

It may be seen in some measure from these remarks whether the line of policy which the deputy of the Union Church and his co-Presbyters follow is in accordance with the mind of God and calculated to further Christ's cause on earth. The day will declare it.

Yours, &c.,

JOHN McLEOD.

Hastings River, Dec. 9, 1869.

---

## MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

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

SIR, – The Unionist Assembly met during last month, and the reports of proceedings afford some points worthy of notice. Conspicuous was the discussion in connexion with the "Christian Review and Messenger," the magazine published by the Unionists. The forenoon sederunt was reported in the evening paper (*Herald*), under the suggestive heading "Rationalism in the Church." From the report it appeared the circulation of the magazine has been increasing. But Dr. Cairns thought the journal admitted of improvement. It did not speak in a sufficiently decided tone upon doctrinal matters. He also feared it might do injury by expressing unguarded approval of unsound writers, such as the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton. The Church of England was suffering from allowing deviations from sound doctrine, and the alarm would soon be raised if the same thing appeared in the Presbyterian Church.

Rev. D. S. MacEachran was glad that the question had been raised. On his arrival in the colony he was pained to see the tone of the periodical which represented the Presbyterian Church. He had spoken to the editor about it; and he was now constrained to speak from a conviction that the tendency of the periodical was not 605
for good. There had been a weight upon his mind ever since he came to the country on account of this periodical. If the Church was to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, it could not support the *Review* with its present tone. He did not say that he was in the right, but if the *Review* was in the right, he and the Confession were in the wrong. Next day the three morning papers had their respective versions. In the *Argus* report Dr. Cairns gave the editor credit for peculiar aptitude for his office, but wished to see a more positive tone about the leading doctrines of the Gospel. Otherwise the report was substantially the same as already given. Rev. D. S. MacEachran agreed with the remarks of Dr. Cairns. He felt he should not be doing his duty if he did not express his opinion that on things inconsistent with the Word of God and the standards of the Church, the *Review* gave a very uncertain sound. He did not believe that true and vital godliness could be promoted among the people unless the Church gave a certain sound on the great fundamental doctrines of the Gospel; and he distinctly objected to the *Review* having a broad Church rather than an evangelical tone. He admitted that the editor occupied a somewhat delicate position in the matter, but if this broad tone was to be adopted, he would rather belong to the Independent Church, where he would only be responsible for himself, than to a Church which had signed standards. In the brief report of the *Daily Telegraph,* it appeared that Dr. Cairns complained of the want of decision on doctrinal matters and that Rev. D. S. MacEachran "condemned, in still stronger terms, the tone of writing in the periodical." The consequence, in these circumstances, was the proposal of a committee to consider the matter and report to the Assembly. Of course the names of Dr. Cairns and Mr. MacEachran appeared in the list. Rev. D. Meiklejohn objected to this altogether. Whatever broad Churchism was in the *Review,* was there before it left the hands of the Rev. J. O. Dykes. It was unfair now to charge this upon the present editor. There were some of them who believed that religious doctrines were better conserved by meeting the peculiarities of the age by a style of treatment suited to it, than by clinging to the stereotyped modes of bygone days. Perhaps there was as much dogmatism as to the faith about himself as about any one in the court, yet he claimed for himself and for all liberty to avail themselves of the new lights – new settings for those doctrines and principles which the time furnishes, and which the fresh guidance of the Holy Ghost, who is perpetually resident in the Church, brings to view. There was more dan-ger to these doctrines in treating them in the language of the past than in the course animadverted upon by Dr. Cairns and Mr. MacEachran. After sundry suggestions the original committee were reappointed with thanks, especially to the convener, who is principal editor.

But now it may occur to ask who is the editor? It is none other than the Rev. J. W. Inglis, the illustrious lecturer on Burns! During the foregoing discussion he was not present. At the next sederunt he was present, and adverted to the matter, and all the satisfaction Dr. Cairns and Mr. MacEachran got was a complaint from him of discourtesy in proceeding with the report when he was absent. Another gentleman was brought to his feet on the subject, and "repudiated the charge of seeking to subvert the fundamental truths of religion as taught by the Church." This was Rev. P. S. Menzies. It is plain that there is a new generation of ecclesiastics whose little finger is to be greater than the loins of their fathers in regard to the doctrines of religion. It has indeed to be added that what value there was in the testimony of Dr. Cairns was virtually filed down to nothing by a letter which he wrote to the *Argus* on this subject. The matter had been taken up by the secular press, who greatly rejoiced at the victory secured by Messrs Inglis and the Reviewers.

The weak Doctor has never been able to stand on the losing side. He must identify himself with the winners. He assures us that in regard to all the leading principles of Christianity the Reviewers and himself are at one. "These Presbyterian ministers hold every doctrine of the Confession of Faith as distinctly, as conscientiously, and as firmly as I do myself." Perhaps this is not saying much for all parties concerned.

Turning to Mr. MacEachran, what has he gained by the notice which he took of the *Review,* and his strongly expressed belief that its tone was not for good? How much of the weight has been rolled off his heart by the refusal of the Assembly to appoint a committee on the matter, and the failure to secure one iota of guarantee that the magazine will be conducted otherwise henceforth from what has prevailed hitherto? How much light has he got from that shallow piece of clap-trap – from Rev. D. Meiklejohn? Whatever new lights appear from any quarter, Mr. Meiklejohn claims for the use of his brethren as well as for himself, but very likely Mr. MacEachran did all this long before Mr. Meiklejohn. Looking carefully at the matter, Mr. MacEachran has brought himself to a crisis, and it will be instructive to see how he gets through it. He says if the Church is to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, it cannot support the *Review* with its present tone. The sentiment is repeated in other language. Now, the Assembly gave him no guarantee whatever as to a change of tone. Will Mr. MacEachran carry out the suggestion of joining the Independents? For the actual result we must abide the revolution of time.

In this short letter I shall notice only one other point connected with the late session of the Unionist Assembly. The following overture was brought before the court by Rev. W. Henderson of Ballarat: "Whereas it is desirable that the Directory for Worship, sanctioned by this Church, should receive more attention and be more strictly adhered to, than is at present the case; and, whereas, one chief cause of the neglect into which the Directory has fallen, is to be found in the fact that there is not a little contained in it which, however suitable for the time in which the Directory was composed, has become obsolete and unfit for use in our present age and circumstances; it is, therefore, overtured to the venerable the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, that such steps be taken as to the Assembly shall seem proper, with a view to fit the Directory for Worship for general use in the congregations of this Church." Of course this may mean much, or it may mean nothing. Mr. Henderson gave a specimen of the alterations required, and mentioned the part where direction is given to pray for the then reigning sovereign, for the conversion of the Queen, "the comforting of the afflicted Queen of Bohemia, sister of our Queen," and Queen Anne of Bohemia, and her son, the illustrious Prince Charles Palatine of the Rhine. But it is difficult to suppose, that this indicates all that is contemplated. All that is pointed to here could be met by reprinting the Directory, but leaving two or three lines blank to be filled in according to the names of the persons concerned in the case. Mr. Henderson, significantly, says that the time is coming when they would require to revise the whole of the standards "from bottom to top," but in the meantime it was only the Directory for Public Worship that was concerned.

Rev. D. MacDonald, a very sagacious Moderate, moved that the Assembly pass to the next business. He believed that in four or five years there would be but one Presbyterian Church throughout

the world, and then would be the proper time to revise the standards. Rev. T. M. Fraser, of Geelong, moved as an amendment, that the clerical members of the Presbytery of Ballarat be appointed a committee to consider the matter and bring up a report to next 606
Assembly – Mr. Henderson to be convenor. This amendment was carried. The two leading men in the Metropolitan Goldfield Presbytery are Rev. Captain William Henderson, of whom I have had large occasion to speak already, and Rev. J. W. Inglis who has also repeatedly come under notice; curiously enough they are both distinguished lecturers on Burns. It will be interesting to see what they make of the Directory for Public Worship.

I am &c.
PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, Victoria,
December 8th, 1869.

---

## REMEMBERING ZION

(*Continued from page* 570.)

Assuming, therefore, that Christianity once throve wonderfully in our native land, and assuming that the Church of Scotland was the instrument which God employed to bring about this flourishing state of religion, it may be worth while to enquire, whether there be any peculiarity in that Church to which these blessed results are owing. And in doing this, we wish not to disparage other denominations. We believe that God has owned many churches as well as ours. We have Christian friends in the Church of England whom we dearly love. We rejoice to know that Independents, and Bap- tists, and Wesleyans, and many others, can produce seals of apostle ship, in multitudes of converted souls, as well as we. But we do think, if Church History is of any use, that we should search it to see which form of Christianity best fulfils the purposes of a Church of Christ: and we do think it no slight matter to depart from scriptural rules and usages, even in the minitiae of church government and worship. And from all that we know of the New Testament, and of the history of other churches, we feel truly thankful that we are members of the Scottish Church.

1. We are thankful for its doctrinal standards. They are clear and simple, and at every sentence they appeal to the written word of God. They are self consistent. There is not a word in the Confession which contradicts the Catechism, and not a word in either which contradicts the Scriptures. We are the more thankful for this, after observing that conscientious members of other churches are embarrassed by real or apparent contradictions in their standards, which it requires an exercise of an ingenuity hurtful to the conscience to reconcile with themselves or with the truth. The standards of the Church of Scotland contain the Reformation doctrines in their fulness. They are not peculiar to our Northern Church. They were prepared by an assembly of the most gifted and godly divines in Britain, and are the result of years spent in deliberation, mutual conference and prayer. Speaking of the Westminster Assembly, says their contemporary, Richard Baxter, "The divines there congregated were men of eminent learning and godliness, and ministerial abilities and fidelity. And being not worthy to be one of them myself, I may the more freely speak that truth which I know, even in the face of malice and envy; that as far as I am able to judge by the information of all history of that kind, and by any other evidences left us, the Christian world, since the days of the Apostles, had never a synod of more excellent divines (taking one thing with another) than this Synod and the Synod of Dort were." And his verdict is confirmed by the enlightened and devoted Archbishop Usher. The christian world has given its suffrage in favour of the Westminster Assembly, for no summary of faith has been so widely taught as its Shorter Catechism. It is a favourite with all the evangelical denominations. And is it not a matter of thankfulness to belong to a church which at once enjoys scriptural standards, and symbolises with the other churches of Christ?

2. We are thankful for the simple and spiritual worship which God has preserved in the Church of Scotland. There is no church which He has more thoroughly delivered from carnal ordinances and commandments of men. Those who worship the Father in spirit find nothing here to trammel or encumber them. Those who cannot so worship will find no substitute for devotion to delude them. We do not wish to introduce anything into our worship which our Master did not warrant, and which His first disciples did not practise. The psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs – the prayers, not read from an unvarying form, but adapted to those exigencies which change every week – the reading and preaching of the Word, are our ordinary sanctuary service. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth," and where He *is not,* a form of prayer will not quicken; and where He is, a form of prayer is not needed.

---

## POPERY AND RITUALISM.

We make the following extract from the opening address of the Moderator of the Original Secession Synod at its last meeting. The remarks made are, in their general bearing, as applicable to this colony as they are to Scotland: –

"Among the more prominent matters which call forth regret, and make it obvious that the times in which we live are perilous, we specify the following:

1. *The alarming progress of Popery throughout our land*."

"The longer we study this antichristian system, the more appropriate and striking will its scriptural designation appear – 'The Mystery of Iniquity.' Although doomed to perish, it lifts its head exultingly amongst us and craftily tries to subvert whole houses and beguile unstable souls. With the threatened revival of the Romish hierarchy, with the erection of extensive monasteries and nunneries, and with a large addition to the priesthood and the various fraternities of Popish agents, it is difficult to foresee what shall befall our country not many years hence. We know that Popery seeks, and will not rest contented till it obtains, absolute and universal supremacy. To attain this it is plotting and working more secretly or openly, striving to ingratiate itself in the favour of the wealthy, and endeavouring to entice the poor and illiterate. By establishing educational *seminaries* for children and *institutes* for young men, by organising *evening classes* for factory girls and artisans, and by originating Sabbath evening *lectures* for all classes on the leading topics of the day, it is endeavouring silently yet surely to gain a firm footing amongst us, and make men believe that instead of being hostile it is most friendly to their best interests, and seeks the promotion of their temporal and spiritual welfare. Wherever Protestant missionaries are laboring, there are its agents at work; and while it zealously guards the homes of its adherents from the visits of those who are really anxious to benefit the people, it intrudes into the dwellings of the working classes, and by means of bribery and false pretences tries to swell its ranks and replenish its coffers. We cannot contemplate the havoc this iniquitous system has produced among all ranks and classes, or reflect on the myriads of precious souls that have been deluded and eternally ruined thereby, without a feeling of horror and dismay. Nor can we think about our inability to reach those who are under its control, and extend a helping hand to extricate them out of their perilous condition, with-out a bleeding heart and an earnest prayer to the God of truth to hasten the downfall of Papal Antichrist. As a nation, we have nursed and fondled that viper which shall yet sting us like a serpent and bite like an adder; and instead of withdrawing

national countenance and support from it, we are caressing, pampering, and honouring it, lauding and feasting and encouraging its leaders, and affording them the most favourable opportunities for carrying on 607
their unchristian work. Callous, unconcerned Protestants may find ere long that the crafty enemy has, under the guise of Jesuitism or Puseyism, done more injury to morality and religion than was supposed. May the Lord open men's eyes to see the wicked, soul destroying nature of this accursed system, enlighten and embolden the friends of truth so that they may successfully expose its pernicious errors, and break the fetters wherewith so many have been bound, so that the oppressed may go free."

2. *The Ritualistic tendencies of the present day*."

"That the Prelatic Church is bestirring itself to occupy the home mission field in our great cities and thickly peopled towns, and is making an inroad among the nominally Presbyterian population, where its agents labour, is well known. Nor is this all, for it is casting its baneful shadow over our Presbyterian Churches, and corrupting the purity, simplicity, and spirituality of the sanctuary services. With what rapidity has the leaven of Episcopacy spread, after once finding its way, into the Established and Dissenting Churches. In imitation of lordly Prelacy, the modern place of worship must needs be gaudily ornamented; its windows filled with pictorial paintings, representing either the Saviour, some familiar scripture scene, or some distinguished ancient or modern saint; its pews furnished with prayer-books, hymn-books, and kneeling boards, and the service of praise performed by a few well trained, and, in some cases, *professional* singers, whose voices blend with the peals of the organ, or with the instrumental band to produce a finer effect, and charm the admiring but silent assemblies of professing worshippers. With ministers advocating the use of the liturgy, and willingly gratifying the popular craving for music by curtailing the other services of the sanctuary, and with the people in great measure prepared to follow their leaders in the highway to Episcopacy, it is difficult to foretell what the end of these things maybe. The changes which many regard as highly commendable and beneficial, we cannot but look upon as extremely hurtful, for they tend to lead men's thoughts away from the grand realities of religion to its bare, empty forms, and foster a desire to rest satisfied with a name to live, while they continue in a state of spiritual death. Formality in religion is nothing new, but its prevalence in our day cannot be questioned, and is greatly to be deplored. Multitudes strive to pacify conscience, and gratify the ambitious desire to stand approved in the sight of fellow mortals, by a professed subjection to Christ, while God is not in all their thoughts. Religious duties are performed by many in the most superficial and perfunctory manner, while, with a few rare exceptions, family religion and parental training have fallen into disuse. Fellowship societies are greatly reduced in number, and prayer meetings are being rapidly abolished, or confined to a few months in the depth of winter. With the Bible neglected, the songs of Zion unsung, and prayer seldom if ever offered in the homes of the people, what can we expect but cold, withering formalism in religion. Many suppose they do well if they give little more than an hour out of the week to Divine worship, and even that is often given grudgingly; and while they pour in hundreds or thousands to the theatre, the ball room, the racecourse, or the concert, during the week, and squander both time and money in attending places of questionable amusement, the preacher may count himself fortunate if he gets a score of persons to gather around the wells of salvation, from whence flow the refreshing streams that can alone comfort and gladden the weary soul. The abounding ritualism and prevailing formalism of the age, together with a strong and growing dislike to the simple and beautiful institutions of Divine appointment, have had the effect of converting many of our fashionable churches into places of sacred entertainment, and rendering the religion of many merely nominal, fruitless, dead."

## TRAFFIC IN MASSES.

The following extracts from an article which appeared in the *Times* of the 18th September, present the saying of masses in its true character. The allegation that masses, celebrated on behalf of deceased persons, are an effectual means of procuring repose for their souls, is, in its entire character, a deception. Masses have no such efficacy; and, if those on whose behalf they are celebrated were parties to the celebration of them, the effect of it would be not the securing but the prevention of the repose of their souls. But the ascription of efficacy to the mass is not the first departure from the truth in this process of deception and fraud. There is a most pernicious departure from it in teaching that for persons, who do not enter into a state of repose at death, repose may be subsequently procured. Indeed, purgatory and the system of which it forms a prominent part, afford the most stupendous illustration and result of deception, to which it is possible to refer – deception practised by Satan on men and by men on each other.

And, deception so entirely characterising the system, what else was to be expected but that deception should characterise the administration of it? And it does characterise it. Priests are paid for saying solitary or private masses, and in multitudes of instances they never say them. In the cases to which the following extracts refer, it can scarcely be imagined that the priests, who engaged to celebrate masses, had any intention to do so. How could one man celebrate 100,000 masses? There is, however, one consolation in cases of this kind: the failure to celebrate the masses, the celebration of which was arranged and paid for, is no loss to those whose interests they were intended to promote.

