

CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN

Whole No. 644.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1877.

Vol. 13.—No. 20.

DISCOURAGEMENTS.

Discouraged, little maiden,
Because your sun is hard?
A merry heart makes life as smile,
They mock your sadness all this while,
With sunny face and purpose strong,
The answer'll come e'er long.

Discouraged, anxious mother?
The child must be a child.
Serious thoughts will come with years;
With hopeful sea instead of tears
Sow good seed e'er youth be gone;
The reaping comes anon.

Discouraged, weary teacher?
Call you your labor vain?
The little ham is that restless play,
And rise before you day by day,
In life's stern school may bear brave part;
O weary one, take heart!

Discouraged, faithful pastor?
Hast toiled and waited long?
Thou hast not known the flames divine
Kindled in hearts by words of thine;
Waiting is weary, but—the crown!
Bave soul, be not cast down!

Discouraged, Christian soldier,
Because the fight goes hard?
The more the need of your strong arm.
Up! bravely sound the loud alarm!
The watchword is, "eternal life!"
On, to the mortal strife!"

Zion's Herald.

REMINISCENCES OF PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS.

BY AN OCTOGENARIAN.
No. 22.
JOHN B. ROMEYN.

Dr. John B. Romeyn was long the pastor of Cedar Street church in New York city. He was a native of one of the counties appertaining to the Empire State. He told me in his own dwelling; but we cannot recollect its name at this distance of time. Wellington said he forgot something at Waterloo which he ought to have remembered. It is not important whether it were Orange or Westchester. We like Orange county in Virginia, but we should like it better if the people would change its Court House name to Orangeville.

Dr. Romeyn paid several visits to Princeton during my stay at that seat of the Muses. But as the end of the week approached he would hurry back to his charge. For this reason the writer never heard him officiate at Princeton. But spending one of our vacations in New York, my lodgings were very near his church. This was something of a temptation to hear so eloquent and evangelical a divine. He read his discourses, but he had such an acquaintance with the manuscript, that his face was everywhere over his large congregation. He was brisk in all his movements, and rapid in his elocution. His prayers were truly fervent. He seemed a wrestler at the mercy seat. One of his discourses made such an impression on my mind, that it can never be forgotten. There had been an inundation in New England, which in its destructiveness was equal to an Alpine avalanche. The following words from Amos were the text of the sermon, "Seek Him that maketh the seven stars and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night—that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth—the Lord is his name. This discourse may be found in the two volumes of his published sermons. The writer subsequently prepared a discourse from the same words, but without committing the sin of Plagiarism.

We cannot certify to the truth of the following statement, to wit, that politics were not without some influence in organizing the Cedar Street church. The statement may go for what it is worth. Party spirit in New York was at its flood tide. The Federalists were jealous of their rights. We once heard Dr. Miller say, that he preached from these words, "Yet all of these things availeth me nothing, so long as I see Mordecai the Jew, sitting at the king's gate." The people thought that Jefferson was the Jew, and John Adams the Amalekite, when such a thought had never entered his head. He was diverted at the bare suggestion. But Dr. Romeyn soon quelled the commotion by his introductory sermon in Cedar Street church, grounded on the declaration, "God forbid that I should know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Dr. Miller uttered his views, for he pronounced the reply of Webster to Senator Hayne a perfect Euclidian demonstration of the American Government. But Bledsoe has forever settled that question in his comments on the statements of the Massachusetts Senator. He has rent them to pieces with as much ease as Samson would have rent a lion or a kid. We do not agree with Bledsoe in his speculations about the human will, but his reasoning on the nature of our constitution is irresistible. After reading his answer to the question, "Is Davis a traitor?" any one who applies to him that ignominious term sins not against the derived light of moon and stars, but against the meridian splendor of the sun.

