

# CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN

Whole No. 637.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1877.

Vol. 13.—No. 13.

## NO MORE SEA.

There shall be no more seas: no more wild winds bringing  
Their stormy tidings to the rocky strand,  
With its scant grasses and pale sea-flowers springing,  
From out the barren sand.

No angry wave, from cliff and cavern hoary,  
To heave its crest and dash its foam of living gold,  
Bearing on shattered sail and spar the story  
Of one who comes no more;

The loved and lost, whose steps no more may wander  
Where wild gorse sheds its bloom of living gold,  
Nor slake their thirst where mountain hills meander  
Along the healthy wold.

Never again through flowery dingles winding  
In the hushed stillness of the sacred morn,  
By shady wood paths, where tall poplars, bending,  
Shed the ripening corn.

'Neath whispering leaves his rosy children gather  
In the grey hamlet's simple place of graves,  
Round the low tomb where sleeps the white-haired  
Father,

Far from the noise of waves.

There shall be no more sea! No surges sweeping  
O'er love and youth, and childhood's sunny hair;  
Naught of decay and change, nor voice of weeping  
Ruffles the fragrant air.

Of that fair land, within whose nearly part  
The golden light falls soft on fount and tree;  
Vexed by no tempest, stretch those shores immortal,  
Where there is no more sea.

Argosy.

## FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

### REMINISCENCES OF PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS.

BY AN OCTOGENARIAN.

No. 15.

#### DR. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER.

It is time that something were said about our distinguished Professors to whom our General Assembly had committed the management of the Seminary. They were two in number, but were always regarded as one by their pupils. We never heard any student even hint a comparison of our instructors, or attempt to run a parallel between them, as Plutarch might have done. A star may appear single to the naked eye, but applying the telescope we may find a couple of beautiful orbs; but we never turned the telescope of Sir John Ross in the direction of our Professors. By example they taught us purity, for we have neither fractions, or ups and downs in our ministry.

In 1805, Dr. Alexander reached Washington on Saturday evening. As churches lay far between at that time, he walked over to the town of all towns, and took tea at Mamre. He was on his way to take charge of the Pine Street church in Philadelphia. He was invited to preach, which he did next morning from the text, "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." The audience was more than satisfied. His voice was clear. There was a sounding-board to the pulpit. His text in the afternoon was, "For my yoke is easy, and burden light." Little then did the writer dream that he would ever sit at the feet of this modern Gamaliel. Strange! Man crumbles into dust, but the secrets of to-morrow are hidden in the chest of his inscrutable counsels who plans the map of our lives, and directeth all our steps. The divine disappeared, but he was heard of in the future!

The life of this remarkable man, contained in a volume of great interest, has long been given to the public. My remarks must be comprised within half a sheet. It would seem from that volume, and other sources of information, that the conversion of Dr. Alexander was preceded by deep and acute convictions. He was driven even to sylvan haunts, that he might pour out his confessions of sin before God. His conscience, instead of mere feeling, was assailed by the Holy Ghost. He was like a pelican in the wilderness, or like a locust tossed to and fro, and up and down in the wooded retreats of Rockbridge. Had he been irregular in his life? We know not. It was enough that he was a fallen being. "Thy fierce wrath," he could say, "goeth over me, thy terrors have cut me off." The Holy Spirit was preparing him for his future as a counsellor to the inquiring, and for the many doctrinal, searching, experimental and practical discourses by which his ministry was distinguished. That profound conviction that he was a sinner, became the ground-work of that humility by which he was eminently distinguished. He would rather have been a violet than a sunflower in the garden of the Lord. He cared nothing for applause, and never fished for praise. He would rather have listened to his Divine Master in the cottage of Lazarus, than to have frequented the forum of Rome, Mars Hill in Athens, or the palace of the twelve Caesars. He was quite as happy when talking to peasants in some obscure hotel, as he would have been at St. Peter's on the Tiber, or St. Paul's on the Thames. In addition to their mental attainments, he desired that his pupils should advance in piety. He wished the rod of our ministry to swallow up every thing which engenders pride, if the redemption of an apostate race could be secured. We quote, in proof, from one of his letters addressed to the writer. "The letter is mislaid, but we remember the very words, 'After all, deep, fervent, intense, earnest and lonely piety is the best qualification for the sacred office.' He was a meditative Christian. His religion may be characterized by a single word, and that is *Heavenly-mindedness*. Yes; this is true. Whilst his abode was on earth his conversation was on high. He admired the twelve gables wrought out of the same number of costly pearls, walked on golden streets, gazed on the tree moistened by the river of life.