"A curious case of swindling was brought before a French police court, which shows a peculiar state of things with respect to the traffic in these ceremonies. It need hardly be said that it is customary for surviving relatives of Roman Catholics to cause masses to be said for the repose of the souls of deceased persons. It seems that the demand for masses in Paris is so large that the clergy in that city are not able to meet it. In order, therefore, to supply the requirements of the public in this matter, there are houses in Paris which undertake for a commission to send the fees and the orders to priests in the provinces. Availing themselves of this practice, two rogues, one of them a priest who had been laid under an interdict for frauds in connexion with this custom, issued circulars which they sent to rural priests, offering to act as agents for them, and to negotiate what may be termed their bills for masses. So specious were these circulars that some priests fell into the trap, and sent undertakings to repeat masses, leaving the number in blank. As the signatures were genuine, the two persons referred to were able to discount these with the funeral furnishers or publishers who were intrusted with the fees and orders. But, instead of sending the vestments, or books, or whatever the priests desired to have in return for their promissory notes, they appropriated them to their own uses. They were also open to receive orders direct from the public, and there was no guarantee that they did not pocket the fees without making any return, as the only prisoner who remained to take his trial declared that his was a ready money business, and that he kept no books. It was no easy matter to get evidence against him, as the priests who had signed the bills of exchange were naturally reluctant to give evidence in a matter which, though it was affirmed to be in accordance with canonical rules, they felt was not creditable to them. One of these witnesses, for instance, had signed bills for 7618 francs worth of masses, and altogether he was under the obligation of repeating 1200 masses, according to

his own admission. How long it takes to say a mass is not stated, but the impression gathered from what was said is that a priest must rise 608
early in the morning and make long days for a considerable time to work off such an accumulation as this. But great as his liabilities were, they were trifling in comparison with those of the witness who followed him; he had bills in the ecclesiastical market to the amount in the aggregate of 11,265 masses. There were others whose liabilities were not much inferior; in the list of these may be mentioned one for 5312, another for 7151, another for 2736, another for 1764, another for 2250, another for 11,708, another for 2395, another for 9381, another for 9457, and another, who in proportion was a pike among minnows [not among minnows, surely] whose liabilities amounted to 28,000 masses. So reckless, indeed, was one of these priests that he had signed bills to the amount of 100,000 francs, which at the current rate of one franc a *mass* rendered him liable to the same number of masses; so that it may be imagined that if his creditors had come upon him in a body they would have been obliged to accept a composition. That the sensation excited by the discovery of these novel frauds and their magnitude has been great and painful may be easily imagined.

---

## OBITUARY

[The following brief notices were in type for our last issue, but were, from some mistake, and without our knowledge, omitted.]

Mrs. McInnes. – Mrs. McInnes, the wife of the Rev. Duncan McInnes, died at Rockymouth Manse, Clarence River, on the 7th instant. A judicious discerning person, who attended her deathbed, says – "As far as I can judge from the Word of God, her soul is with the Lord. Shortly before she died, she was longing much for Christ's coming. I asked her if she was ready to go, and she answered that she was at least willing to depart, and longing to do so. She said also that she loved the Saviour, that he was her hope, and that his blood was the only ground on which she looked for the pardon of her sins." Our correspondent adds – "She hated sin, and hungered and thirsted after holiness. She loved the people of God much."

The Rev. Donald Morrison. – Mr. Morrison, one of the New Hebrides missionaries, died at Onehunga, New Zealand, on the 23rd October. Mr. Morrison was eminently soberminded and judicious, and, in harmony with this peculiarity of his character, his piety, while deep and fervent, was calm. His natural endowments and his gracious qualifications fitted him, in no ordinary degree, for the work to which he devoted himself. He died in the full hope that an entrance should be ministered to him abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "Farewell! earthly scenes; welcome! glory, honour, and immortality," were among his last words.

---

## PRESBYTERY OF MAITLAND:

At a meeting of the Presbytery of Maitland, lately held at Raymond Terrace, Mr. McLeod was appointed to continue his labours in the Port Macquarie district, and Mr. McInnes was appointed to preach at Grafton on the second Sabbath of January next.

The next meeting is to be held (D.V.) at Raymond Terrace on the 5th January next.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 52. SYDNEY, JANUARY 1870.

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. 52 JANUARY.

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Necessity of Christ's Sufferings and Glory … … | 609 |
| The North Shore Again … … … … | 611 |
| Awkward Apologies … … … … … | 612 |
| Correspondence – Bearing of the Decision of the Free Church with respect to Australian Unions on Union Negotiations in Scotland … | 614 |
| Mr. Grant's Address … … … … … | 615 |
| The Structure of Romans 1: 1-5 … … … … | 616 |
| The Moral and Religious Aspect of the Elections … … | 617 |
| Review: "Church and State" … … … … | 618 |
| St. George's Mutual Improvement Association … … | 619 |
| Psalm 46 … … … … … … | 619 |
| Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia … … … | 620 |

## THE NECESSITY OF CHRIST'S SUFFERINGS AND GLORY.

"Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory." – Luke 24: 26

The Jews expected a Messiah, who without humiliation or suffering should triumph over every enemy, and raise them as a nation to great prosperity, power, and pre-eminence. And even the disciples were under the influence of this expectation. The circumstances of humiliation, indeed, in which the Saviour appeared, proclaimed very emphatically that such an expectation was wholly baseless; but from the majesty of his character, the divine wisdom of his teaching, and the absolute power over all things which his miracles displayed, and displayed as exercised in doing good, his disciples, we may well conceive, could scarcely be impressed with his humiliation as being humiliation. But, when he was crucified, they were not only constrained to recognise the reality and depth of his humiliation, but even seemed to themselves as if they were shut in to the conclusion, which however they would not adopt, that he would not effect for them the redemption for which they looked to him. "We trusted," they said, "that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel." They did not say that they no longer entertained this expectation, but they could not say that they did still entertain it consciously and intelligently. They preferred therefore to state how it had been with them in times past as regarded the entertaining of it: they trusted it had been he who should have redeemed Israel. To the position which they had thus occupied they still clung. Their hope, still living in its root and principle, though for the time driven inward, so to speak, and restrained from conscious exercise, would not permit them to view and still less to describe themselves as no longer cherishing it.

But, though they clung to their hope and did what they could to sustain it, – for it seems to have been for this purpose that they referred to its being the third day, the day on which he said he would rise again, and to the report brought by certain women who had visited the sepulchre, and the subsequent confirmatory report of certain men of their company, – still they were greatly to blame for their unintelligent erroneous view of the crucifixion, and their consequent unbelieving fears. Our Lord therefore, though dealing with them as if he were an ordinary traveller, who had casually joined them, administered to them the severe reproof, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?" They ought to have known, and, if they had acted in the matter a wise and dutiful part, applying their minds with becoming earnestness and without prejudice to the revelation vouchsafed to them, and dealing with the truth which it presented according to its claims, they would have known and recognised that Christ having suffered and entered into his glory was altogether necessary.

What they ought thus to have known and recognised we shall now consider, – the necessity of Christ's sufferings and the necessity of his glory. Christ's sufferings were not necessary absolutely, they were not necessary in the nature of things or viewed in themselves. They were necessary only in relation to the salvation of his people. In order that his people might be saved, but not otherwise, it was necessary that he should suffer. That it was in this relation that his sufferings were necessary is intimated by the language employed: "Ought not Christ," or the Christ, "to have suffered." It not only was not necessary, but it was impossible, that he should suffer as the Son of God; and, viewed as a perfectly righteous man, it was not necessary that he should suffer – it was necessary that he should not suffer; but sustaining the relation to his people of their Saviour and substitute, it was necessary that be should suffer.

The justice of God requires, and requires necessarily, that sin shall be punished. It would be as irreconcilable with justice, with justice as an attribute of the Supreme Moral Governor and as exercised by him, that sin should escape unpunished, as that righteousness should not only go unrewarded but should even expose to punishment. And, God having announced that sin should be punished, that the soul that sinned should die, his faithfulness conspired with his justice in requiring that the punishment denounced should be inflicted. Thus from the justice and faithfulness of God a necessity arose that sin in every case, and therefore that the sins of Christ's people, should be punished; and with this necessity his purpose of shewing mercy and bestowing salvation in no way interfered; it affected

only the mode of meeting and satisfying it.
610

Christ in the eternal covenant between him and his Father, concurring in his Father's choice and appointment of him to be his people's substitute, accepted and assumed the position of their substitute, and as their substitute undertook and engaged to bear the punishment due to their sins. Thus the necessity; that their sins should be punished, became a necessity that the punishment due to them should be borne by him. In virtue of his engagement to satisfy the claims of Divine justice on behalf of his people, it became necessary that he should suffer.

But Christ undertook and engaged not only to procure salvation for his people, but also in by and doing so to glorify his Father, that is, to afford a glorious and even singular display of the divine character and perfections, and particularly of the love, the wisdom, the mercy, and justice of God. The love of God was no doubt manifested in his forming the design of bestowing so great and glorious a salvation on his people; but it is only when this salvation is viewed as purchased for them with the blood of his own Son, that it possesses its full significance as an evidence and illustration of his love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." – l John 4: 10. And, as regards the Divine wisdom, the most peculiar and marvellous displays of it, which the plan of salvation affords, are presented in the constitution of Christ's person, which rendered him capable of suffering, and, at the same time, secured that his sufferings should derive infinite efficacy from his divinity; and in his being brought into and sustaining such a relation to his people, that his sufferings and his whole obedience which terminated in them should be available for them. And then of the Divine mercy the special glory lies not only in its forgiving multiplied and heinous sins, but particularly in its being exercised in forgiving sins for which full atonement has been made, and in its being thus exercised righteously, and righteously not merely on the ground of the exercise of it involving no violation of justice, but on the further and higher ground of its affording or at least being inseparably associated with an unparallelled manifestation of justice, that manifestation consisting in this that, circumstances having arisen under which, if sin was to be punished at all, the punishment of it must be inflicted on God's own Son, the punishment of it was inflicted on him, – that the commission was issued and executed, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow; smite the shepherd." – Zec. 13: 7. Thus it is evident that the sufferings of Christ were necessary, in order that he might fulfil the engagement into which he had entered to glorify his Father with the peculiar and singular glory which accrues to him from the work of redemption.

We have now seen that the sufferings of Christ were necessary. From the justice and faithfulness of God it is necessary that sin be punished; Christ having become the substitute of his people and undertaken to save them it became necessary that he should bear the punishment due to their sins. He engaged to bear that punishment and his sufferings were necessary in order to the fulfilment of that engagement; he engaged also to glorify his Father with the glory which accrues to him from the work of redemption, and in virtue of this engagement also his sufferings were necessary. The matter standing thus, Christ might well have asked the two disciples, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things?"

While Christ's sufferings were thus necessary, he underwent them voluntarily. His language with respect to them was, "I delight to do thy will, O my God," (Ps. 40: 8,) and he used this language, while he recognised that it was a part of his Fath-er's will that he should die for his people. "By the which will," says

the apostle, "we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all." Heb. 10: 10. Elsewhere he says "the cup which my Father giveth me shall I not drink it," John 18: l l; and to Peter, on his deprecating his master's sufferings, he addressed the severest reproof, we presume, that ever was addressed to a disciple, "get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me."

His sufferings were at the same time vicarious and penal, while he voluntarily bore them, they were inflicted by God in punishment of the sins of his people. The Lord laid on him the iniquity of them all. He was wounded for their transgressions, he was bruised for their iniquities. The chastisement of their peace was upon him. He died for their sins and for themselves. He died for them all, so that they all died. Is. 53: 5, 6; 2 Cor. 5: 14.

His sufferings were expiatory. He so bore the sins of his people in his own body on the tree, that he bore them away. The efficacy of his atonement was testified by his resurrection. As he was delivered on account of their offences, he arose again on account of their justification. Rom. 4: 25. He was justified as their substitute; they therefore were virtually justified in him, and on account of this he rose again. His ascension and his session at the right hand of God repeated the testimony thus conveyed by his resurrection. "By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9: 12.

It was necessary also that Christ should have entered into his glory. The glory particularly intended is, doubtless, his glory as the Christ – his mediatorial glory. This glory comprehends in it his exaltation to the right hand of God and to the exercise of universal dominion, all power in heaven and in earth having been given to him. It comprehends also the glory implied in his being the head of the redeemed. It was necessary that he should enter into this glory. As his sufferings were necessary in order to the procuring of salvation, his entering into his glory was necessary in order to the application of it. He has been therefore exalted by the right hand of God to be a Prince and a Saviour. He procured salvation as a suffering Saviour, but, in order that he might apply it, it was necessary that he should be a reigning Saviour, a Saviour possessing and exercising the power and authority of a prince. In order that he might be in a position to save his people to the uttermost, nothing less would suffice than that he should be made head over all things.

It was necessary that he should enter into his glory, because it was necessary that his suffering should be of such efficacy that they should issue in his entering into his glory. The Father promised his mediatorial glory to him, on condition of his finishing the work which he had given him to do; and it was necessary that he should finish that work and thus obtain the promised glory. It was thus necessary that he should enter into his glory. This was necessary as the issue of his having by his sufferings finished the work of procuring salvation.

It was also necessary that he should enter into his glory, and thus, as the forerunner of his people and for them, take possession of the inheritance which he has purchased for them.

It was necessary that he should enter into his glory, in order that the high complacency with which his Father regards his work and himself as having accomplished it, might thus be fully and emphatically testified. His regarding Christ's obedience unto death and himself as having rendered it with complacency consummates the display of his perfections, which that obedience furnishes.

From the truths which have now engaged our attention, the following conclusions evidently flow. Sin will not go unpun-



ished; it was necessary that Christ, when accountable for the sins of his people, should bear the punishment due to them, and shall those who are still accountable for their own sins escape punishment? If such things were done in the green tree what shall be done in the dry?

All things that are necessary in order to the salvation of sinners are ready. Christ has finished the work of procuring salvation, and he is now at the right hand of God "a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." (Acts 5: 31). He has entered into his glory.

There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, and they shall lack no good thing. They are interested in the satisfaction which Christ has given to the justice of God, – in all that he has done for his people and in all that be has procured for them. His love to them carried him through his sufferings, and now that he has entered into his glory and has been made head over all things, will it not move him to do all things for them and to perfect that which concerns them? He can and he will save them to the uttermost. In due time they shall be with him where he is, and they shall behold his glory. This is his will with respect to them, and it will be accomplished; they shall be for ever with the Lord.

Now my friends, what think you of all this? Is not Christ a glorious Saviour? Is not the salvation provided for sinners in Christ a precious salvation? Christ and this salvation are offered to you. Will you not accept the offer?

Let believers recognise more and more what a Saviour Christ is, and how blessed those are to whom he sustains the relation of their own Saviour, and let them recognise the obligations under which they lie to him. In his love to them he met and satisfied the necessity that we should suffer, and now be is engaged in applying to them the benefits which he has procured for them. How can they fail to ask "What shall we render unto Thee?"

---

## THE NORTH SHORE AGAIN.

A considerable time ago we laid before our readers the leading facts of the history of Presbyterianism on the North Shore. Those facts, as our readers will remember, exhibit a case of shameful and unmitigated intrusion. First of all, the church under the spiritual superintendence of "the Synod of Australia in connection with the Established Church of Scotland," placed and retained a minister on the North Shore not only without the consent of the people, but in the face of the most decided and strenuous opposition, the object being apparently not to relieve the existing spiritual destitution, but to place the intruded minister in circumstances to draw his Government salary. The wrong thus done by that church, and done by it consistently enough with its antecedents and ecclesiastical relations, did not fail to produce its legitimate effects. Presbyterianism was laid waste on the North Shore. The Presbyterians of that important suburb, with the exception of a few who came to Sydney on the Sabbath, either attached themselves to congregations of other denominations, or fell away from church going habits. But, notwithstanding the grossness of the wrong in question, and the full exhibition which we have described of its desolating operations, the Union Church accepted and continued it. Some indeed, of those, who took part in forming that church, encouraged the expectation, or rather promised, that, when formed, it would speedily and effectually redress the ecclesiastical grievances of the North Shore. This promise, however, was not fulfilled; no honest effort, we believe no effort at all, was made to fulfil it. The condition of Presbyterianism on the North Shore having thus become desperate, the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia was solicited to come to the rescue. That church has virtually laid it down for itself as a rule, to abstain from invading fields of labour occupied by the Union Church; but this rule did not apply to the North Shore. The Union Church, indeed, occupied that suburb, but it occupied it not as *a field of labour*, but for the purpose solely, if we may infer the design from the result, of qualifying one of its ministers for drawing his Government salary, that is, for it really came to this, of obtaining money from the Government under false pretences. The Government pay salaries to ministers on the faith of an assurance given to it by the Moderator for the time being, that they officiated as ministers for the period for which salaries are claimed, the understanding being that the ministrations supplied promote, and do not hinder, the cause of religion. But it was notorious, and the certifying moderator could scarcely have failed to know, that the ministrations thrust upon the North Shore, and if we are rightly informed, scarcely accepted by any, had very decidedly the latter effect.

Under those circumstances the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia complied with the application made to it, and sent Mr. John A. Stuart to labour on the North Shore as a Missionary. We abstain from expressing the very decided opinion we have formed, as to the manner in which Mr. Stuart fulfilled the important mission entrusted to him. We must, however, advert to the manner in which his fulfilment of it, such as it was, was brought to a close. Before he was licensed it was deemed necessary, from certain circumstances which excited an uneasy feeling with respect to his views on some points, to subject him to a special supplementary examination. His answers were so far satisfactory that he was licensed. One of them, however, it is now evident, was given insincerely, or at least did not express, as it ought to have done, his honest and settled conviction. The answer to which we refer was to the effect, that he did not approve of instrumental music in the public worship of God. But, in the face of the assurance which this answer conveyed, and in violation of what he knew to be the law and practice of the Church, from which he held his license, and by which he was employed, he deliberately introduced, about the end of September, the use of instrumental music into public worship as conducted by him on the North Shore. In forming an estimate of Mr. Stuart's conduct in this matter, it is not necessary to determine whether the use of instrumental music in the worship of God is sanctioned by Divine institutions. It was partly on the faith of an express declaration that he disapproved of such use of instrumental music, and "sincerely owned the purity of worship authorised and sanctioned" in the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, – and that Church holds that instrumental music ought not to be used, and, therefore, does not use it in the worship of God, – and of a solemn promise "that in his practice he would conform himself to the said worship," that Mr. Stuart was licensed, and subsequently sent to the North Shore. He thus professed to agree with the Church that licensed and employed him in holding that instrumental music ought not to be used in the worship of God, and solemnly promised that he would not be a party to such use of it. Accordingly, if he changed his views, he ought at once to have informed the Church, to which he had given this promise, that he could no longer perform it, and to have resigned the mission with which, partly on the faith of it, he had been entrusted. An honourable man would unquestionably have acted thus. But, whether from inability to

perceive the obligation he had incurred, or from what is commonly called want of principle – that is, a disregard of obligation, or 612
partly from the one and partly from the other, Mr. Stuart did not do so. He acted in the very different manner we have described.

On learning that he had done so, the Rev. W. Mclntyre, under whose superintendence, as already stated, he was appointed to labour, wrote a letter to him, remonstrating with him, and calling upon him to discontinue at once the innovation which he had introduced. In reply, he intimated that he withdrew from his connection with the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and that he meant to retain, to the exclusion and prejudice of that church, the position, such as it was, which, as its agent and at its expense, he had obtained on the North Shore. Subsequently he transferred the advantages of that position to the Union Church, which did not hesitate to act the part of *resetter* in the matter.

When he was licensed, and previously, Mr. Stuart professed, in the most distinct and decided manner, to approve of the position of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, as distinguished from that of the Union Church; but the result has proved that his profession in this case was as little to be relied on as his profession and promise to which we have already referred. Such professions, as made by some men, amount to no more than this, that they are willing, quite willing, to *act on* certain views, and, indeed, to *hold* them, in the loose and temporising way in which they hold any views: for honest conviction on their part is out of the question. And, of course, a profession of this kind will form no obstacle in the way of their adopting, with the sort of adoption we have just described, any other views they may find or deem it expedient to adopt. By adopting other views to serve a purpose, they will only act in the spirit of their former profession, and do over again the very same thing they did in making it. Mr. Stuart, accordingly, has connected himself with the Union Church, and, while he formerly professed to disapprove of its position, now professes to approve of it, the profession, as an exponent of conviction, having in both cases, as we are constrained to believe, precisely the same significance, that is, having none whatever in either. His secession, so far as we are aware, has been universally felt by those from whom he has withdrawn to be *a relief,* and, with the exception that all right thinking persons acquainted with the facts must deplore on his own account that he acted in a manner so utterly reprehensible, the only regret which it has caused arises from his having so foully betrayed the position and inter- ests of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia on the North Shore.

We regret that the proceedings which we are now reviewing exhibit another instance of similar betrayal – an instance in which Mr. Stuart, to whatever extent he may have been an adviser, was not the immediate agent. The following letter addressed to the gentleman who occupied the latter position, Mr. Henry Allan, discloses the nature of the betrayal to which we refer: – "You will remember that the church, formerly occupied by Mr. Aitcheson, was taken at the instance of the provisional committee, of which I was myself a member, in order that the services supplied by the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia on the North Shore might be conducted in it. I submit to you, therefore, that to transfer the use of it to another body is a violation of the arrangement under which it was taken, a violation all the more evident from the fact that the body, to which the use of it has been so far transferred, is the very body from which it was taken, and to which rent was to be paid for it; and of course it was not taken to be occupied by the body by which it was let.

It is thus evident that the position assumed by those, who have been instrumental in transferring so far the use of the Church to the body from which it is rented, is one that cannot be honourably, and, I may add, that cannot be legally, occupied; and

I persuade myself that, the matter having now been placed before you in the proper light, you will not be a party to the occupation of it."

This expectation, we are sorry to say, was not realised. The use of the Church has been transferred to the body by which it was let, – to the Union Church, which has not scrupled to be a party to the transaction, notwithstanding the breach of trust which it involves.

This fresh chapter of the history of Presbyterianism on the North Shore is a fitting sequel to the earlier chapter of it, which we formerly submitted to our readers, and affords a manifold display of obliquity of conduct, on the part of individuals and of a Church, not easily parallelled.

---

## AWKWARD APOLOGIES.

By the dictionary an apology is "a defence" or "an excuse;" by usage, far less often a defence than an excuse. Commonly it is an exculpatory explanation presented in extenuation of a fault; hardly ever, in ordinary parlance, a defence in vindication of what men count glorious. Nevertheless, the origin of the word from the Greek favours the less frequent signification; and, accordingly, "Apologies for Christianity" and "for the Bible" have been written. That is to say, treatises have been published under these titles, which were sound *defences* of revealed religion. And we are bound to forgive an infelicitous name, which seems or sounds as if Christianity needed to be "apologised" for, in consideration of having got a solid "*defence*" against Paine or against Gibbon. But a lame defence may be made for the best of causes as well as an able one; and, when the author of such a performance denominates his work an "Apology," the awkward name has no countervailing consideration to relieve it; and we cannot help the impression, as we read, that, after all, an apology is most commonly an excuse for a fault, is meant to explain away something that is felt to be offensive, and that makes the apologist awkward or ashamed.

It is an observation of Bishop Butler, that the evidences of revealed religion are adapted to test the moral dispositions of men; and therefore, presumably, were intended by their author to do so. So much light attends the teaching of scripture as is sufficient to guide honest inquiry. But neither the amount nor the character of the evidence is such, as to exclude cavil or overbear prejudice. Butler cites Grotius as preceding him in this observation; but in fact we find the same idea expressed in the teaching of our Lord. The discriminative power of the gospel evidence, – its effectiveness as a test searching the moral dispositions of men – is plainly enveloped in the declaration of Jesus, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." This averment of our Lord, (which Butler's observation merely echoes,) clearly implies that revealed truth demands a healthy – at least, an honest and sincere – condition of the moral faculties for its reception, and that, on the other hand, the rejection of that truth by any mind forms the sure index to a disturbed and vitiated state of the affections and the will. To take our Lord's words in reverse, as it were, they assign the paramount cause why men fail to appreciate the divine origin of Christ's doctrine, in a lack of docility and submission to God. The root of scepticism, in other words, is (on our Lord's authority) a rebellious temper declining and repelling the benignant rule of the divine sovereignty.

Sophistical attempts have been made by unbelievers to strip speculative opinions on religion of all moral character, and to represent the views which are formed so variously among men on that subject as all equally good. Error and truth, on this showing,

are but accidents of the mind; their possible differences from each other being immaterial, as compared with the equally honest relation, which both alike are alleged to hold to the capacities and opportunities of their respective disciples. Such a maxim, applied to slur over extenuate the differences between scepticism and the faith of Jesus, embraces a contradiction as full and direct as possible of our Lord's statement. It is clearly futile to speak of the gospel evidence as a test of men's moral disposition, or to affirm that an honest search after God's will shall be rewarded by the assurance of the truth of Christ's doctrine, if serious error and saving truth may be spoken of as both equally honest and equally correct and sincere.

It is but one step in advance from the principle now laid down – from the testing character, *i.e.*, of the Gospel evidence – to affirm the sinfulness of a settled state of unbelief or scepticism, whether on the part of an individual, a country, or an age. And, if the age we live in be admittedly infected to a very lamentable degree with extremes of mutually contradictory opinions on the most vital subjects, it betrays but a weak regard for the prerogative of truth, and an excessive complaisance to the persons of men, for a Christian apologist to level no word of pointed remonstrance, not to say rebuke, at the dislike of God's will and distaste for his truth, which such a medley of opinions demonstrates. For all the various phases of cold, repelling, scornful superciliousness or coarse derisiveness, which scepticism assumes, are imputable (if Christ's saying is to hold good) to an unsubmissive and rebellious frame of spirit towards the Maker of all things; and the guilt which belongs to them can be realised and measured even by natural conscience. The culpability of a confirmed habit of unbelief consists much in the contentment or gratulation, with which the unbeliever rests in the distance from God, at which his intellectual conclusions leave him. The pride of intellect in which he wraps himself is far less a genuine respect for intellectual vigour, or an enthusiasm for rightly conducted intellectual processes, than a biassed predilection in favour of a specific order of opinions. Materialism, with its envelope of religious darkness, has a foregone attraction for him. Powerful prepossessions – the mere deadweight of an unrested conscience, but which he mistakes for strength of understanding – incline him in favour of a system which attenuates, to the confines of extinction, the practical import of moral considerations and the influence of a personal holy God. This quiescency of feeling – disguised as mental superiority – with which the sceptic relegates God, and also the whole subject of sin beyond the pale of his philosophy, both measures the guilt of his speculations and effectually exposes it to the reprobation of natural conscience.

This criterion – of contentment, with the negation of his creed – also clearly distinguishes the unbeliever from the doubting but sincere enquirer after God. The plain speaking, which we desiderate in denouncing the guilt of scepticism, need involve no harshness in dealing with a tempted and solicitous seeker after truth. Such solicitude is precisely the disposition to which our Lord promises the clearest satisfaction; and it differs so diametrically, both in its nature and manifestations, from the self complacent spirit of the settled unbeliever, that a just plea for tenderness and consideration in treating the former need never, except by carelessness or design, be abused to cover a slight or unfaithful dealing with the latter. The two characters, in fact, stand on opposite sides of the moral test which our Lord has established, and need no more be confounded with one another than a Bunyan agonizing with despair need be mistaken for a Hume sporting with sophistries. The soul wrestlings of the Pilgrim, labouring in the Slough of Despond, may be harassed with doubts as dark as any that envel-

ope the hosts of infidelity; but the burdened wayfarer's doubts are ever generous with the fear of not reaching the Eternal City, and leave him loyal in his darkest hour to the ever glorious King of that place: while the doubts of the sceptic are pungent with scorn of the unseen, and pay homage only to objects of sense, informations of human experience, and inferences of human reason. Two such classes need never in practice be mistaken for one another; and they deserve widely different treatment at the hands of the spiritual physician. True, it would be a strange inversion of duty on the part of a Christian minister to make sad the heart of an Asaph when the conflict of diffidence is upon his hand; but what shall we say of that "Apology" for Christianity, which fails to discriminate the tempted doubter of the seventy-third Psalm from the satisfied sceptic of the fifty-third; and, under colour of charity and tenderness to honest enquirers, speaks smooth things to underminers of the truth, who survey with satisfaction every shock that is inflicted on the credit and, as they would have it, on the truth of Christianity.

The practice of making court to influential sceptics of the literary world was a characteristic of the ministers who ruled the Church of Scotland in the last century. Dr. Robertson, the eminent historian, whose influence long predominated in the councils and withered the congregations of the Church, cultivated an intimate friendship with such literary celebrities as Hume and Gibbon, and was the leader of a school which "secured for the church from David Hume the sinister and significant compliment of being more favourable to deism than any other church of that day. – "Ten Years' Conflict," vol. I., p. 195. It seems not impossible that such a tendency to caress the literati of doubt and negation may return among Presbyterians – Unionist Presbyterians at least. Ministers, bent on literary and scholarly reputation, may set themselves to gain the fellowship and goodwill of speculative and free thinking spirits at the expense of unfaithfulness in their office. For this purpose, of accommodation with an unscriptural literature, no instrument more convenient could be used by an affecter of the world's goodwill than a series of quasi-official reb- ukes, addressed to those whose hearts tremble for the ark of God, combined with an ostentation of expressed charity for the difficulties, and patronizing asseverations of the sincerity of the disciples of doubt and error. If such a left-handed distribution of censures and caresses were followed up by a dexterous display of the corruptions of Christianity within the Church, and an oracular announcement that the outworks of Christianity must be abandoned in order to defend the centre, – if, moreover, the concentration of the defence were projected so as to include a partial abandonment of the magazine, or, to speak plainly, a curtailment of the area of inspiration in the Scripture itself, a sacrifice of some of its historical teachings to the clamours of modern science; – if all this were done, with a high disdain expressed for all who should tremble for the liberties taken with the word and truth of God, – few unbelievers, we should think, would quarrel with such a defender of the faith. All philosophical sceptics surely would hasten to accept and applaud his "Apology." But even such pleasant titillation of the sceptical cuticle might be surpassed. The clerical apologist for Christianity, or, as it might almost seem in this case, for infidelity, might advise his hearers or readers that sceptical processes are natural and effective instruments for the re-assertion and vindication of scriptural truth. He might hold forth the relative functions of the Church and the fraternity of sceptics in this fashion, that the former has overlaid God's truth with a crust of corruptions and errors; and that the vocation of the latter is to shell off that crust, and uncover the true core and

substance of religion, The chair of the scorner and the chairs of theology would thus be approximated as by magic The 614
*ne plus ultra* of terms with unbelief would be reached at the same time. For, by such a representation unbelief is no nomine invested with the advantages of our Lord's promise, and becomes the way "to know of Christ's doctrine whether it be of God."

Of course we have a particular " Apology" in view. We defer the author's name, however, lest we might do him injustice, until we can let him speak in his own words – possibly in our next.

# Correspondence.

## BEARING OF THE DECISION OF THE FREE CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO AUSTRALIAN UNIONS ON UNION NEGOTIATIONS IN SCOTLAND.

(*To the Editor of the Testimony.*)

SIR, – Through the reading of a certain pamphlet, on which we happened to lay our hands sometime ago, we have been led to reflect, more than ever, on the connexion between the discussions and decisions of the Free Church Assemblies respecting Australian unions, and the movement for union between the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church in the Fatherland. The pamphlet to which we refer bears the title " A Forgotten Chapter in the History of the Union Movement, by the Rev. Andrew Cameron." Whilst we dissent from the views evidently held by the writer both regarding the Victorian union and the contemplated union in Scotland, he has, we admit, conclusively established the connexion above alluded to. In referring to the discussions in the Free Assembly on the question of the Victorian un- ion, Mr. Cameron says truly, that no attempt was made to deny either that the Free and United Presbyterian members of the Australian Church held different views as to some of the practical applications of the principles laid down in the Confession and the Second Book of Discipline, regarding the relation of the civil magistrate and the church; or that the disputed article in the basis was regarded by both as covering all these differences. In regard to Dr. Cunningham, (the great champion of the unionists in Victoria and of their defenders in Scotland,) Mr. Cameron proceeds to say, " He (Dr. Cunningham) evidently took it for granted, that our brethren in Victoria had ascertained that the United Presbyterian brethren, with whom it was proposed they should unite were reasonable voluntaries," *i.e*., according to his own definition of that term, that they did not deny the great principles of the responsibility of nations or rulers to God; or the universal supremacy of God's word as the rule for all things, to which it applies, or "the competency of rulers and nations having some regard to the interests of religion, and the welfare of the Church of Christ," (the very principles, I need not say, brought out much more fully in the Articles of Agreement); in which case he was satisfied, although they might, and, as he knew, did differ as to certain applications. "These," said Dr. Cunningham, "are the great scriptural principles which we hold on this subject." "Wherever there is a union of this kind" he adds, "there must be some measure of accommodation and some measure of adjustment. We cannot get on without that. There are in the basis of union both in Canada and Nova Scotia questions of forbearance admitted, as to the application of the great doctrine with respect to the duty of nations and rulers." But the Victorian basis was not framed simply to cover the differences between voluntaries and Free Churchmen, but also the difference between Free Churchmen and Established Churchmen in Victoria. Were not all references to controversial matters and to faithful churches, which found a place in the first Victorian basis, excluded from the second, after a memorial had been sent from Mr. Hetherington's congregation objecting to these references, as offensive to Established Church people, and

calculated to prevent them from entering the union? Hence this basis was framed to cover questions of forbearance as to the application of the headship of Christ over the Church, as well as questions of forbearance respecting the doctrine of his headship over the nations. In this connexion we would notice the absurd line of reasoning adopted by Dr. Cunningham in the following statements. "The standards of the Established Church, as every one knows, are the standards of the Free Church. We desire no more for the Free Church of Scotland than we have there. The Erastianism of the establishment does not lie in the standards. The Erastianism of the establishment lies in its submission to the actual interference of the civil power. If the new basis (Victorian) contains as much of Free Church principles as the standards of the Established Church it is quite enough for us." How easy to answer such statements. Is subscription of the standards of the Established Church deemed sufficient by the Free Church in the case of parties admitted to office? Whence then the reference to the Protest and the Claim of rights in the questions put to such parties, and in the formula that has to be signed by them? This is doubtless to ascertain whether they concur in the application the Free Church makes of the doctrine of the headship of Christ in opposition to the Establishment which rejects that application. The avowal of holding the general principles of the headship as stated in the Confession is not held to be enough And there was a time in the history of the Free Church when the bare subscription of the Westminster standards, on the part of ministers entering into colonial unions, was not deemed quite satisfactory. In 1852, Dr. John Bonar, as convener of the colonial committee, wrote thus to a minister of the Established Church party in Tasmania: "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 further on, he says, "as to the ministers to be admitted to any Church which the Free Church could approve; it is necessary 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 exists in Scotland." This was surely a very necessary guarantee on the part of those who had all along approved of the principles and position of Erastianised Establishment. But it seems Dr. Cunningham and the rest of the majority who voted with him came to think differently in 1861. And yet the Established Church ministers in Victoria and in New South Wales continued, up to the time of their entrance into the union, avowedly to approve of the principles and position of the Establishment. All this shows what progress in a certain direction had been made in eight or nine years in the Free Church. But, to pass from this, a large majority in the Free Church Assembly in 1861 evidently adopted and acted on the position, that Free Churchmen in the colonies were justified in uniting with United Presbyterians and Established Churchmen, because these par-ties held the same general principles, though they differed as to certain applications of these principles. That position virtually raised the question as to the practicability of union between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, (and why not add the establishment?) As Mr. Cameron well says, "Had it not been argued and proclaimed in the most emphatic terms, that the ministers and members of the Free Church in Victoria, in going into a United Church, in which such open questions were tolerated, and indeed practically provided for by the very basis of union, and in which

the Protest was in no shape or form recognised, would not and could not be regarded as sacrificing 615
in the very least their distinctive principles? With all these things so, how could the question of union at home fail to be raised? Did not the Assembly that very night, by those speeches and that vote, in the most signal and impressive way, actually raise it?"