Dr. Alexander was elected in 1812 by the General Assembly to the chair of "Didactic and Polemic Theology." This reminiscence heard his inaugural discourse from the text, "Search the Scriptures." It was delivered

to a large audience, but that promiscuous audience held good judges of all theological compositions. It would be useless to say that it gave satisfaction. We heard many express their approbation of the occurrences which took place on that memorable day. Many sincere prayers rose on that day that the Seminary might be kept secure from false doctrine. There was need for suppletion when we remember that Harvard has become the nestling place of Unitarianism, and that its Professors are fed on money supplied by orthodox. Oxford is now disfigured by a puerile Ritualism. The Northampton school degenerated into scepticism, and the shade of the illustrious Calvin hovers over men who have embraced Rationalism, save that God has reared a school which may supplant the one under the control of the Geneva Established Church. But thus far we hope all is secure in the hands of its able Professors. And should it ever decline into Heterodoxy the Great Head of the Church will plant another in its stead.

It would be presumption in the writer to attempt any analysis of the publications of Dr. Alexander after he became a Professor. Up to that time, we believe, he had given but two of his sermons to the press. One was on the burning of the Richmond Theatre in 1811, from the passage, "Weep with them that weep," and the other from the text, "Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church;" capital discourses! But after his removal to Princeton he became an extensive writer on the "Evidences of Christianity," the "Elements of Moral Science," the "Liberian Colonies," the "Log College," and various other subjects. But he never wrote anything that he might make himself a name. It was done to promote the good of mankind and the glory of his Master. He died in 1851. Though long separated from his native State, he never lost sight of the Shenandoah Valley, in which he was born. We held converse with him about it, and found always that he cherished for it a fondness which could never be obliterated. He did not view it perhaps so much with the eye of a sentimentalist as with that of a Christian. He knew that the Creator had given the currents of transparent water which run among its hills, the blue mountains which form its boundaries, the noble oaks that crown its rivers, the curiosities which draw the sandalled feet of pilgrims, and that he sent a persecuted people from the uncouth Loughs and stony hills of Ireland to occupy an unrivalled heritage.

## FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

### PAUL NOT A "BAPTIST."

BY REV. H. H. HAWES.

No. 6.

As we have seen, Paul says the church is one in all ages. He knows nothing of the "modern views" which date our church only as far back as the incarnation of Christ, or the day of Pentecost. Let us now hear him as to the relations of church members. Some say that we do not "belong to the church," and are not entitled to all its privileges unless we think as they do, and have been baptized in water, according to their baptism.—The world knows very well, how, for this cause only, even husband and wife, child and parent, brother and sister cannot sit at the "Lord's table" together. But Paul had no such notions, and never gave any teaching to warrant them. Indeed, there is not such a teaching nor hint of it in all of God's Word. Let him produce it, who can! Necessarily, the conclusion is suggested, that God's Word is nowhere a teacher of "Distinctive Baptist Principles." Well! So be it. It is purely and absolutely true! To take the Bible only, and make a Baptist church, is impossible! This we are now showing in these articles, in part. But what does Paul say about the church membership, etc.? In Rom. xii: 4, 5, the Apostle teaches that all the members of Christ are "one body," and so closely related, as to be "every one, members one of another." His illustration is drawn from the human body. We have a body. This body has many parts, or members. These members have their respective places and duties. All "have not the same office." Yet they all belong to, and compose the one body. So is the church, the body of Christ. In this state of things, he gives the most excellent direction of xiv: 1. "Him that is weak in the faith receive as ye, but not to doubtful disputations"—or, as ye in the margin, "Not to judge his doubtful thoughts."