Mr. Cameron shows that by those speeches and that vote, United Presbyterian ministers felt encouraged to entertain the hope, that union between their Church and the Free Church was quite practicable. "Accordingly, when two years afterwards it was proposed in the United Presbyterian Synod to open negotiations with the Free Church Assembly with a view to union, it was distinctly declared by leading speakers, that the views expressed in these Australian discussions, and the character of the Assembly's decision, were the very foundation on which they rested their hope that the difficulties in the way would not be found insuperable." "There are," said Dr. Cairns, "views held in the Churches with which we seek to unite with which most, or probably all, of us cannot agree, as to the right or duty of the magistrate to endow the Church and support religion from state resources. I do not think we differ as to the so-called Headship of Christ over the nations, and as to the duty of civil governors to regulate their legislation by the revealed will of God. It is rather as to the application of these great principles, more especially in relation to the support of the Christian Church, and the means which the magistrate may lawfully employ, and the Church lawfully take advantage of, for that end. . . . For myself, I may say that I am quite prepared to unite substantially upon the Canadian basis, or the Australian. And it is a vitally important fact, that these documents have been ruled by the Free Church at home to be in harmony with its standards."

In alluding to the negotiations that had been conducted for several years between the committees of the negotiating churches in Scotland, Mr. Cameron remarks, "I shall merely say, that after four years conference, the committees of the negotiating churches have agreed on articles which, in fulness and precision, go far beyond what Dr. Cunningham and Mr. Nixon described as the substance of our Free Church principles – far beyond, also, any of the statements in the colonial bases by which the Church has declared these principles to be sufficiently covered." We believe Mr. Cameron argues correctly, that those who approved of the Australian union have only two courses before them – either to retract what they did in regard to these unions, and, in that case, as far as possible, repair the wrong they did to dissenting minorities in Australia; or go forward to union with the United Presbyterian Church, making differences as to the applications of great principles matters of forbearance – as was argued in regard to colonial unions. Of course we consider that the former is the proper course. When Free Churchmen at home see what their own reasoning and course of acting in respect to colonial unions has brought matters to in their own midst, it is surely high time for them to reconsider that reasoning and course of acting. If different views as to the applications of a great principle should be made an open question in Australia, why not in Scotland? And why not extend this to ever so many great principles, and ever so many applications of these principles? According to the reasoning adopted respecting unions in Australia, make all these matters of forbearance or open questions. Let that be followed out, and there will be no great difficulty in effecting unions, or rather coalitions, far more extensive than those already effected or contemplated among Presbyterians.

We observed in reading Mr. Nixon's speech, delivered in last Free Church Assembly – a speech of great ability, and in much of which we cordially concur – that he defended the Australian unions on the ground that the Australian Church can take up their testimony tomorrow if they choose: we are called on to lay down ours. This is truly astonishing! Is it not well known that Free Churchmen in Australia who joined the Union had to lay down their testimony so far as it differed from that of the Voluntaries and of the approvers of the Erastianised Establishment? Was not the basis framed, as Dr. Cunningham argued, to cover different views as to the application of the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the nations? And it was just as much framed to cover different views in respect to the application of the doctrine of of the Headship of Christ over the Church. If this was not the case, why was all reference to fellowship with faithful Churches excluded in the second Victorian basis? Why were all allusions to those events in Scotland, which, (as Free Churchmen believed,) involved important applications of Christ's Headship over the Church excluded? The answer is in consequence of the application of the admirers of the position and principles of the Establishment. Was there no laying down of testimony in all this on the part of Free Churchmen? Was it no laying down of testimony on their part, to agree to resolutions accompanying the basis, and Free Church on the same level as to obtaining a supply of Ministers? What is the Testimony in regard to the Headship of Christ over the nations and over the Church, which the Union Churches in Victoria and New South Wales could take up? It is a testimony which must be in accordance with making different views on these points matters of forbearance or open questions. Or, otherwise, if one party rises up to bear testimony as to his Free Church view of the application of these doctrines, another party will feel warranted to rise up and give his voluntary view, and a third will feel that he has no less a right to give his view as an admirer of the Erastianised Establishment. I suppose such a kind of witness bearing as this would not be withheld from parties in the Union contemplated for Scotland.

We intended to refer to other matters but must at present forbear.

Yours, &c.,
PRESBYTER.

18th Jan., 1870.

---

## MR. GRANT'S ADDRESS.

*To the Editor of the Testimony.*

My Dear Sir, – I happened to read the opening address of the Reverend William Grant, of Shoalhaven, as the present Moderator of the Union Church in N. S. Wales, that is, the Church in New South Wales which is composed of parties holding widely different and irreconcilable views of doctrines of vital importance. My old friend, forming a right estimate of his position as presiding over the deliberations of such a Church, took special care to avoid making any reference in his address to topics, which would make manifest the heterogeneous and discordant character of the assembly before him. We, see in this a probable reason why his address was so rambling and incoherent, as he himself admits it was, notwithstanding it was written and read.

The address in question is sadly different, in many ways, from the addresses my old friend delivered when he first arrived in this colony and for years thereafter. In the addresses of bygone days he showed his hearers without mincing or fulsome praise, such as he practises now-a-days, that the post-disruption Scottish establishment occupies a sinful position; that by its practically denying for the loaves and fishes of the State Christ's Headship over the Church, it assumed an erastian position, highly dishonouring to Christ and therefore highly calculated to prove ruinous to the souls of men; that hundreds of the *best* and the *most*

learned of its ministers, (ministers unsurpassed in any Church in the world,) thous- 616
ands of its most devoted elders and deacons, and tens of thousands of the very flower of its people in all ranks of society felt it to be their imperative duty to Christ, to their own souls, and to the souls of their families, to withdraw from it that they might not receive of its plagues. Such is the light, (and it is the true light,) in which my old friend used to present the post-disruption Scottish establishment, and such were the grounds on which he urged his bearers to have no connection with it. No wonder then that intelligent and God fearing Free Churchmen as well as erastians consider it monstrous in them, who viewed the post-disruption Scottish establishment in the light in which my old friend thus viewed it, to unite in one Church with avowed adherents and admirers of that very post-disruption Scottish establishment. Monstrous certainly it was, in a moral and in a spiritual point of view, in Free Churchmen, and more especially in Free Churchmen that were engaged in the ten years' conflict against erastianism and disrupted from erastians, to unite again in one Church with them.

Notwithstanding the great difference there is between Free Churchmen, Voluntaries, and Erastians, as to matters of the last importance, it seems the union between these parties in this colony was accomplished without hurting the conscience of any of them. It may have been so; but, if their consciences were at all tender, the surrendering of principle and the crooked and demoralising policy by which it was effected would deeply distress them.

It is obvious that my old friend is not in good odour with his new associates. If he were Steel and Geichie and Purves and Ross would not have been placed in the Moderator's chair before him. The truth is, his connection with them, poor man, is monstrous in the eyes of the most judicious of them, and justly.

Yours, sincerely,
A UNIONIST OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

---

## THE STRUCTURE OF ROM. 1: 1-5.

There is nothing peculiarly difficult or obscure in the meaning of this passage; but the structure of it has not been understood by commentators. To account for it they suppose that the apostle was carried away repeatedly from the direct line of thought, by the power of a succession of associations presented to his mind. "We find here," says Tholuck, "what often occurs in the writings of this author, a large group of co-ordinate clauses. With reference to these we remark that Paul's peculiar mode of thinking, and, consequently, also of expression, is most aptly compared to a throng of waves, where, in ever loftier swell, one billow presses close upon the other." Now, the truth is that the structure of those verses is most regular and exact, and presents nothing that is not common to the Apostle with the other sacred writers. Following a mode of composition of constant occurrence in the Scriptures, the whole passage forms what has been called an introverted parallelism; and we shall now present it to the reader so arranged, that this peculiarity of its structure will be clearly exhibited: –

A. a. Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ,
b. called to be an Apostle,
c. separated unto the gospel of God, which he had promised afore by his Prophets in the Holy Scriptures,
B. d. concerning his Son, *
e. which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,
*B. e.* and declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead,
*d*. Jesus Christ our Lord;

* We have removed the words, "Jesus Christ our Lord," to the place which they occupy in the original. See below in *d*.

*A. a*. By whom we have received grace,
*b*. and apostleship
*c*. for obedience to the faith among all nations for His name.

Here A. corresponds to *A*., and B. to *B.* First A. corresponds to *A*.; for in a. Paul describes himself as "a servant of Jesus Christ," and in *a*. he states how he became his servant – he "received grace;" in b. he further describes himself as a "called apostle," and in *b.* traces his apostleship to its origin – "he received" it; in c. and *c*. he declares on what field his apostleship was to be exercised – it was to be exercised "among all nations," or, rather, "among all the Gentiles," in preaching "the Gospel of God which he had promised afore by his Prophets," namely, "the Gospel of the uncircumcision which was committed unto him." – Gal. 2: 7. Compare also Rom. 16: 25, 26, which is clearly a recapitulation and expansion of the words under consideration. Thus, it is not the Gospel, generally considered, that the Apostle says God "had promised afore," but the "Gospel of the circumcision" unto which he was "separated." – Acts 13: 2, 3.

We stated further that B. corresponds to *B.* In d. and *d.* the Saviour is named "his Son," "Jesus Christ our Lord;" e. asserts his incarnation, and *e*. the renewed manifestation of his divinity, after it had been veiled during the season of His humiliation. There is also a beautiful progress and historical succession of parts in the description of the glorious Redeemer presented in those two members, B. and *B*. In d. he is presented as the eternal Son of Ood, and in *e*. as the Son of man. When he appears as the Son of man, his Godhead is veiled; in *e*. the veil is removed "by His resurrection from the dead," and His Godhead is gloriously displayed. And then in *d*. he is described in his exalted state, "a Prince and a Saviour" – "Jesus Christ our Lord." Oh that our hearts could rise to the high contemplation to which the Apostle thus conducts us! the Son of God – made of the seed of David – declared to be the Son of God with power by his resurrection – and now at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, Jesus Christ our Lord!

We have already suggested the meaning of some of the expessions that require explanation; we shall now add the following brief notes.

"According to the flesh," v. 3, means "as to His human nature," and "according to the spirit of holiness," v. 4, "as to His divine nature." This latter expression, "the spirit of holiness," which does not occur elsewhere in the Scriptures, seems to have been chosen by the Apostle to express the idea of the *divine essence,* which is *spiritual,* as the word "spirit" intimates, and which he distinguishes from every other spiritual essence, by adding "of holiness." He does not say, "the Holy Spirit," because this is a title of the third person of the Trinity. He had already expressed the idea of *personality* by the expression, "the Son of God."

The same view of Christ's person, as God and Man, is presented in the 5th verse of the 9th chapter of this Epistle: "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

"With power," v. 4, refers to "Son of God." The state of humiliation and suffering in which Christ appeared on earth, might seem to indicate weakness, and, therefore, to imply that he did not at all possess a nature to which power is essential; but, when he rose triumphant from the grave, his "power" was demonstrated by the victory which He thus achieved, and He was declared to be "the Mighty God" – "the Son of God with power."

In verse 5, "the obedience of faith" would be a more literal translation. The Apostle intends the obedience which consists in

believing: not the obedience which faith produces, but that which it constitutes. God commands us to believe, and faith, therefore,

bears the character of obedience. It should be observed, however, that it is not as an act of obedience it has any influence in our justification, but, simply, as the soul's reception of Christ and his righteousness. It may also be remarked that, seeing we are commanded to believe, there is no room to doubt that we are warranted to believe.

It was in order that he might be an instrument in producing "the obedience of faith among all nations," that Paul received his "apostleship" from Christ. This was the immediate and subordinate end. The supreme end was the glory of Christ's "name" and the glory of God in Christ.

There are three remarks suggested by this passage, to which we request the reader's attention.

1. Christ is the only head of *influence* and the only head of *authority* to His Church. As the head of influence, He gave "grace" to Paul and made him His "servant;" as the head of authority, He made him "an Apostle." Popery and Puseyism deny Christ's headship in the former sense, and Erastianism denies it in the latter.

2. The Christian ministry should be exercised with an earnest and believing desire that sinners may be saved. This is only to say, in other words, that it should be exercised agreeably to Christ's design in instituting and maintaining it: Paul "received apostleship" from him "for the obedience of faith."

3. The great aim of the exercise of the Christian ministry should correspond with the first petition of the Lord's Prayer – "Hallowed be thy name." The office-bearers of the Church must ever seek the glory of the Church's Head. To this great end they must subordinate all else. Love and devotedness to Christ, and zeal for His glory, are the very spirit of the Christian ministry – nay, they are the very spirit of the Christian character.

---

## THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF THE ELECTIONS.

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

Sir, – As the elections of representatives to sit in the new Parliament are now almost, if not altogether, terminated, we beg to make some remarks through your columns in connexion with these important events. As the excitement produced has to a great extent passed away, your readers will be in a better position for reflecting calmly on these occurrences. That these involve important issues to the community is patent enough; and we are far from thinking that those issues will be limited to man's civil interests. It is not at all improbable that questions respecting the extension of railway traffic on the Lord's day, the education of the young, and state aid to religion, will be discussed and disposed of. Surely these are matters that relate to the religious interests of the community, and strike deep into its future weal or woe. Besides, it is not unlikely that efforts will he made to adopt measures calculated to advance Romanism in the colony, – a result which could not but prove injurious, both to the the civil and religious interests of the country. There were some attempts towards this in the latter days of the late Parliament, and that these attempts will be renewed, who can doubt? It was not without a reason, that the priests were so energetic in driving their flocks to vote for candidates favourable to one side of the house. Although Father Duigan at Yam, and Father Kenyon at Newcastle, came so notoriously before the public, they were not, by any means, the only priests that acted a similar part. Few Papists were in the position in which *Mick* found himself, for, when asked for whom he intended to vote, he was actually able to say: "No word has been sent to me, I will vote for so-and-so."

But to pass from this point, in the meantime, in reading the speeches and addresses of many of the candidates, we were struck with the utter absence of correct ideas regarding the duty of the state towards religion, or the advancement of Christ's kingdom. In speaking of different systems of education and of state aid to churches, they either maintained that the state ought to have nothing to do with imparting religious truth, or that it ought to support various and conflicting creeds. For to this the advocacy of denominational schools and state aid to religion amounted; not one of the candidates, so far as we observed, recognised the obligations of the state to promote the interests of true religion; that this is its duty to Christ as king of nations, and that by its acting thus the civil and social interests of the community will be most effectually promoted, and hence, that the state is shut up to the withholding of aid for the communicating of scriptural truth in schools and churches, simply because the divided state of the community in religious matters; and that, if it were not for this insuperable barrier in the way, it ought gladly to perform its duty to Christ by aiding and encouraging the spread of Divine truth in the land.

Another thing to be noted in the late elections is the sad fact, that in many cases electors seemed to attach little or no importance to the religious and moral character of candidates. And, yet, perhaps in some cases there was little room for preference in this matter. But how deplorable to see men returned who have little or no regard for religion, who are notorious for being profane swearers and open Sabbath breakers; and whose character as to sobriety, chastity, truthfulness, and honourable dealings is woefully defective! What frightful examples to a community! and what reliance can be placed on such men, whatever their political views may be? How can such be expected to legislate faithfully in matters that concern the due observance of the Lord's day, or for the suppression of intemperance, dishonest dealings, &c., &c.? That such men could be returned, and perhaps returned in considerable numbers, indicates the prevalence of a miserably low tone of religion and morality.

Another evil, that seems to have been not infrequently practised, was the giving of strong drink for obtaining votes. How demoralising such a practice, and how highly objectionable as a method of influencing electors! Can no stringent measures be enacted to prevent the repetition of such practices?

In canvassing the electorates, it appeared to be not uncommon for candidates to ask and obtain promises of votes. This practice is objectionable, inasmuch as it places candidates in a mean position, and is calculated to entangle the electors. This was evinced at some of the late elections, parties who had given promises, seeing cause to change their mind, asked to be released from their promises; in some cases this request was granted and in others refused. In the latter cases they had either to break their promises, or to act against their present convictions as to giving their votes. Let the candidates embrace all opportunities for influencing the electors in a legitimate manner by the presentation of their views and claims, and leave the matter between God and the consciences of the electors when they come to the ballot box.

In the late electioneering contests, a great outcry has been raised against introducing religious matters, – setting sect against sect, Protestants against Romanists; such an outcry is in various respects senseless enough. Who set the example of introducing religious matters on this and on previous occasions? We answer, the priests of Rome. The priest at Wellington, some years ago, told the Wellington people that Mr. Samuel was unfit to be a member of a Christian Legislature, and led his flock in the usual priestly style to vote against him. And why was this? Mr. Samuel was against state aid, and the priests, who were the great clamourers for state aid, had some hope of the decision against it being upset. In the late contests priests and guildmen were

exerting themselves to the utmost, in leading or, rather, driving their flocks 618
to vote for the supporters of the present ministry.

Any person, who knows the system of Romanism and the scheming of priests, will feel assured that they acted thus, not for the good of the country, but for the interests of Rome. Fathers Duigan and Kenyon had not sufficient Jesuitism to keep the secret. When earnest and intelligent Protestants saw this combination, and that it involved the civil and religious rights and liberties of the community, – for whatever is calculated to advance the interests of Romanism always involves such anger, – they felt it was high time to act on the defensive, and exert themselves to defeat the designs of such priestly combinations. Among others who raised the outcry about setting sect against sect, was the Minister for Lands, in his speechifying at St. Leonards. "He had been given to understand that a certain influence had been brought to bear against him in this electorate by what was known as the Protestant Political Association. He should say nothing in any way offensive to any body of religionists. He was and always had been a very consistent Protestant, but he believed that in this country, where we had abolished State Aid, and all stood on a footing of perfect equality before the law, every man should profess the religion he preferred without being placed under any restriction on account of that profession. That man was a traitor to free institutions, who voted for or opposed a candidate because he belonged to any particular form of faith; and it was for that reason he was opposed to the body who proposed to promote Protestantism by political organisation." These statements, we conceive, contain a misrepresentation of the real state of the case. We do not enter at present into the consideration of the connection, that subsists between a man's religious belief and his being a thoroughly good citizen and legislator, although much might be said on this point, especially when the case is Protestantism against Romanism; and surely electors have a perfect right to be influenced by such a consideration in making their selections among the various candidates offering themselves for election. But to pass that, we are not aware of any organisation formed for the purpose of excluding men from Parliament or their other civil rights simply because of their religious views. But no doubt the association referred to by Mr. Forster are opposed to the return of men, who show a disposition to truckle to the priesthood of Rome, to the endangering of the civil and religious liberties of the country. The Romish system differs from every other form of religion in this respect – that it is a system bent on the overthrow of men's civil and religious freedom. In confirmation of this we would refer to the state of continental nations, such as Italy and Spain, previous to their late revolutions. We would also refer to the late syllabus of the Pope, which contains the following blasphemous and tyrannical assertions: –

"I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men – of the peasant that tills the fields, and the prince that sits on the throne – of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last judge of what is right and wrong." According to these assertions, what the Pope undoubtedly aims at is this: that through his agents, – his bishops and priests, – he may be the supreme judge and director of the legislature of the colony, and that, as a consequence, the country may be as much without civil and religious liberty as Italy and Spain prior to their late revolutions. Hence any set of men who would truckle to the Romish priesthood are not to be trusted; inasmuch as their policy tends to the accomplishment of the aim of the Pope to subjugate the country civilly and religiously to his sway. The conduct of Messrs. Forster and Samuel in breakfasting with the priests and guildmen on a Sabbath morning, in connection with the celebration of the Assumption of the blessed virgin, is anything but calculated to impart confidence as to their keeping clear of truckling to the Romish priesthood.

The Immigration Bill, lately introduced by the Government, and the placing on the Estimates of an amount of money for St. Vincent's Hospital, are rather indicative of pandering to the wishes of the priests. In defence of this latter act, it was said by Mr. Forster, "that it was a charitable institution, open to all classes of religionists." But is the management of the institution open to all classes of religionists? Is there any allowance for even one Protestant being a member of the managing committee, or for one Protestant to act as an attendant on the sick in the institution? Mr. Forster knows that there is no such allowance. That it is open to all denominations, whilst it is wholly under Popish control, is the most objectionable feature of the case; because thus a very favourable opportunity is afforded for drawing Protestant invalids over to the Romish faith – an opportunity which the female friends in the institution will not be slack in availing themselves of, for they have none of the lukewarmness and inconsistency of many so-called Protestants.

These things being so, it is not wonderful that, in many cases, Protestants felt a difficulty in voting for the supporters of the present ministry, and gave a preference to the supporters of the Martin-Parkes Administration, inasmuch as it showed great promptness and decision in resisting the policy of the priesthood. An instance of this was furnished by the refusal to admit for general reading books containing idolatrous and seditious matter into the Public schools, under the Public Schools Act.

Members of the Church of Rome greatly disqualify themselves for being legislators under the British constitution, inasmuch as they are subjects of a foreign potentate – and a potentate hostile to that Constitution; and nominal Protestants who, to obtain the influence of the Priests, are ready to truckle to them, are still more to be dreaded than decided papists. Very probably some of the candidates who are, in many things, favourable to the political views of the present administration, are not in any way favourable to the truckling Romeward policy of that administration. It would have been well if this had been made known by them, that thus they might have been calculated upon as men who would be ready to resist such a policy. Some two years ago, Dr. Lang in a public lecture gave the warning, that whenever a dissolution would come, a desperate effort would be made to have a large portion of the power and patronage, as well as the funds of education, placed in the hands of the priests; also, that an unprecedented effort would be made to "Tiperaryfy" the colony. The Doctor also called on Protestants to sink their minor distinctions, and to combine, as others were doing for a very different object, to preserve and to perpetuate our civil and religious liberties, which were secured to us by our glorious Reformation three centuries ago. Late events have shown how necessary and important were such statements; although he who uttered them acted in the face of them.

AN ELECTOR.

January 14th.

---

## REVIEW.

*Church and State*; *being the substance of a Lecture delivered at the first Annual Meeting of the Free Presbyterian Church, Cargerie, on the 17th November, 1869, by Rev. Peter Macpherson, A.M., Edin. and Melb., Free Church Minister of Meredith, Lethbridge, &c.*

The Church and the State occupy distinct spheres, and each of them has, in relation to the other, a right to independence of action within its own sphere. But, while in this respect they are independent of each other, that is, not subject to each other in

the discharge of their respective functions, in other and import-

ant respects they sustain relations of mutual dependence. Thus, in order that the circumstances under which the Church performs its functions may be at all favourable, the existence of civil government is necessary, and in order that, so far as they derive their character from the existence and action of the State, they may be wholly favourable, it is necessary that the State acknowledge the Church, that it maintain a friendly attitude towards it, and that it act towards it a friendly part, so far as circumstances permit and require; and, on the other hand, the ends of civil government cannot be fully accomplished, if the State do not enjoy the advantage, throughout its territory, of the efficient performance of the Church's functions.

It is upon the former element of the relations of the Church and the State to each other, upon the fact, that is, that neither of them is subject within its own province to the authority or control of the other, that Mr. MacPherson specially dwells, and he proves, by an interesting induction of facts from scripture history, that the presence of this element should ever be maintained. In the following sentences, with which he concludes his pamphlet, our author specifies various forms under which deranged relations have obtained or may obtain between the Church and the State, and the form which the relations between them ought to assume, and will doubtless assume ultimately. "On this question of Church and State there appears to be a definite number of different arrangements, all of which are to be tried. What are the possible relations between Church and State? There is (1) the relation of determined antagonism, on the part of the civil ruler, against the church. We have this illustrated in the paganism of the early centuries of the Christian era. (2). There is the arrangement whereby the church invades, or absorbs, the province of the civil ruler, so that he becomes the mere executioner of the will of the church. We have this abundantly illustrated in the history of the dark ages. (3). We have the case of the state making a mere tool of the church the unhappy fate of a number of the churches of Protestant Christendom. (4). A growing recoil from this is the system of simple divorce between church and state. Let each pursue its way regardless of the other! But neither party can get quit of its obligations in this way. The other schemes have all brought forth such evil fruits, that this one is coming fast into favour, and is, perhaps, not a whit better than its predecessors. But (6), in due time, there can be no doubt that the right relationship will be historically evolved, when kings will be nursing fathers and their queens nursing mothers to the church of God in the world; and when the ordinance of God in civil rule and the institution of Christ – the church – shall harmoniously co-operate in working out the great designs of the Almighty." (Isaiah 49).

---

## ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION.

The fifth anniversary meeting of this association was held in St. George's Church, Castlereagh Street, on Tuesday evening, the 18th instant.

The meeting was numerously attended both by members and others. The chair was occupied by the Rev. Dr. Geddie, of Aneiteum.

The President of the association (Rev. W. McIntyre, A.M.) having opened the meeting with prayer, the Rev. Chairman offered a few remarks on the objects of the meeting, and expressed the pleasure it afforded him to preside over a meeting of an association, which had so high an object in view as the intellectual, moral, and spiritual improvement of its members.

From the annual report, which was then read, it appeared that while almost uniform success had hitherto marked the progress of the association, greater success attended its operations during the past year than at any former period of its history.

The report adverted particularly to the fact that during the year no fewer than eighteen members were admitted; and stated, as another gratifying fact, that of forty-nine weekly meetings convened during the year, none had to be adjourned for want of a quorum. For the first half of the year the average attendance of members was twenty, and for the latter half nineteen, and the interest of the meetings had been very materially enhanced by the presence of lady visitors.

As a further evidence of prosperity it stated that arrangements had been made for the immediate formation of a library, and that the financial position of the Association was most satisfactory. The system of classes under which the different means of improvement are applied, and which has affected most favourably the interests of the Association, had during the past year been supplemented by a class formed specially for the advocacy of Protestant principles, – an extension of much importance, as being calculated to stimulate members to a more careful study of the respective character and claims of Protestantism and Romanism. It formed a new and very pleasing feature in the working of the Association for the past year, as well as gratifying evidence of its internal resources, that three public lectures, each of which was deservedly well received by a numerous audience, were delivered by members, viz., Phrenology, by Mr. E. A. Rennie; The Phrenological Map of the Mental Faculties, by the same gentleman; and the labours of John B. Gough in the cause of temperance, by Mr, John McDonald, junr. Twelve original essays on various subjects had been read by members; sixteen discussions had been held; and thirteen readings and twenty-five recitations had been given. A psalmody class, in connection with the Association, but also open to all the members of the congregation, was carried on for nine months of the past year under the leadership of Mr. A. Spence, and will by and by be resumed.

The report further recorded the painful fact that death deprived the Association of two valued members, Mr. P. S. McPherson and Mr. John Fraser.

Mr. John McDonald, jun., moved the adoption of the report, and, in so doing, said that although he had been connected with half-a-dozen kindred societies in Sydney, he had never seen one so well conducted. Mr. D. K. McIntyre, in appropriate terms, seconded the resolution, which was put to the meeting and carried.

After the President had addressed the meeting on Mutual Improvement Societies as a means of self-improvement, Mr. Robert Campbell moved a vote of thanks to Mr. McIntyre for the interest he had evinced in the working of the association. The motion was seconded by Mr. J. G. Wilson, and unanimously carried.

On the motion of Mr. Rennie, seconded by Mr. M. M. Campbell, a vote of thanks was awarded to the chairman, Dr. Geddie, who had previously submitted to the meeting some interesting details of his early missionary experience in the New Hebrides. Dr. Geddie returned thanks, expressing the gratification the meeting had afforded him.

The proceedings were then closed with the benediction.

---

## PSALM 46.

GOD is for us a safe resort,
A help in troubles ever found;
Nor will we fear, though earth dissolve,
And hills in heart of seas be drowned,

Though roar and foam the troubled tide,
And mountains swerve before its pride.

620

A river gladdens with its streams
The city of the living God,
Holy place of the Highest One,
Lov'd tabernacle of his abode.
God bides in her: she cannot shake:
God for her help ere morn shall wake.

The nations raged with clamors fierce;
Kingdoms were moved with tumults dire;
He challenged with his voice; the earth
Melted, as wax melts in the fire. *The*
*Lord of hosts to us is nigh,* *And Jacob's*
*God our refuge high.*

Come, view Jehovah's mighty deeds!
What wasting woes on earth he hurl'd,
Quelling war's tumults in the earth,
Shedding a Sabbath o'er the world,
Shiv'ring the bow, snapping the spear,
Burning the chariot in the fire.

Desist ye! know that I am God!
I will exalted be of all
The heathen nations: on the earth
All tribes of men exalt me shall. *The*
*Lord of hosts to us is nigh:* *And Jacob's*
*God our refuge high.*

S. T. K.

---

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF EASTERN AUSTRALIA.

Intelligence was received by the last mail that an additional labourer for this Church – one of those formerly expected – would soon sail for the colony, and that another had made up his mind to follow.

# The Testimony.

**"BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT."**

**"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."**

NO. 53. SYDNEY, FEBRUARY 1870.

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. 53 FEBRUARY.

**CONTENTS**.

PAGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Objects of Christ's Advent … … … … … | 621 |
| Awkward Apologies … … … … … … | 623 |
| Congregational Meeting … … … … … | 625 |
| Moderatism in Victoria … … … … … | 627 |
| Lecture on Incidents of Missionary Life in the Loyalty Islands … | 629 |
| The Relation of Ritualism to the Spirituality of the Gospel Dispensation | 631 |
| St Andrew's Church … … … … … … | 631 |
| Remembering Zion … … … … … … | 631 |

## THE OBJECT OF CHRIST'S ADVENT.

This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." – 1 Tim. 1: 15.

If we were destitute of the knowledge of the love of God and of the plan of salvation, which the Scriptures convey, we could not but regard the saying, that Christ came into the world to save sinners, as in the highest degree incredible. It is, however, a faithful saying, – a saying uttered by the God of truth, – and, accordingly, the testimony, which it embodies with respect to the fact and the design of the advent of Christ; is wholly true. And, while it is a faithful saying it has the most benign aspect on the interests and prospects of men. All are sinners, and, therefore, in their natural state ruined and lost; but Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, and he does save all sinners at whose hands this saying meets with due acceptance. Surely a saying, which announces such a fact, and of which the reception is attended with a result so unspeakably advantageous, is pre-eminently worthy of all acceptation.

Forming the estimate of the saying of our text as faithful and worthy of all acceptation, which the apostle teaches us to form, we propose to bestow upon it close and earnest consideration. In doing so we shall first direct our attention to the character and condition of those, on whose behalf Christ has interposed; and then to his interposition on their behalf in procuring and in applying salvation.

We are, in the first place, then, to contemplate the character and condition of those on whose behalf he has interposed, that is, the character and condition of men as sinners. It is to save sinners that Christ came into the world; and that we may be in a position to perceive the necessity and to understand the nature of the salvation, which he has procured to meet their case, we must form scriptural and definite views as to what is comprehended in being sinners, unsaved sinners.

All such are guilty and condemned. When we say that they are guilty, we mean that they deserve the punishment, which God has righteously attached to sin. That punishment is death: the wages of sin is death, and they, being chargeable with sin, deserve death.

And, being thus guilty in point of fact, they are regarded as being guilty by God, their righteous and omniscient sovereign. They are not in the position of a subject of human government, who has committed a punishable offence, but whose guilt has not as yet become known; but in the position of such a subject after his guilt has been fully proved, so that, being guilty, he is regarded as being guilty by those whose office it is to take cognizance of such facts and to deal with them.

Regarding them as guilty, God has pronounced on them a sentence of condemnation. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Gal. 3: 10. "He that believeth not is condemned already." John 3: 18. A sentence of condemnation has been pronounced on sinners. This sentence is revoked in the case of those who believe in Christ, but is revoked in their case only. Those who do not believe in him are, therefore, under this sentence, – they are condemned already. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8: 1. This statement implies that it is to them only that there is no condemnation, that there is condemnation to all others.

And it is to be borne in mind that God is angry with those, on whom he pronounces a sentence of condemnation. Those, whom he condemns with a judicial condemnation, he condemns with a moral condemnation, – with the condemnation of strong disapproval and hot displeasure. He "is angry with the wicked every day." Ps. 7: 11. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness." Rom. 1: 18. While "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," John 3: 36; it is on him as a sinner, and abideth on him as an unbelieving sinner. If he believed it should be turned away from him; but as he does not believe; it abides on him. Thus it both was and abides on him.

The sentence of condemnation, under which unsaved sinners lie, has to a certain and, indeed, to a very great extent, been already executed. One element of the execution of it is, that those, against whom it is in force, are liable to all the miseries of this life, which are neither few nor inconsiderable, and actually experience them, and that they die. It may be thought

however that, inasmuch as all this obtains also in the case of believers, it cannot be regarded, in the case of unbelievers, as the execution so far of the sentence of condemnation under which they 622
lie. But the evils in question were originally the execution so far of that sentence, that is, they bore originally the character of penal evils, of evils adjudged to sinners as part punishment of sin; and, while they are divested of this character in the case of believers, they still bear it in the case of others. Though the sentence of condemnation has been cancelled in the case of believers, God for wise purposes still visits them with the temporal evils, which originally resulted from the execution of that sentence; now, however, and in their case, they do not bear the character of penal evils, but are constituted elements of a grac-ious disciplinary treatment. In the case of others they bear unchanged the character of penal evils; they manifest the anger of God; they do not serve a disciplinary purpose. On the contrary, from the spirit in which they are met, they become occasions of further and more aggravated rebellion; and all the baneful consequences of such rebellion result. Another element of the execution of the sentence of condemnation is that those who are under that sentence die. While death performs, in the case of believers, though as it were covertly and under a disguise, an eminently friendly office, the work assigned to it in the case of unbelievers is of the most opposite character. It puts an end to their enjoyments, such as they are, and it translates them from the milder and mitigated evils of the present life to the utter and hopeless misery of the future state.