Each member is the Lord's and as such a member and part of the body as any others. This is also the doctrine of Christ in John xvii. Paul's idea is, that there are and will be divisions of opinion among these members, but that these non-essential differences should not cause a schism in the body. If we are all the Lord's, this suffices for communion and fellowship. So xv: 1, "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." And verse 7, "Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God." How does Christ receive us?—Not denominationally, but as believers.—Therefore when one sect casts out a brother of another sect whose hope is in Christ, this is a sin against the law of Christ. Paul knew nothing of what is called, "close communion."

It is written (verse 10) "Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people," the Jews. If Jews and Gentiles are called to rejoice together as the one people of God, this shows not only the oneness of the church, but the oneness of communion and fellowship. And in xvi: 17, 18, the Apostle condemns those who cause divisions and offences contrary to his

doctrine, saying: "They that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

To the same intent he continues in Cor. i: 10-17, and shows also that he esteemed the preaching and faith of the gospel, as far above the doctrine of baptisms. And teaching thus, he goes on to chapter 11th—"the communion chapter"—where he teaches that faith in Christ, not a special mode of baptism, is "the prerequisite for communion." I Cor. xi: 28; II Cor. xiii: 5. In chapter xii, he returns to a more full discussion of the unity of the church among both Jews and Gentiles, and the oneness of the body, united by the baptism of the Spirit, (verse 13) though composed of many and different members. The union is in and to the Head, Christ. And he teaches clearly that the members have, each and all, need of each other, no matter what their name, order or place; and therefore should not deny each other, "that there should be no schism in the body." What is all this but the doctrine announced in II Cor. iii: 17, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." That is, no human opinions nor creeds are to bind the members of Christ's body. The law comes from the Head, even Christ. If He will have His church to be one, and His people all as members of one body, it cannot be according to His will that schisms now exist, separating the old dispensation church from the new; and causing Christians to deny one another at the place where all are commanded to confess one Lord. Paul not only preached, but also practiced this doctrine.—For example, in Col. iv: 10, 11, we read of Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus whom he commended to the church at Colosse as his "fellow workers unto the kingdom of God." These Colossians, who had been buried with Christ in baptism, (ii: 12) are taught to esteem as "fellow workers unto the kingdom of God" these persons who were not of baptism but (verse 11) "of the circumcision."

Evidently Paul was not a "Baptist." Had he been, he would have taught those Colossians to give these brethren of "the circumcision" the cold shoulder.

## FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

### DIVISION OF THE SYNOD OF VIRGINIA.

Your correspondent, "Partitio," has shown that a Synod of Virginia, when it meets, is a representative, mainly, of that part of the State which lies near the place of meeting—the more remote Presbyteries being, to a great extent, excluded by the circumstances of distance and expense. "Winchester," in the last *Central*, virtually concedes the force of this conclusive argument when he proceeds, as he declares, not to answer but to outweigh it, by considerations belonging to other aspects of the question; which, however well presented and worthy of regard, do not meet that great difficulty of our present organization, which being a physical one, can only be solved by a division. "To this complexion it must come at last."

As a sequel to the argument of "Partitio," I propose to show that the Synod of Virginia, as at present constituted, not only places itself, in its meetings, beyond the reach of a very large proportion of its ministers and elders, but that it seldom or never can go round the circle so as to give all an equal chance, from year to year. It meets most frequently in those parts of the State where Presbyterian influence is strongest, and therefore its moral power is least needed to awaken an interest in our denomination with those who do not know us. In some parts where Presbyterianism is weaker, it meets seldom, and in other places where our Church is weakest it meets not at all.