Another and momentous element of the execution of the sentence of condemnation, under which unbelieving sinners lie, is spiritual death. The original threatening was "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shall surely die." (Gen. 2: 17.)

Accordingly, when Adam ate the forbidden fruit, and thus broke the covenant made with him for himself, and his posterity descending from him by ordinary generation, a sentence of condemnation was pronounced upon him; and this sentence, while the full execution of it as regarded temporal death was deferred, was immediately executed as regarded spiritual death. He was at once smitten with spiritual death, and became obnoxious to the consummation of it in death eternal And this sentence, applying to those whom he represented as it did to himself, all men in their natural state are under it; and it has been executed in their case to the same extent, to which we have just stated it was immediately executed in his. Hence all men in their natural state are spiritually dead and obnoxious to death eternal. Man was first formed in the image of God; that is, as he was first formed he was, so to speak, like God in respect of knowledge, moral disposition and tastes, of all his equipment and character as a subject of the divine government. The original righteousness, as it is generally called, he lost when he sinned. His possession of it resulted from the indwelling and agency of the Holy Spirit. But, when he sinned, he forfeited this indwelling and agency. The Spirit, in righteous judgment, withdrew his presence; and on his withdrawal of it man became spiritually dead, he lost his original righteousness and became corrupt in his whole nature. Accordingly, all who are still in the condition into which man thus fell, are spiritually dead. In their being so it is comprehended that they do not possess the true knowledge of God and of spiritual things, and that they are even spiritually incapable of it. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. 2: 14.) Accordingly, Christ prays that God would give to his people the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, the eyes of their understanding being enlightened." (Eph. 1: 17, 18.) Being spiritually dead, they are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them. They do not

love God, and not only so, but they hate him. "I know you," Christ says to some, who represented but too faithfully men in their natural state, "I know you that ye have not the love of God in you," (John 5: 4.) He even prefers against them a heavier charge, "They have hated," he says, "both me and my Father," (John 15: 24.) Of the world as a whole he testifies, "it hated me before it hated you," (John 15: 18.)

Hating God, they forsake, they reject him, and as a necessary consequence, idolise the creature; "They worship and serve the creature more than the Creator," (Rom. 1: 24.) "They love the world and the things that are in the world, because the love of the Father is not in them," (1 John 2: 15.)

They love sin, "Ye are of your father, the Devil," Christ testifies to them, "and the lusts of your father ye *will* do," (John 8: 44.) He does not merely announce the future fact of their doing the lusts of their father; he announces the present fact of their *disposition* to do them. And loving sin, they take pleasure in the character and in the society of sinners. (Rom. 1: 32.)

In the present execution of the sentence of condemnation under which they lie, it is further comprehended that they are excluded from communion with God. This exclusion was judicially initiated when God drove our first parents out of the garden of Eden. And it is chosen by those who are condemned to it; they all pursue a course analogous to that adopted by "Adam and his wife," when "they hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden," (Gen. 3: 8.)

They are all guilty of the offence with which God charged his ancient people; "they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters," (Jer. 2: 13.) As a consequence their lives are full of vanity and in every condition to which they can attain they still experience emptiness and destitution; nothing can afford them satisfaction. Whatever they possess, it is in no way commensurate with the capacity and cravings of their soul; it is when the world has done or is doing its utmost for them, that its utter insufficiency as a portion is most impressively discovered to them. That they may escape from this sense of emptiness for the briefest period, and it is only for a brief period they can escape from it, they must work themselves into delirium or phrensy by stimulating the body or exciting the mind. This is the purpose which the "many inventions" of pleasure seekers are intended to serve, and it is the highest and the only purpose they can serve.

In our survey of the condition of men as sinners, we must not overlook the momentous and deplorable fact, that as sinners they are under the dominion of Satan. Our first parents complied with Satan's temptation, they accepted his testimony and counsel to the rejection of God's. It was thus they sinned and fell. By acting such a part they placed themselves under Satan's guidance, and subjected themselves to his dominion. The dominion over them, which they thus conceded to him, he retains over all in their natural state, that is, over all who are not delivered from subjection to him by divine grace. As thus exercising a dominion, which with the exception now indicated, is universal, he is called the prince and the god of this world, the former title referring to the exercise of dominion on his part and the latter to the acknowledgment of it on the part of men. He exercises dominion as the prince of this world and receives homage as its god.

When man yielded to Satan's temptation and sinned, the Holy Spirit, who dwelt in him as the author of spiritual life and holiness withdrew, and on his doing so the spiritual life, which he communicated and maintained, became extinct. Man thus, as

we have already seen, acquired a character distinguished by a forsaking and rejection of God, and by an idolatrous regard to 623
created things, by ungodliness and lust. This character Satan impressed upon him.

All men in their natural state act under the influence of this character, and by means of it therefore Satan exercises dominion over them. By bearing it, they are so far what he would have them to be, and by acting under its influence and in accordance with it, they do so far what he would have them to do. They are submissive to his will and subservient to his purposes.

The state of things in the world is, doubtless, to no inconsiderable extent determined by the part that Satan acts, and the influence he exerts, as its prince and god. All that is distinctive of it as the world in its agencies, in its influences, in its usages, in its tastes, and in its doctrines and maxims, is to be traced to this origin. By means of the characteristics which be has thus impressed on the world, he exerts a universal influence, – an influence which in the case of multitudes is wholly decisive. All men in their natural state walk according to the course of this world, and, in doing so, they walk according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. Eph. 11: 2.

But, further, Satan, by a more direct and immediate agency, lays snares for individuals and labours to seduce and corrupt them. Hence he is called the tempter; and we read of his putting it into the hearts of men to commit certain sins, as he did in the case of Judas and Ananias. We have two signal illustrations of the procedure which he adopts as the tempter, in the temptation of Eve and in that of Christ.

Satan's activity is directed to the frustrating of God's design, and the accomplishing of man's ruin. He is the enemy of God and man. He manifested his enmity to God by withdrawing man from his allegiance. That he is himself an enemy to God appears from the fact, that, by bringing man's character into conformity with his own he constituted him an enemy to God. As the enemy of man, he walketh about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. (1 Pet. 5: 8) And the evils of every kind with which men are afflicted are intimately connected with his agency.

To accomplish the ruin of men, he endeavours to plunge them in worldliness and carnality. As the prince of this world he does what he can to secure that they shall love the world and the things that are in the world, and thus do his own lusts. He prosecuted this design in tempting Christ. Certain temporal advantages furnished the inducements which he held out to him.

He further labours to prevent men from believing in Christ. As the god of this world he blinds the minds of those who believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. (2 Cor. 4: 4.) His efforts in this direction are stimulated partly by hostility to men and partly by hostility to Christ It has been thought probable that the fall of the angels, who kept not their first estate, resulted from their refusing to do homage to the Son as the God-man. Human nature is inferior to their own. Accordingly, when human nature was exalted above them in the person of the Son of God, and they were required to do homage to the God-man, acting under the influence of pride, they refused to do so. If this be the history of their fall, they cannot fail to be animated with a spirit of special hostility to Christ. But, whatever the explanation of the fact may be, they are animated with such a spirit, and under its influence they do what they can to prevent men from yielding to him the homage which they themselves refused to yield to him. Hatred to men also prompts him to do what he can to prevent them from believing.

Satan is engaged in prosecuting a systematic organised rebellion against God, and men, in their natural state, are associated with him in this rebellion.

---

## AWKWARD APOLOGIES.

Mr. Dykes, late the colleague of Dr. Candlish, in Edinburgh, and more recently of Dr. Cairns, in Melbourne, was installed a few months ago as successor of the late Dr. Hamilton in Regent Square Church, London. His inaugural sermon has been published under the title of "*The First Christian Apology*." In tone, it much resembles his lecture on "*The Written Word*," delivered and published in Melbourne some years ago, and reviewed in the pages of the *Testimony* at the time. In matter, also, the "Apology" appears much like another contribution to the same des-ign as the lecture. The desertion of the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures was the most notable characteristic of Mr. Dykes' earlier performance; and on this manifestation of unfaithfulness to his pledges as an ordained minister, we took occasion to animadvert. The aim of Mr. Dykes in contravening the Confession, at that time, seemed to be governed less directly by a repugnance to the doctrine of inspiration in itself considered, and rather to have been managed with the immediate object of propitiating sceptical science.

In the work before us, the writer resumes this programme of concession and conciliation in favor of sceptical opinion; and as in this operation he has all the fears natural to a deserter, he turns round frequent and not pleasant looks at the defenders of the positions he is betraying. In a few preliminary sentences "to the reader," he tells us: –

"What the author had in view was no more than to reduce to its simplest issues the question betwixt belief and unbelief, and point out the incidence of that evidence upon which belief must mainly rest. In choosing to open his ministry in a new field with such a subject, *it was also his desire at once to protest against that narrow dread of modern research into Christianity which is at present assisting to alienate from 'Evangelical' religion reflecting and studious men.*"

This "protest" which the newly inducted minister is so prompt to offer, is by far the most vigorously executed portion of his programme. He returns to it from time to time, and deals out unsparing severities against "some theologians" whose "narrow defensive conservatism," and "fear of every doubt," and "timid, distrustful clinging to traditional forms of truth," and "nervous desire to defend the farthest and most doubtful outposts of orthodoxy," appears greatly to have ruffled Mr. Dykes' serenity, and even to have roughened his placid style. The amount of the protesting matter, but especially the strength of the adjectives which reinforce it, make a large figure in the discourse. "Some theologians" are well kept and awkwardly handled before the reader; and so far as their annihilation by words of quality can be effected, the second branch of the design which our Apologist sets himself is not lost sight of. In fact, Mr. Dykes' vocabulary wants regulating. It is very convenient in one way, to anticipate an opponent with scorching epithets, and to lead him out on the arena dressed up for controversial annihilation in a mask expressive of meanness and imbecility. But such a way of introducing parties leaves no room for a balancing of arguments. If "evangelical" theologians are ridden by a spirit of "narrow dread," and the other side all "reflecting and studious men," engaged in the honorable task of "research into Christianity," there is nothing to be gained by discussion. The case is ended before the trial is begun. All

through the discourse, our author has this "reflecting and studious class" under his protection. How comprehensive it is, we learn at p. 7. Our author says: –

624

"*Grave and able men* tell us that the virtue of Christianity lies in an order of men, is transmitted by one man putting his hand on another man's head, and reaches the rest of the world through water, wine, and bread. *Other men, as grave and able,* assure us there is in the system no supernatural virtue at all – only certain religious instincts which long ago attached themselves crudely to a few more or less mythical facts, the real value of which we can scarcely now make out. Betwixt the two poles of the neo-catholic and the positivist, *an infinite variety of not less inconsistent opinions* find room; and for each of them, intelligent and honest advocates may be heard to plead.

No passage in the Apology is more noteworthy than this. It is the keynote of the whole performance. Under cover of stating his case, our author has brought into play a highly mischievous and unscriptural principle. The moral difference between faith and unbelief is here dexterously drawn out of sight, and "*intelligence* and *honesty*" are predicated indiscriminately as actual attributes of "an infinite variety of inconsistent opinions." Honesty of purpose in dealing with revealed truth is discredited under this representation, as if it were no guarantee for safe conclusions. The guilt of unbelief is in effect denied. The evidence of revelation is not, as Butler argued, a test of men's sincerity. Our Lord's assertion, that if any man will do God's will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, is silently but *effectually* set aside. And all this is done by Mr. Dykes' mere way of setting parties on the stage. If, as Butler held – and our Lord's words appear unequivocally to affirm, – the Gospel evidence operates in the manner of a touchstone, satisfying the willing and disappointing the heartless enquirer, the sin of unbelief stands *ipse facto* undeniable. But if, as Mr. Dykes puts it, honesty and intelligence are found equally among believers and unbelievers, are impartially distributed among the advocates of an infinite variety of inconsistent opinions, scepticism is possibly as virtuous as faith. This pernicious and subtle flattery of the sceptic and the unbeliever is worked elaborately into the diction, and suggested by the phraseology of Mr. Dykes' discourse, from the beginning to the end. There is indeed no other effect more recognisable in the performance than this slurring of the moral repugnancies between faith in Christ and unbelief – this *suppressio veri* as to the guilt of rejecting the Gospel. It is a miscarriage of the ministerial office on the part of Mr. Dykes. It merits censure in the gravest and most del- iberate tone.

But not only are the respectable qualifications of "gravity" and "ability," and "intelligence," and "honesty," showered out in liberal profusion from "pole" to "pole" over every degree of religious and non-religious latitude, among "neo-catholics" and "positivists," and "an infinite variety of not less inconsistent opinions," but, by an ingenious flight on the part of our Apologist, these mutual contradictions are all indiscriminately converted into sincere enquirers after Christian truth, and even into serviceable reformers of the Christian faith. At p. 8 we have the following: –

"Sad as this utter bewilderment of men's minds is in some respects, it surely betrays at least a desire, or unconscious struggle to get now at length at the heart of a phenomenon so important as Christianity, and to do so by disentangling its essentials, if one could, from all later or accidental accretions. No one can pretend that such disentangling is unnecessary. Christianity, in the course of her nineteen centuries has had her own central and proper truths so sorely overlaid by external forms of church life; has passed under the influence of so many philosophies, and modes of culture; has seen her simple doctrines pressed into shape, determined by changing fashion and thought; speculated on, debated over, worked up into systems and deduced into syllogisms; has entered also into alliance with so many other influences – with art, with politics, with social systems; – that in no land of Christendom does she offer to us today the features she wore when she began her mission, or speak with the voice with which she first spoke when she won the world. To get at the kernel of our faith, and know it as it is, there is need for some unwrapping. And if the critical tendency which has thrown the theology of educated men into such confusion has any aim or *raison d'etre* at all, it is this, that it is bent on getting at the kernel of what we call Christianity."

If this be not an apology for scepticism considered as such, it is difficult to see what is meant. Mr. Dykes perceives a "critical tendency" in operation, "which has thrown the theology of educated men into confusion;" yet this principle of doubt and unsettlement he is so far from attributing to a disaffected state of the moral faculties, that he honors it as an earnest and honest effort to ascertain the pure essence of Christianity itself. It is not difficult to see what favor such an estimate of the critical tendency is fitted to secure for Mr. Dykes among a certain class. Such a flattering representation of the "infinite variety of inconsistent opinions" is sure to bring encomiums to the Apologist from all the "educated men" whose "theology" has been "thrown into such confusion." But how does it consist with the teaching of our Lord to associate a chaos of contradictory opinions about religion with an honest endeavor and sincere desire "to get at the kernel of what we call Christianity." Is it possible to admit, or even conceive, that all the various aberrant lines of religious latitude – from the pole of ritualism and high churchism to that which negatives the supernatural altogether – are one and all governed by the honest desire to get now at last, after so long a time, at the true substance and essential truth of Christianity. Can that which is described as an utter bewilderment of men's minds – an utter confusion injected into the theology of educated men – be transformed without jugglery into a system of research, having an intelligent aim and an intelligible *raison d'etre,* along with a mission to deliver Christianity from all the dire entanglements which nineteen centuries of mismanaged church government have agglomerated around it.

Mr. Dykes aims at originality, however, and he has a special method for obviating disagreeable questions, of this nature. It consists in discrediting the intelligence as well as the spirit of all who may differ from him before hand. He forestalls all inconvenient enquiries and criticism and scattering a grapeshot of uncomplimentary adjectives in advance against all intending dissentients. He says p. 11: –

"In these circumstances I cannot think that the wisest attitude for the Church is that attitude of mere narrow, defensive conservatism, which some theologians assume. Some, I mean, who shut within their sectarian orthodoxy, and unable or afraid to look over its boundaries, fear every doubt, because they know not how far doubt may lead, resent inquiry because it implies the unsettling of what they have settled, and think they best serve the cause of Christ by buttressing each distinctive principle of their own theological school. A timid distrustful clinging to traditional forms of truth with a nervous desire to defend the farthest and most doubtful outposts of orthodoxy appear to me to be an utterly mistaken policy."

There is of course no contending against this. The mere adventuring of ourselves into the attitude of dissent from our apologist *ipso facto* brings down upon us the whole discharge of these great guns of position with their withering volleys of "sectarian orthodoxy," and "distinctive principles," and "narrow dogmatism," and "small points." Let us wisely abstain therefore and hear the conclusion of the whole matter from the lips of our apologist, p. 14.

"The Church need fear no gift even from her foes, *so long as their gifts are light and truth*."

The Church's foes are surely flattered! But this mention of the Church brings a special question to the front. An apologist must

necessarily have a client for whom he exerts his functions. Being in the attitude of defence he must have an object over which to throw his shield. Accordingly, our apologist takes the Church "under his tutelage." But what Church? Naturally we might understand the Free Church of Scotland. Our apologist enjoys the ordination of that Church; has signed – or pledged himself to sign – her standard and any simple minded reader of his sermon might conclude there-



fore that the doctrines of the Westminster Confession are the faith for which he earnestly contends, – that they define the Church in whose defence he volunteers. Still, however, we must take account of the special "protest with which the successor of Dr. Hamilton has chosen to open his ministry in a new field." It amounts in fact to a codicil attached to the Free Church Protocol of 1843, and neutralises in no small degree the older and more respectable document. The Church, in this "apology," is not defined by the Westminster standards. The faith is not that of 1843. "The Church" with which Mr. Dykes associates himself and on whose behalf he plays apologist, is the "Broad Church," under a Presbyterian instead of an Episcopalian development, and he flings into the waste-basket of "narrow orthodoxy" the teaching of the Confession as to the doctrines of grace, together with the whole subject of Presbyterian Church government. At page 12 we have the following: –

"Do the men who stickle for small points of orthodoxy know what the real issue is which at this moment is pressed by hostile critics upon the Christian Church? The question is not now one simply of detail as it has often been betwixt the partisans of rival creeds; not like the *filioque* which rent East from West or the five points which distinguished 17th century Calvinism, or the comparative claims of a Bishop and a Presbyter."

Within "the Church" which enjoys the advantage of our author's apology these small points, are not stickled for, then, and "the men" who "defend" them are relegated to "the farthest and most doubtful outposts of orthodoxy," and must look for no countenance from the incumbent of Regent Square Church. We fear we are living without protection from Mr. Dykes' apology, – and that we even belong to the crabbed people for whose castigation his pen has adjected such abundant materials. Of course we are not embraced within the pale of "his Church," for, comprehensive as it is, it is the curious characteristic of a Broad Church that it cannot contain what is less broad than itself, and by a paradox, which defies Euclid, affords less accommodation for "*narrow points*"exactly in proportion as it is broadened.

Another very significant circumstance attends the part which "*the Church*" plays in this apology. The Church, as Mr. Dykes has modelled it, is everywhere in this "apology" the seat and source of doctrine. The Scriptures, with our apologist, are nowhere. He never refers to them as the frame on which the truths of Christianity are supported; nor as the measure by which all subjective faith, of churches and individuals is to be estimated; nor as supplying a delineation of revealed truth independent and corrective of the confusion which has supervened on "the theology of educated men," and "the accretions" with which "nineteen centuries have so sorely overlaid the essentials of Christianity." From the opening to the close of the sermon we have constantly recurring references to subjective forms of Christianity. Thus we have "Christianity in the course of her nineteen centuries," p. 9.; "our holy faith," p. 10.; "the vast and sacred fact of Christianity," p. 11.; "no Protestant Church claims infallibility," p. 13. "There is no Protestant Church which can very confidently say that in the pure truth of her creed which she holds matter of faith – that her creed perfectly represents all truth," p. 14. "A solid body of Christian verity has been the possession and life of the Church," p. 15. As if influenced (perhaps involuntarily) by the exigencies of his own argument, and also – we cannot but add – by its innate weakness, our preacher has impressed as much as might be of variableness and uncertainty on his portraiture of Christianity: for clearly the less there appears of the fixed and authoritative element in the system of revelation the larger the possible margin of honesty and intelligence remaining to "an infinite variety of inconsistent opinions." Our author seems to prefer, therefore, such renderings of Christian belief (and practice also) as are afforded by the fluctuating opinions and morality of men and Churches, while he holds back from the unerring and unbending representations of saving truth and eternal rectitude reflected from the Scriptures. It can hardly be though it might seem – in collusion with this avoidance of the Scriptures that Mr. Dykes has dealt in a curious way with the passage of Scripture which furnishes his text. We do not refer to his mode of reference, although that also is tinged with a sort of stained glass cathedral window mannerism. For he occupies the first business page of his performance with five verses of Scripture, printed large like a gothic window opening into the nave of a church, while underneath there is appended, as in a scroll, the words "*From St. Peter's Pentecost Sermon in the Acts of the Apostles, c.* 2." A more unimpressive but certainly a more convenient style of reference would have directed the reader to Acts 2: 22, 24 and 32, 33. What, however, we have in view at present, and what also appears to the eye in the latter style of reference is the hiatus which the text shows in the middle. Mr. Dykes drops eight verses out of the heart of his text passage, and marks the *lacuna* by a few asterisks. The omitted verses then were not germane to our apologist's design. And what do they consist of? They constitute an exigent and irresistible appeal to the testimony of the Old Testament Scriptures in favor of Jesus – an appeal involving in the directest possible way the assumption that the Scriptures are an infallible oracle of truth, and standard of faith and not less that they are a legitimate instrument of persuasion and argument even as between believers and unbelievers. But Mr. Dykes expurgates this scripture element "from St. Peter's Pentecostal sermon." He not only refrains from adducing the Scriptures as a material element in his own management of the Christian cause, but he makes no sign – and even obliterates the traces – that such an adduction of Scripture stands part of "the first Christian apology" as conducted by "St. Peter." We have given some prominence to this inaugural discourse more indeed than some of our leaders will think it deserves. But Mr. Dykes is a sign of the times. He is evidently in accord far less with the "narrow dogmatical theologians" who believe in "17th century Calvinism," and the Westminster Confession, than with the "intelligent and honest advocates for an infinite variety of inconsistent opinions," to propitiate whom seems indeed the design of his "apology." Of course Mr. Dykes is a Unionist.

---

## CONGREGATIONAL MEETING.

A meeting of St. George's congregation was held in the church on the evening of the 23rd instant, and was well attended, notwithstanding that the weather was rather unfavourable. The meeting having been opened with prayer, the Rev. William McIntyre, A.M., who presided, delivered the following address on the duty of bearing testimony to the truth: –

There is nothing in this world more wonderful, nothing mightier, than the supernatural revelation we have in the Bible; for is it not wonderful that God should in different ages give the Holy Ghost to men to inspire them to communicate successive portions of such a revelation, until at last He supplied the Church with the whole of it, and is not the existence, the possession by us of this revelation, as we have it in the Bible, most wonderful. It was communicated by supernatural means, and it is itself therefore supernatural. And while it is wonderful in respect of its

origin, and, indeed, also of its character and contents, it is mighty in its influence. It conduces exceedingly to the glory of God, and it deeply and powerfully affects all the interests and especially the eternal interests of man. It is by its light, made effectual for the purpose by the Holy Spirit, that sinners are guided into the way of life, and it is under its purifying and elevating operation that those, who are walking in that way, are fitted for the glory and blessedness to which it conducts.

626

Now, in order that the supernatural revelation conveyed in the Bible may fulfil this double office, its office with respect to the glory of God and its office with respect to the welfare of man, is there anything that is required to be done by any? An emphatic affirmative answer is given to this question by the efforts that are made, and from year to year on a larger scale, to supply and circulate the Bible in all the languages of the earth, and to execute the commission, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And the answer thus given is the right answer so far as it goes. It is unquestionably required that the efforts referred to be made, and all of us ought to be parties to them.

But is nothing else or further required for the purpose specified than that we be parties to such efforts, – nothing in which each of us would personally be more fully or even fully or wholly occupied? We cannot all be fully engaged, – find full employment in efforts to multiply copies of the Bible, or to circulate the copies which others produce; nor yet in missionary labours. It is only by modes of promoting such efforts that will by no means afford us anything like full employment that most of us can be parties to them, as, for example, by our prayers and contributions and by helping to awaken and extend an interest in them, and to procure support for them.

But is nothing more than this, – nothing more than what is thus occasional; is there not something more continuous and pervasive, – something that will more fully; that will wholly occupy us, – is not something of this kind required of us as our contribution, so to speak, towards promoting the accomplishment of what we have specified as the twofold purpose which supernatural revelation is intended to serve? What we specially propose on the present occasion is to supply an answer to this question, or, in other words, to determine and state the precise nature and extent of the duty which devolves upon us with respect to the application to the accomplishment of its proper purposes of the supernatural revelation which God has given to us, that is, of the truths of the Bible. Our first duty in this direction clearly is to acquire the knowledge of, and to embrace those truths. God has revealed them, he has thus placed us in circumstances to acquire the knowledge of them, and by doing so, he has laid us under obligation to acquire it. If the revelation which God has given to us did not place us in circumstances, so far as it falls within the province of an external revelation to do so, to acquire the knowledge of the truths which it conveys, it would not be a revelation. It is true, indeed, that the mode of communicating the supernatural revelation with which we are favoured, and still more its teaching, are such that by its form and character a test is applied to those to whom it comes, which, to a certain extent, is fitted to discover how they stand affected towards God and his truth. If they submit themselves to God and resign themselves to his guidance and in this attitude with an honest and earnest desire to know the truth, search the scriptures as he directs them to do, their labour will not be in vain. It is only when this attitude is not assumed, or is not assumed fully that the result is more or less unsatisfactory. The view is very generally entertained that men's minds are constituted so differently, that it is not to be expected and cannot well be the case, that they shall all adopt the same interpretation of the Bible, and derive from it the same creed; that this view is wholly without foundation, and clearly infidel in its tendency. Men's minds are so constituted that, in a state of sanity, they exhibit a delicate adaptation to the laws of evidence, just as the age does to those of light. The intellect, accordingly, if no interference with its operations proceeded from the state of the heart and from kindred views and habits, would always adopt a belief in accordance with the evidence sufficiently presented to it. If this were not

the case, it does not appear that man could be, as he certainly is, responsible for his belief. We are under obligations every one of us, to adopt a creed in accordance with the scriptures; to adopt the creed that is in accordance with them, for there is only one such creed. There is nothing in the constitution of our minds that relieves us from this obligation, whatever there may be, – and there is much, – in the state of our hearts and in our whole moral condition to disincline us to discharge it.

And having adopted that creed, – the scriptural creed, – with the adoption of which the intellect is capable, we are cordially to embrace it, our hearts doing their part in the matter; and, as will then be infallibly the case, we are to be conformed to it in our entire character and practice.

We shall thus under the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit give full scope to the word of God in our own case, or rather, we shall enter upon and make some progress in the process of doing so.

Then, further, we are to stand out and to move up and down among our fellows as persons in whose case this point has been reached. By being in the truth, our walk and conversation furnishing evidence that we are in it, we are to be witnesses for the truth. By bearing before those around us, – bearing evidently and with the proper practical results, – the relations to it in which we ought to stand, we are to recommend to others to assume the same relations to it.

But, while this is much, it is not all. We are not only by the implicit language of our position and character, but also explicitly and in express terms to bear testimony to the truth, to assert its claims, and to urge upon others the duty of fully acknowledging them, availing ourselves for this purpose of the opportunities afforded to us by the relations and intercourse of life.

This is the testimony we are required to bear, all the testimony we can bear, on behalf of the truth in our individual capacity; and it is only by bearing it that we can in our individual capacity contribute to the accomplishment of the purpose which the truth is intended to serve. This testimony, however, is not a sufficient testimony to the truth. It is not all the testimony we can bear, and therefore it is not all the testimony we are required to bear to it. Its insufficiency arises chiefly from two peculiarities by which it is distinguished. In the first place it is to a great extent indefinite. However clear, full, and scriptural our creed may be, it is not definitely embodied in the testimony under consideration. This testimony is a testimony to the truths of the Gospel generally. At the utmost it is only of some of those truths and that only on some occasions that a statement is introduced into it, and the statements thus occasionally introduced into it will scarcely ever be full statements of the truths which are the subjects of them.

Then, secondly, any testimony we can bear as individuals cannot rise to the character of a public testimony. And even though we might succeed in attracting the attention of the public so far, that the testimony we bore should be borne before the public and should itself be public to that extent, still it would not be public as being borne by the public, or by a public body. But it is our duty to bear a testimony to the truth which shall be public in this latter respect.

Now, it is only by associating ourselves with the Church, or, as there are several Churches, let us say with a Church, that we can bear such a public testimony. Any Church, any Church that has a definite and published creed, may serve our purpose so far as regards the elevating of our testimony to the character of a public testimony. But as it is our duty to bear testimony not to some truths or other that are represented as the truths of the Word of God, but to those very truths themselves, we must select a



Church in whose creed they are embodied clearly, fully, and in their purity. Loyalty to the truth, and to Him whose truth it is, and the honour of whose name and the prosperity of whose cause are so closely associated with it, requires that we conscientiously, under the guidance of the Scriptures, and in the exercise of our utmost power of discrimination, make this selection. If there be a Church accessible to whose creed bears the character specified, it is our bounden duty to associate ourselves with it, in preference to any Church whose creed does not bear that character.

Let it be observed that we here use the term creed in a comprehensive sense as including the views held with respect to Church government, discipline, and the worship of God; and what we assert is, that, in selecting a Church, with which we should associate ourselves, we should regard it as indispensable that its creed taken in this comprehensive sense should be thoroughly scriptural. If we connect ourselves with a Church, whose creed is not scriptural, we concur with it in casting disparagement on the truth or truths which it rejects, and give the countenance and support to the substituted error or errors to which the truth and the truth alone is entitled. This cannot be a light offence. It may be urged that the errors, into which a particular Church may have fallen, are not grave errors, and that the truths which they supplant are not important truths; and that, therefore, it is of little consequence, whether it be the errors in question or the truths in question, that form a part of a Church testimony. But is not this shocking language to be used with respect to truths which God has given to his Church to receive and hold, and is not the practice which gives it effect, if possible, still more shocking. Yet there are many who adopt such a practice, and who thus virtually enunciate and teach the views which it implies; there are even some who enunciate them consciously and deliberately. Such as arrive by defection at the position, which those who do either occupy, have the greater sin.

Even believers are left, in not a few instances, to occupy that position; but this does not justify the occupation of it. In occupying it they sin, and by occupying it they suffer loss, and greatly impair their own usefulness, especially if you consider as an element of usefulness, and you ought to view it in this light, the transmission of a full scriptural testimony to coming generations.

Mr. Buyers, the treasurer, then read the following financial statement: –

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Amount of mortgage debt, … | | £5000 |
| " Floating debt … | | 300 |
| | | £5300 |
| Subscriptions reported … … | £300 | |
| Of which £150 have been paid. | | |
| Estimated amount subscriptions still to be obtained, say … … … | 50 | |
| Amount of donation from Mr. Ewan, and subscriptions obtained from him … | 300 | |
| Estimated amount of proceeds of land to be sold, being a site granted to the congregation by the Government … … | 400 | |
| | | 1050 |
| | | £3250 |
| Amount of the bequest of W. Manson, Esq, | 2500 | |
| Balance to be yet provided for … … | | £1750 |

The Deacons' Court have not as yet matured a plan of meeting this balance, but hope to be shortly able to do so.

Mr. Wilson then moved – "That such of those, whose names are attached to the mortgage and bond, under which the loan from Mr. Darvall and the balance of the amount now due to Mrs. Burdekin were obtained, viz.: – Messrs. Peter Stewart, John MacDonald, and Robert Campbell, elders; Mr. James Cameron, deacon; and

Mr. William Buyers, treasurer, with the addition of the Rev. Wm. McIntyre, minister of the congregation; Mr. Duncan St. Clair Maclardy, deacon, and James Ewan, Esq., of Messrs. John Frazer and Co., be now elected trustees of the church.

Mr. Halley seconded the motion, which was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Meeting was closed with the benediction.

---

## MODERATISM IN VICTORIA.

### REV. P. S. MENZIES, A. M. (2nd Notice.)

*To the Editor of the Testimony.*

Sir, – Some time ago I drew attention to a very objectionable style of writing which appeared in an article by the Rev. P. S. Menzies in the *Union Magazine.* The article was one of a series on the French Pulpit, and the series appears to be concluded. I noticed, in passing, in my former letter, the slipshod way in which Mr. Menzies refers to some of the fundamental errors of Popery. Looking over the whole series, extending to five articles, I find a number of things in the same direction, to which I would briefly draw attention. The heroes of the French pulpit, to whom Mr. Menzies gives chief prominence, are Bossuet, Massillon, and Lacordaire; while Bourdaloue and others are incidentally noticed. With these materials before me, I am reminded of an essay, in praise of Pascal, written by an Orthodox Catholic, and which gained the prize awarded by the French Academy. One's curiosity is a a little piqued in such a case, to know how a Romanist will sing the praises of the man who may be taken as the representative of a formidable Protestant schism within the bosom of the infallible Church herself. But the mystery is soon solved. Pascal was a geometrician as well as a theologian, and, above all, he was a fine writer. Thus a clear course opens out for M. Bordas Demonlin – the essayist referred to – for exalting the literary merits of Pascal to the skies, while he hurls Calvin and all protestant blasphemers to the opposite extreme. The eminent Port-Royalist comes in for praise, as one who invented a calculating machine; confirmed the doctrine of Torricelli and Des-cartes as to the weight of the atmosphere by the famous experiment on Puyde-Dome; determined questions as to the pressure of liquids; propounded the Calculus of Probabilities; and made observations on the Cyclord. But his literary style is the crowning glory that adorns the brow of Pascal. It is set forth as noble, quick, penetrating, nervous, sublime, unique. It is characterized by precision, rapidity, elegance, almost mathematical accuracy. Add to all this grace, ease, fecundity, readiness to follow out all the motions of thought, energy, brilliance, grandeur, boundless resources, &c., &c. &c. The exuberant Frenchman-Romanist as he is – seems almost to enjoy the delicate raillery, the far reaching irony, the skinning analysis by which the author of "*Les Provinciales*" tortures alive the Jesuits, in the casuistry which propounds a doctrine of proximate power which leaves man without power, and of sufficient grace – which does not suffice! From these few observations you may form some idea of the prize essay. So far from being warped in the direction of Protestantism on account of his hero, the ingenious Frenchman takes occasion to fix the brand of schism upon Protestantism. For here was Pascal at the head of a reform within the bosom of the

infallible Church. It was, therefore unnecessary to quit the pale of the Church to accomplish a reformation.