The obvious reply of those who oppose division is, that the Synod cannot go to these weak places because it cannot be accommodated. But the reply is itself a confirmation of our argument, because it shows that we ought to have in the place of this grand ecclesiastical assembly, which so many people can never see, two or three that are more susceptible of locomotion. To Presbyteries in distant corners "half a loaf is better than none."

Looking at the human side of Christians, there is another reason why the present large Synod does not go to out-of-the-way places, even when invited, and when the invitation is accompanied by every necessary assurance that it can be accommodated—other brethren being always willing to aid us, as we so freely aid them on similar occasions; viz.: the members of Synod from densely populated Presbyterian communities are always able to give more votes to carry it to their favored localities than the members from sparsely settled districts. In this discussion it is desirable that no writer or speaker impute unworthy personal motives, or give offence to those who hold the opposite view. I do not ascribe the fact which I have mentioned to selfishness, but rather to a love for the Synod and a desire to enjoy its meetings, which, added to considerations of personal convenience, may sometimes unconsciously prevent a due regard to the interest of our denomination in other places, and to the feelings of those who have so rarely, perhaps never, been permitted to witness the proceedings of a Synod. The same difficulty is experienced sometimes in our Presbyteries, when excellent brethren living along a line of railroad, are tempted to keep the meetings near them, to the detriment of isolated congregations. "The sober second thought" of good people will convince them that they ought to remember their fellow Christians thus situated, and endure hardship for their sakes; and so it comes to pass, in general, that our Presbyteries do submit to much inconvenience to encourage feeble

churches by their presence. But a body so large and varied as the Synod cannot be expected so sensibly to feel the force of such appeals. At any rate I think the following facts and figures will show that the Synod of Virginia, has, from its first meeting to its last, held its annual assemblies with undue frequency in some parts of its bounds, and therefore that, as its course for the future is indicated by its history in the past, there are large districts in the State which, unless it be divided, will never enjoy the advantages that accrue to our churches from nearness to its place of meeting.

Since, and including its first meeting in 1788, the Synod has met eighty-nine times. Dividing the States, with the parts of States of which it has been composed, by certain geographical and Presbyterial limits, sufficiently well defined for the purpose, its meetings may be classified as follows:

In the Valley of Virginia—Forty-five times, or more than one half of all the meetings, viz: at New Providence, 1 meeting; Lexington, 12; Winchester, 15; Harrisonburg, 3; Shepherdstown, 1; Washington, Pa., 1; Staunton, 11; Charlottesville, 1.

In Eastern Virginia and Maryland—Twenty times, viz: Richmond, 6 meetings; Fredericksburg, 4; Petersburg, 4; Norfolk, 4; Baltimore, 1; Alexandria, 1.

Southside Virginia—Five times, viz: Hampden Sidney, 4; Farmville, 1.

Piedmont Virginia—Ten times, viz: Charlottesville, 4; Lynchburg, 6.

West Virginia—Five times, viz: Charleston, 3; Lewisburg, 2.

South-West Virginia—Three times, viz: Fincastle, 1; Salem, 1; Christiansburg, 1.

There was a meeting at Lickinghole church in 1812, but I do not know where this was located; probably in Goochland.

Two remarks may be added, considering the distance from Christiansburg to the Tennessee line, more than a hundred miles, with the breadth of that large section of the State, and all the region on the Southside, including Danville, there is at least one third of the territory of the present Synod in which it has never met.

Brethren are in the habit of saying that, if we divide, the bodies that meet would not be the Synod of Virginia; but it is evident, when we consider that the Synod which now meets is composed of adjacent churches mainly, that there is never a meeting of the Synod of Virginia. When it meets at Staunton or Winchester it is chiefly the Synod of the Valley, as it would be if they of the Valley were set off. It is furthermore evident that to a large part of our Church, there is now, as a matter of personal experience, and privilege, and stimulation, no Synod of Virginia. Is it not better for them to have, as a fact, a Synod of South-West Virginia, or Southside Virginia, than as a sentiment, a Synod of Virginia whose only enchantment, to them, is that which distance lends? P. B. P.

## A Great and a Greater Question.

In a Christian family the oldest son, a lad of ten years, once bright and promising, by disease had been reduced to a pitiable state of idiocy. Now and then the cloud was lifted, and there was a momentary flash of intelligence. On one of these occasions he ran into his mother's room, and falling on his knees, caught her hands and cried out, in a passion of excitement and tears: "Oh! mother, how can you love me!" There was a sudden consciousness of his sad condition, his burdensome dependence, bringing with it the wonder how one so imbecile and useless could have any share in a mother's love.

Many a child of God, in the painful consciousness of sin, and in deep self-condemnation, has exclaimed, "How can God love one so unworthy? It seems daring presumption to suppose it possible."

We have words of counsel for such persons.

1. Look at yourself as simply a creature of God, without respect to character. In your complex nature, as body and mind, you are one of the most wonderful of his works, —only a little lower than the angels. Can there be any doubt that God loves an object on which he has been so lavish of his power, wisdom and goodness?

2. But sin, you assume, has made a sad change in your character, and consequently in your relations to God. And there is the ground of the question, "How can he love me?" But at this very point you are met by the most decided and most affecting testimony of his love that could possibly be given. He had the whole of your unworthiness in his sight, and ten thousand fold more than you have ever seen, when he did it in reference to this very sinfulness of yours, which has astonished the universe. All the sons of God shouted for joy when creative power proclaimed his glory; but a thousand fold sweeter their song over the work of Redemption:

"Great to create, greater to redeem."

God's gift of his Son, as an atoning sacrifice for your sins, has laid you under the highest possible obligation to believe in a love for you which creative power never has displayed. You are sinful, but that very fact has attracted the Infinite One toward you, and brought him into the most close and endearing of all possible relations to you.

How can he love me? But he has loved you. For there stands the cross, with the suffering Saviour upon it, a testimony of love to you greater than which you have no conception.

Did the idiocy and helpless dependence of that child alienate the mother's love. And is it too much to say that the pitiful condition to which sin has reduced us causes a more affecting demonstration of God's love for us than any other condition of ours could

have done? Was it not a sinful world that God "so loved," and sinful and not sinless men for whom he has displayed the wonders of atoning mercy?

Never again, in doubt and unbelief, allow the thought or use the language, "How can God love me!" Say rather, and with the whole consenting soul, "How can I help loving him!"—*New York Observer*.

## "THE INIQUITIES OF THE FATHERS."

BY REV. T. D. WITHERSPOON, D. D.

During a season of religious awakening a case of peculiar interest presented itself.—A young lady called at my study in deep distress. As she was not a member of my congregation, and her pastor was a man universally esteemed and beloved, I wondered that she should come to consult a comparative stranger. The mystery was soon solved only to give place to another. She had come because she loved her own pastor so much that she could not bring herself to make a confession which she knew would grieve and horrify him. But what was this confession? She had supposed it would be a less difficult task to communicate to me, but her courage failed her. It was some terrible sin, at the very thought of which she shuddered, but the nature of which her lips refused to tell.

Some time passed in fruitless efforts to secure from her the confession which she had come to make, and her agony seemed every moment to increase. At length I took my Bible and, opening to the twentieth chapter of Exodus, asked her to place her finger upon the commandment she had broken. Slowly and with a great struggle she lifted her finger and placed it upon the words, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Knowing her gentle birth, her pious parentage, her religious training, and the refined society in which she moved, I was amazed, and inquired how it could possibly be.

The silence was now broken, and she told me all. She did not, indeed, utter profanity with her lips, but her mind was filled with horrid oaths; oaths, which, as she protested, she had never heard from human lips, and which, therefore, could only originate with herself; oaths too horrible to be repeated, and yet obtruding themselves upon her even in the midst of her devotions, until her soul seemed to be but a depository of the most blasphemous and revolting formulas of profane swearing. She had heard oaths at times, but never such as those which were constantly coming into her mind. How did they originate? By what strange law of association were they constructed? Must there not be some demoniacal possession to account for them?