Now let us see how Mr. Menzies gets on. His first article is on the Augustan age and general characteristics of the French pulpit. He has scarcely made a beginning when he produces a lengthy and grandiloquent passage from "*La Harpe*," setting forth the greatness of religion in the age of Louis XIV. It begins with the conversion of Turenue by Bossuet, and ends with the Duc de Bourgoyne, with some rather curious materials in the intermediate space. It ekes out



at the fag end of a foot note, that the conversion in the case was "from Calvinism to Catholicism." The great act of religion in the Duc de Bourgoyne was his refusing to go to a ball while only about twenty years of age, because his grandfather desired him not to go. La Harpe, indeed, in the passage as given by Mr. Menzies, warns us that he is regarding religion in its "human relations," and thus viewed, he maintains it was great, like everything else pertaining to the age of Louis XIV. Of course, it requires no special penetration to see what a superficial view of religion is here concerned. It was of primary importance that kings and dukes, cardinals and bishops, warriors and statesmen should figure in his exhibition, and hence he brings in a catalogue of titles and dignities. But while this is the great religion sought by La Harpe, what kind of pulpit is Mr. Menzies dealing with? He allows that it is extremely doubtful whether there was much real piety under Louis XIV. – remarkably safe venture; and he urges the more curious suggestion that it is doubtful whether a really religious age is that which ought to produce the finest religious oratory. He admits, however, that the age of Louis XIV. claims "by far the finest religious eloquence which France has produced in any age, and which is entitled to a high rank, if not the highest, in the pulpit literature of the world." In dealing with the characteristics of this Augustan age, Mr. Menzies speaks of the air of finish, the careful elaboration, symmetry, purity of language, rhetorical effect, and rhythmical flow, &c., &c. So, like the eulogy on Pascal, the matter dwindles down to a mere academic exercise. "Pulpit" is used not so much as the symbol of the important ordinance of preaching the gospel of the grace of God, converting souls from darkness to light, and building up the saints in their most holy faith, as it is used to supply occasion for good composition and oratory. Mr. Menzies warns us that it is not the great doctrine of justification by faith that is to be expected so much as the doctrine of works, and we are cautioned not to be shocked when we find some of the great French masters beginning their grand orations with a prayer to the Virgin Mary. All the mere literary praise, then may be alongside the darkest errors of Popery, just as the supreme literary merit of Homer and Virgil, Herodotus and Livy, Thucydides and Tacitus, Anacreon and Horace, &c., &c., are to be found coincident with paganism. Coming, in the second article, to Bossuet, I am the more inclined to regard the articles as old essays written for the class of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres at college, and now furbished up to do duty in the *Union Magazine.* Nor do I find fault with this. I do not say that purely literary articles should be excluded from the *Magazine.* I say nothing against the study of literature. The pages of John Owen, give ample proof of the important uses to which such studies may be turned. The great Puritan had evidently traversed the whole field of Pagan literature, and illustrated some of the deepest subjects of justice and atonement by numerous quotations, coming as echoes from the inner consciousness of men, bearing witness to the claims of God. Glancing at the index of authors I find about fifty quotations made by Owen, even from such a writer as Horace. But when the Pulpit vanishes into a question of elegant sentences, rhythmical flow, etc., are we not entitled to say that an improper liberty is taken with the pulpit? It is by no means satisfactory to discover that mere fine writing by papists becomes a means of shedding a halo of glory over the papacy itself. If fine writing is to carry the day, let us understand distinctly where we are. John Owen, who wrote in a very plain style, will not admit of being mentioned in the same century with such a master of composition as Bossnet. But at this rate, Paganism will carry the day against Popery itself. Mr. Menzies demurs to the verdict of Hallam, that Bossuet's funeral orations surpass all pro-

ductions of the same kind, even by the ancient Greeks, and produces a passage from Thucyclides in support of his demur.

But am I doing injustice to Mr. Menzies by the charge that, having brought down the pulpit to a mere question of fine writing, he has also used the fine writing as a stepping stone towards spreading a halo of glory around the Papacy itself? Take the following passage from the article on Lacordaire; – "We may sufficiently introduce him to the readers by saying, that as an apologist for Christianity, as an ornament of the first pulpit (its influence considered) in Europe, as an ingenuous and fearless reviver of mediaeval orders, with all their darkest and yet most solemnizing features, as a precious example of the mighty power of the Gospel, as one those truly loveable and saintly souls which have sometimes come into public contact with the rude life of the world, purifying all they touch and contracting no taint of pollution, Lacordaire must be ranked among the few men who redeem the worst features of French history. It is not the ungenerous object of this brief notice to assail the system, venerable and noble, amid all its elements of frailty, to which, as a Catholic priest and *religieux,* he belonged." Alongside the glassy but spurious liberalism of the silly Protestant, we may exhibit the manly candour and historical honesty of the popish eulogist of Pascal already noticed. After referring to the collision between Christianity and Paganism, in which the institutions of the latter fell, he sums up the abuses in the Church which demanded a reformation. He says that worship lost its early simplicity in ceremonies, in idolatrous devotions paid to saints, relics, and images, and in a crowd of senseless and stupid observances; that manners became depraved, and ignorance and crime were universal; that purity of Life was never at a lower ebb; that a perverted religion, so far from exercising a controlling power, increased the evils in existence; that the most solemn mysteries, the mere sports of degraded consciences, were a public appeal to falsehood; that the communion preceded clime, and confession followed; that pleasure and voluptuousness seated themselves in the sanctuary, with an insatiable cupidity that trafficked shamelessly in sacred offices; that the retreats destined for the protection of innocence degenerated into encouragements for licentiousness; that liberty to sin was bought and sold in the traffic in indulgences; that heaven itself was set up to public sale, and a few liberalities, or even silly observances expiated the most criminal deeds; that casuistry had subverted morality by subtle distinctions which changed vice into virtue; that corruption was universal; and that the Christians (quoting from Fleury) did not differ from the Pagans except in the use of vain ceremonies which made men no better. So far the popish essayist; "venerable and noble" says the shallow Protestant, and he is not going to be so ungenerous as to assail the system which produced those things! Here is another piece of Unionist Protestantism. "He (Lacordaire) said very hard, very unjust, and very ignorant things of Protestantism; and could not have said them in England without injury to his reputation merely as a scholar and student of history. But he did, and does, to our thinking, prove that there is a foundation, however rarely

recognised, on which Protestant and Romanist can stand together, and by the occupation of which alone can we see any hope for an ultimate reconstruction of Christendom on really Catholic principles, and that is unfeigned love to the Lord Jesus Christ and complete submission to His blessed authority." Just see the magnificent conclusion to which the fine writing is leading us! The reconstruction of Christendom! Submission to the blessed authority of Christ! Did Mr. Menzies give one thought as to the bearing of this on the papacy when he wrote this shal- 629
low stuff? Put in actual operation the authority of Christ and what becomes of the papacy? Strike out the worship of angels, saints, and relics; strike out the worship of the Virgin Mary, by which the Mediatorship of Christ is practically set aside; strike out the doctrines of transubstantiation, justification by works, and purgatory; strike out celibacy, confession and indulgences; strike out the whole host of ceremonies and inventions by which the authority of Christ has been effectually set aside in doctrine, worship, discipline, and Church government – and what have you left for reconstruction in the papacy? Is it not instructive to find such meaningless conglomerations of sentences in articles pretending to deal with high criticism and to set forth the characteristics of the finest pulpit oratory of the world?

Here is yet another noticeable passage from the articles on Lacordaire. My quotations are rather long, but they will enable you to form a judgment independently of my criticism: – "It is no doubt laudable to be possessed with zeal against the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, and candour will admit that from some of the worst of these errors and corruptions Ravignan, like his friend Lacordaire, was not free. But it seems to us that both these men illustrate a theory which helps at all events to account for the power which that Church still wields over the consciences of one hundred and eighty-five millions of men – viz., that there is something in its ecclesiastical organization which so overwhelms and possesses faithful members as not only to divert attention from the merits of particular doctrines, but actually to favor the growth of a form of piety, which, although thin and sickly, when turned towards the warfare of life, shines with a peculiar fire and energy when turned towards the world beyond death." A little while ago we saw Mr. Menzies was not going to be so ungenerous as to assail the venerable and noble system to which Lacordaire belonged. Now, it appears there is something laudable in zeal against the errors of popery. There is surely some screw loose here. Mr. Menzies is astounded at the extraordinary influence exerted over the minds of the votaries of the infallible Church. Does it not correspond to the fanaticism of Mahometanism? We are forewarned of a strong delusion which will operate very unsatisfactorily on men's minds, and the sickly piety to be found in the Church of Rome! No wonder it is sickly. The wonder is that any is found at all. When the bread of life is often not to be got, and sometimes in the shape of mere scraps and crumbs, no wonder life is a rarity and not of a healthy type when it is found. But *jam satis.*

We have some curious illustrations of changed times in our Victorian Churches. With this softness towards the papacy on the part of a Presbyterian minister, just contrast the charge of Puritanism against the Bishop of the Church of England! In some recent deliverances, Dr. Perry, Bishop of the Church of England, gives renewed evidence of a deep and earnest piety, a zeal for the cause of God, and a spirituality which have indeed uniformly characterised him during his now long retention of office in this colony. He dreads bazaars and declares plainly that, when singing in church becomes a matter more of artistic consideration than of devotion, it is degrading and profaning God's ordinance. You will see at once he is not in the trade of the advanced spirits of the age. But the crowning act which has brought a perfect hurricane of nameless midges about him, as well as the angry hum of those hornets, the newspapers, is his distinct refusal to ordain a certain person for certain reasons, and what are the reasons? The applicant for ordination believes, it would seem, in the actual body and blood of Christ being present in the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper; and believes also in confession to a priest, To all intents and purposes such a man is a Papist, and the Protestant Bishop is

worried out of his life because he will not ordain him! Such narrow-mindedness is an anachronism. This is the 19th century, and Bishop Perry finds no quarter though he is a real pillar of Protestantism, or rather, apparently because he is a pillar. On the other hand the creatures of the hour, the pets of the press, are such as Inglis and Menzies! Yet it would not do to blink the fact in regard to the Bishop, that, good man as he is, he cannot escape the inconveniences of forming part and parcel of an anti-scriptural hierarchy.

PETER MACPHERSON.

Manse, Meredith, Victoria, Feb. 10.

---

## LECTURE ON INCIDENTS OF MISSIONARY LIFE IN THE LOYALTY ISLANDS.

On Tuesday evening, the 8th instant, a very interesting and instructive lecture was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Ella, on "Incidents of Missionary Life in the Loyalty Islands," in St. George's Church, Castlereagh Street, in connection with the Mutual Improvement Association of St. George's congregation. The Rev. James McCulloch occupied the chair. The chairman, having opened the meeting with prayer and named the subject of the lecture and the lecturer, made remarks to the following effect: We are now met for one of the most important objects for which men could be assembled in this world: to hear of missionary operations for the saving of souls and extending of Christ's kingdom on earth. Christianity is a great missionary work. The founder of Christianity was the great Prince of missionaries. He came "to seek and to save that which was lost" – to be the Good Shepherd. He went in search of the lost sheep in the wilderness. All Christ's people feel a deep interest in missionary work, and the more they imbibed His spirit the more would this interest be felt and manifested. That individual, congregation, or church, which showed little interest in missionary undertakings must be in a low condition. After a few further observations, the chairman introduced the lecturer to the meeting.

Mr. Ella said that it is not now necessary to preface an address on the subject of Christian missions with any remarks on the theory involved beyond a quotation of the Divine command to "I preach the Gospel to every creature," and a reference to the promise "I am with you, even to the end of the world;"while for evidence of the success which has attended them we cannot do better than point to the wonders which in our own day have been effected in the islands of the South, in India, in China, and in Madagascar – the consideration of which fills the heart with wonder and the mouth with praise. This evening, however, he was to speak specially in regard to mission work in the group of islands known as the Loyalty Islands, situated about sixty miles east of the large island of New Caledonia, under the dominion of the French Government, whose flag was first hoisted there in the year 1854. The Loyalty Group consists of three large and several smaller islands, and contain a population of about 16,000. The mission was commenced in the year 1841, by native teachers, and was prosecuted with no apparent success for about eight years, when on the death of the reigning chief, his son and successor permitted the people without let or hindrance to attend

to the things which were pressed upon their consideration by the missionaries and the teachers. Good success attended the labour of the missionaries, and now the whole of the New Testament and portions of Old Testament Scriptures, are in the hands of, and are highly prized by, as many as make a profession of Christianity. Their course was one of uninterrupted progress until the year 1864, when a blow was struck at the missionaries and the Protestant religion from a quarter whence it was as unexpected as sev-ere. The French Governor of New Caledonia came to the islands,

630

with soldiers and priests, and prohibited the English missionaries to teach or preach to the natives in their own language, and forbade the use of the books to which they had been accustomed. From that time until the present – notwithstanding representations made to the French Government, both by the representatives of British missionary Societies, and the representative of the British Government in Paris, and the assurances of the Emperor that no obstacle should be thrown in the way of either the teaching or the practice of the Protestant religion in the Loyalty Islands – the missionaries and their converts have been subjected to indignity and persecution at the hands of the Popish priests and the chiefs, and people under their control, under the eyes of the nominal Governor, without anything be- yond the merest feint of interference. The Protestants have been driven from their homes, have been wantonly fired upon when worshipping, their chapels and schools have been pulled down or destroyed, or have been appropriated as barracks or other purposes equally foreign to that for which they were erected. Nevertheless the work prospers, and from even those who professed Popery the Protestant ranks are continually recruited. The rev. gentleman entered into details, which were received with marked attention, and concluded by exhorting his hearers to do all in their power towards the evangelisation, which is the only road to the civilisation, of the many heathen peoples which are at our very doors.

Mr. J. G. Wilson in rising to move a vote of thanks to the Rev. lecturer, said that he felt himself incompetent adequately to express himself as to the merits of the excellent lecture they had just had the satisfaction of listening to. The painful circumstances related, could not but make a deep impression on the minds of all present. It appeared to him that the conduct of the Roman Catholic priests and people of the Loyalty islands, was simply illustrative of the proceedings of the same party in every other part of the world; and it had struck him forcibly, while Mr. Ella was depicting the thrilling, incidents with which his lecture abounded, that they were very fair representations of certain proceedings which had occurred in this colony of a no less outrageous and tyrannical character, and which doubtless would be of as frequent occurrence and accompanied with as disastrous results, as those in the islands spoken of, but for the fact, that the authors of them had not the same power. They for example had had the murderous assault made upon their esteemed president {the Rev. Wm. McIntyre), when proceeding to deliver a lecture in his own church at Maitland, and also that impudent and unprincipled interference of the same party at the Masonic Hall, on the occasion of the delivering of a lecture, by the Rev. John McGibbon, which was prevented from being proceeded with until the obstructors were turned out of the room. The same spirit was also manifested at the late elections, particularly at Araluen, when "the Catholics" assembled in mobs, on the roads leading to the polling places, and by means of threats and physical force; prevented many Protestant electors from exercising their rights as citizens, by going to the poll. The spirit of Popery was the same everywhere; but, notwithstanding, such a state of things, sleepy Protestants conducted themselves very much with regard to it, like the sluggard mentioned in scripture, who was represented as saying: "Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep." Many Protestants asserted that there was no danger, that when the time for action came they would be ready for it, that when the crisis arrived they would bestir themselves in earnest; but in the language of one who knew Popery well the crisis had already come and the
only thing now to be expected was the catastrophe. He sincerely

sympathised with the lecturer, and those engaged with him in the mission; and he had, therefore, much pleasure, in moving that a vote of thanks be given to the Rev. Mr. Ella, for his exceedingly interesting and instructive lecture.

In seconding the motion Mr. Rennie spoke as follows: – He was sure the audience would desire along with him to express their sympathy with Mr. Ella in the difficulties and dangers he had described as having attended his mission in the Loyalty Islands. Many of those hindrances had arisen through the action of the French Government – or, at all events, its representatives. Much had been said about France in connection with civilization. France had herself claimed to have led the way in all the movements of the European nations towards what is generally claimed as the civilization and enlightenment of the present day. But French civilization, as carried out in the Loyalty Islands – and as carried out at Tahiti – was something vastly different to the standard of civilised life laid down in the Gospels and the Holy Scriptures generally. What, indeed, had France done towards the spread of Christian principles – the only solid basis of real civilization? The alliance of France and England had been held up as something surpassingly excellent, and intimate relations between the two nations as of the utmost importance in promoting the welfare and peace of the world. But it is much to be feared that this alliance has rather proved a hindrance to England's own mission, and damaged her reputation in the character of promoter of Christianity – which she has sustained not through her Government, but mainly through her Churches. Is the noble band of missionaries they have sent forth to such places us the Loyalty Islands – there to be met with such counteraction on the part of her ally as has just been related by the lecturer? It was to be feared that Mr. Ella's appeal for assistants in the South Sea Missions from these colonies would not meet with much response until the people felt the power of the truth more strongly and more universally themselves. Whenever Christian principles should be carried out in the lives and intercourse of the inhabitants, there would doubtless be a more or less lively desire to promote the knowledge and practice of those principles, where, as in these Islands, there were now darkness and vice – and many would then rejoice and be glad to carry there the message of Salvation, because they knew themselves the value of it, and its unspeakable importance to the perishing, inhabitants of those neighbouring Islands of the Pacific.

The motion was then put to the meeting in the usual manner and carried unanimously.

The Chairman, in addressing the lecturer, spoke to the following effect: I have much pleasure in conveying to you the thanks of this meeting for the lecture with which you have now favoured us. I say this not merely as the organ of the meeting, but also as expressing my own feelings regarding the lecture. It was a lecture that contained information both time very refreshing to hear of the fidelity and courage manifested by those labourers in such trying circumstances; and also of accord

with the sentiments uttered by the mover and seconder of the resolution calling on the meeting to express its thanks to you (Mr. Ella). The observation made to its persecuting spirit, is one well worthy of notice. Whilst you were proceeding with your lecture I could not help wishing that the three parties I am about to name had been present to hear. In the first ? ? ? ?

---

Note. The last page of this issue has been torn and pages 631 and 632 are incomplete and have been scanned as an image only.