Long did this distressing state of mind continue, and even after it was gone, and peace and relief were found at the cross, there remained the unsolved mystery, Whence came these horrid oaths that so polluted and haunted the soul of this gentle and pure-minded woman?

Time rolled on, and my mind revolved about the mystery, until, on a certain occasion, some gentlemen were speaking in my presence of the father of this young lady and of his recent decease, when one of them remarked that he had heard many men swear, but had never known any man who could invent such strange and awful oaths, and utter them with such terrific emphasis, as did this man in his earlier and irregular days. To my readers must be left the connection between this extraordinary profanity of the father, and the terrible visitation in after years upon his lovely and accomplished daughter. Had she heard him use these oaths in her infancy and before his conversion, when he conceived that she was too young to remember them, or had this tendency to profanity been transmitted as an hereditary taint, just as the thirst for ardent spirits, or the love of money, or any other base passion, is transmitted? I only state the facts. I base no theory upon them, but I find in them, however explained, a startling fulfillment of the Scripture threat that "the iniquities of the fathers shall be visited upon the children," and I find in them a solemn admonition to parents to guard with the utmost care lives which are not only full of solemn responsibility as regards themselves, but momentous in their influence for good or ill upon their children.—*Christian Weekly*.

## Singing the 104th Psalm.

A story, if you please. Nearly three-fourths of my college class entered the ministry of the gospel. One of them, now over eighty years of age, has spent most of his ministerial life in frontier work, on an average salary of \$400 a year, and has consequently no trouble about real estate, or bonds and mortgages. He owns the roof that covers his head, surrounding ground enough to raise his own vegetables, and the privilege of preaching gratuitous sermons as a supply for absent pastors, or a free-will offering to the destitute. So he is rich and happy as a lark; but on examining his pantry and wardrobe the other day he found the bottom of both flour-barrel and tea-caddy inconveniently low; and the lark's feathers too decidedly thin for winter comfort.

So he called his old help-meet, as he had done a hundred times before, to a family conference. What shall we do? Our income all told is less than one hundred dollars a year. The Presbyterian Ministerial Relief Fund is as low as our flour-barrel; then there is so many that need help more than ourselves.

But this we can do: write an old classmate, who has himself endured hardness as a good soldier in frontier life; who can give

genuine sympathy if he can't furnish cash; and who may remind some one of the Lord's stewards of the double blessedness of sending us a suit of clothes.

The conference closed with prayer. The letter was written and duly received. It was put into the hands of a son of another old classmate, who with his family, at once responded with a bank check for two hundred dollars!

And here is a letter of acknowledgment, brimful of surprise and gratitude, from that old minister and wife in their Iowa home.—Clothing and comforts and cheer for both!

When the letter left them they were exercising their voices, and hearts, and souls on the *One hundred and fourth Psalm*; and it will not be strange if their New York benefactors, together with their old college mate, join them in singing that blessed song longer than the coming Winter lasts! S. J.

## THE REV. WILLIAM ARNOT.

Mr. Arnot—who would not be called "Doctor"—was well known on this side of the Atlantic as both preacher and writer, even before he won all hearts which felt the influence of his face and voice at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, in 1873. He was one of a brilliant galaxy of Edinburgh pulpits. They were scarcely less distinguished in literature than in theology, but especially were they remarkable for an uncommon lustre and freshness and vigor of thought, and for a happiness of methods in dealing with the social and religious difficulties of their time and day. From the interesting circumstances under which each of them obtained an education; from the motives which, after keen self-examination, finally impelled them to enter on the work of the ministry which they so splendidly adorned; and from the special interest that gathers round them, owing to the parts they took in the trying ordeal of the disruption of the Scottish Church,—they were more than any other like number of Scotch theologians who could be named, peculiarly and strikingly representative of the best and most strongly elements in the Scotch national character. They were of the class of men who, as if by magic, can gather half a nation into a powerful religious organization; and it must be remembered that, although the Scotch are, perhaps, as a people, more interested in religious matters than any other people in the world, the Scotch head is one of the hardest to move out of its beaten tracks in religion or philosophy. And, finally, they were all the truest, most earnest friends of the working-man, and the ruthless exhortors of moderation of every kind.

They are all dead now—except Professor Blaikie. First, there was Candlish, the sinewy, agile dialectician, the profound exegetical divine. He was a little, wizened, shyness-looking man, with a tremendous forehead; but insignificant-looking as he was, he was the Bismarck of the Free Church. Then there was Hanna,—author of "Heaven our Home," and of a "Life of Christ" and biography of his father-in-law, Chalmers,—the direct opposite of Candlish in externals. He was a pale, spiritual-looking man, with a rather weak voice, but with a calm, sweet style and ethereality of thought that drew to him one of the most refined congregations in the city. Guthrie, the humanitarian and eloquent preacher, then, too, stooped in his strange, ungainly way over a dense array of faces which he could at any moment electricity. Oswald Dykes, the fervent, rapid rhetorician and earnest Christian worker drew his crowds easily. Dean Ramsay, (the only one of the brilliant number not of the Free Church), the antiquarian, and author of the excellent "Reminiscences of Scotch Life and Character," an enthusiastic nationalist, but as enthusiastic an evangelical Christian minister, led the brilliant St. John's congregation, a stone-throw from Candlish's ever-open church. And Arnot, the practical preacher, who was so full of the love of nature that he frequently took his text from what he had met with in his walks, seemed, with his florid complexion, jocular expression, and manly, well-developed frame, to bring into his church with him a breath of fresh, country air, and a blink of sunshine, whenever he entered his pulpit. He was, perhaps, the best loved of all, and drew the greatest numbers of promiscuous, never-go-to-church visitors, to his popular evening services, which were particularly fresh, hearty, and captivating. He had the knack—quite common among Scotch clergymen—of dropping his sermon or lecture into what we understand in America as a "talk" and a manner of illustration so apt and pleasant that the sermon often transferred itself in its entirety to the hearer's memory. He seemed to take more pleasure in American society, where form and ceremony are less studied than in similar company at home.—The call for speeches, which is so frequent here, did not embarrass him, but was always responded to heartily and pleasantly.—S. S. Times.

## What I Can do for the Church.

1. I can give my whole heart to God by faith in Jesus Christ, and thus secure a special blessing for myself and for the church of which I am a member.

2. I can set my brethren a good example, and so help them to grow in grace, and that will be a blessing to the church.

3. I can, through faith, be courageous and cheerful, and thereby strengthen and encourage the church in its heroic work.

4. I can pray for the prosperity of the church, and God hears the prayer of faith.

5. I can, by a godly life, illustrate to the world the saving power of the gospel, and thereby lead souls to Christ.

6. I can induce others to attend the divine services with me.

7. I can give part of my earnings for the support of the church.

8. I can induce others to attend the divine services with me.

9. I can give part of my earnings for the support of the church.

## THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES ASSEMBLED AT SHANGHAI, MAY 10-24, 1877.

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS.

## ON THE DIVISION OF THE FIELD OF LABOR.

1. Without seeking to interfere with the freedom of individual missionaries, or the action of any society, they recommend that the grand oneness of the Christian Church in spirit and in aim, should be ever before the minds of all, and that nothing should be done which would in any way originate or perpetuate the idea of strife or dissension among us, in the minds of the Chinese people.

2. That therefore the missionaries of the different churches residing in the same region should arrange to carry on their labors, as far as possible, in different localities.

3. That in the case of sickness or absence, or on other occasions calling for assistance, missionaries should supply each others' need, and thus by mutual help seek to indicate the great truth that they are brethren in Christ Jesus, and fellow-workers in the same great undertaking.

4. That, wherever it is practicable, missionaries should deliberate together, and combine in carrying on schools of all kinds, seminaries for students, dispensaries, hospitals, and such like; that, with our limited forces, the highest possible result may be attained.

5. That in the event of societies not hitherto represented entering the field, they be recommended to occupy one or other of the newly opened ports, or one of the provinces as yet unoccupied.

ON OPIUM.

1. That opium-smoking is a vice highly injurious, physically, morally and socially.

2. That the opium trade, though now no longer contraband, is deeply injurious, not only to China, but also to India, to Great Britain, and to the other countries engaged in it; and especially that both from its present history, and its present enormous extent, producing suspicion and dislike in the minds of the Chinese, it is a most formidable obstacle to the cause of Christianity; and it is the earnest desire of this Conference that the trade may be speedily suppressed, except so far as it is necessary to supply the strictly medicinal use of the drug.

3. That while fully aware of the serious commercial and financial difficulties in the way of abolishing the trade, and not venturing to give any opinion as to the means by which these may be obviated, it is the solemn conviction of this Conference that in this case, as always, "nothing which is morally wrong can be politically right."

4. That in addition to the dissemination of strictly accurate information, the Conference believes that the labors of those in Great Britain opposed to the opium trade may at present be most practically and beneficially directed towards the effort to sever the direct connection of the Indian Government with the growth, manufacture and sale of opium; and to oppose any attempt to obstruct the action of the Chinese government in all lawful endeavors to regulate, restrict or suppress opium-smoking and the opium trade in China.

5. Finally, this Conference urgently appeals to all the churches of Christendom to pray fervently to God that He may prosper the means used, so that this great evil may speedily come to an end, and to make their voices heard in clear and earnest tones, so as to reach the ear, and awaken the conscience of England, and of all other Christian people and governments.

S. L. BALDWIN,  
JOHN BUTLER,  
Secretaries.

## The Feast of the Pharisee.

BY REV. MR. TREDD.

We may indeed wonder why one of the chief Pharisees invites Jesus, and that He accepts. The Pharisee does not invite the Great Teacher to be instructed by Him, nor for the sake of reaping honor from the distinguished Guest. Jesus is on His last journey to Jerusalem. What the Pharisee has planned hitherto, history informs us. It is cunning which is made use of in this instance, and the Sabbath day is taken. The guests are assembled. They are, as each other, no doubt, on the probability of the dreaded Nazarene's coming to the feast. He really has come. He wishes to meet people, and loses no proper occasion. The Pharisee has ordered a man with the dropsy to be present, not as a guest, but as a trap. If the Lord heals him on the Sabbath, they have won the game.—"If He does not heal him, they are ready to say: 'He cannot.' The play is about to begin. The parts are properly assigned.—The question of the Lord, 'Is it lawful?' breaks up the whole play! Their cunning is seen through—falsehood and truth, deception and sincerity, hypocrisy and the penetrating Eye of Heaven met here. 'He knew what was in man.'

Wickedness here sets traps. It lays hold on sacred things even—the rite of hospitality which is respected by barbarous people, and the day of the Lord is seized upon. Outward keeping of the law and inner godliness often are seen together. Wickedness also uses the poor sick man. He is a tool of its malice. Malignity shudders at no deed.—But the simple yet powerful words, "Is it lawful?" overcomes them. If they say yes,—or if they answer no; in either case they will be truly confounded. Truly, the cause of Christ's enemies is in a sad plight.

In the pride of the self-righteous, cunning and wickedness are essential elements. It was this pride that shut the door of the Pharisee's heart to the Lord. This high-mindedness is afterward censured by the Lord, when He put forth a parable concerning such as choose out the upper seats at entertainments. He censures pride by His own humility. In exercise of this humility, He does not think of Himself as personally slighted—His whole life is a