Dr. Romeyn was associated with Dr. Mason, as joint editor in conducting the *Christian's Magazine*. My immediate progenitor took that work, and always hailed its arrival with pleasure. It contained no crochets or platitudes. The editors were agreed in all their doctrinal views. Its articles were full of good sense, expressed in a style plain but forcible, and always to the point. It did not excite interest by wooden pictures, and puerile illustrations combined with empty reading; but in able discussions on a variety of important subjects. It did justice to Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart the burnt martyrs, and to Covenanters who were shot down in platoons on the moors of Scotland. It placed in striking contrast the demise of

Hume played off by his affected merriment, and embellished by the prismatic glass of Adam Smith, with the heavenly death of Finley in the midst of hovering angels who conveyed his spirit to the great white throne. It defended the purity of the Presbyterian clergy against all the conceits of sacerdotalism, the genuflections of Ritualism, and the manufactured pretensions of a ministry to apostolical succession. This last subject is made perfectly plain in the Bible. The four and twenty elders in the fourth chapter of Revelation represent the adoration of the Jewish and Christian Church. The worshippers were Presbyters. But they were called Patriarchs and Apostles. These were their Jewish and world names; but then their church office was that of Presbyters. The world has given name to the Reformers who were Presbyters. Suppose twelve of these Reformers perform an ordination, do they make a Reformer or a Presbyter? The latter beyond a doubt. We have had fathers of the Church who were Presbyters. Let them ordain. Do they make fathers? Fathers would be their world name, which they have no right to transmit. And Apostles had no right to transmit their world name, but their Church title of Presbyters. There fore when Apostles ordained, they made Presbyters and Bishops which are convertible terms. It may be objected that Patriarch was not a world title. This arose from the local nature of the Jewish Church.— Their title was that of elders, but after the dispersion of the Jews, this became a mere invention of Jewish ecclesiastics. This course of remark might be continued at length but space forbids.

The health of Dr. Romeyn became seriously impaired. His devoted people believed that a sea voyage might be of advantage.— He embarked at New York, probably bound to Liverpool on the Mersey. Dr. Raffles, of that city, was always attentive to American ministers. It was the residence of Roscoe, Mrs. Hemans, and Sir Stamford Raffles.— Literature has thrown a portion of its charms over the adjacent cottages occupied by these distinguished persons. Our traveler of course made for London, a much larger city than it was when Cowper celebrated the famous ride of John Gilpin. He saw Westminster Abbey where Chaucer and Spenser sleep, with a host of others who have handled the lute of poetry, the pen of history, the astrolabe of Astronomy and the mace of power. But we cannot follow this eminent divine in all his locomotives. Americans have become familiar with foreign lands, and the advice of Lord Bacon, in his chapter on travel, has been strictly followed. A repetition of these things would be needless.

Dr. Romeyn visited the grave of D. D. Dodge, in the Protestant ground of Lisbon. We wonder that his remains were not borne to Northampton, that he might sleep among a people he loved so well. On his return he visited Princeton. One of the Seminary students was too late at one of our debates. Called on for his excuse, he replied that "the conversation of Dr. Romeyn about Lisbon and Doddridge was so interesting that he could not get away." The excuse was not sustained. This was being rigid over-much for who would not excuse a man for lingering where a divine was talking about Doddridge taking his rest among Jews, Papists and muleteers, soothed by the murmurs of the Tagus. Dr. Romeyn, after a few more years of health, died in the triumphs of the faith, and went to be ever with the Lord.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

BY REV. H. H. HAWES.

No. 5.

As we have intimated, if Christ was not duly consecrated to the Priesthood, He was a lawless intruder. This, Immersionists would make him by their denial of His consecration. Of course we cannot accept such a reproachful idea. We hold that Christ was, in all points, *law abiding*. If He entered upon the duties of the priest's office, He must be consecrated. We have shown (in No. 3) that this was done; and that "baptism by John, was one part of that consecration." To this doctrine we hold, not to be "exempt from obligation to follow his example," as has been charged upon us, by immersionists; but because we see it clearly in the Bible. But if it can be shown from the Bible, that "Jesus was baptized as an example to us"—there is no true Christian in all our ranks, who will not gladly follow His steps. And if it can be shown in addition, that He was put under the water, we will gladly go there too. It would be no hardship—certainly not so great a trial as to make us dodge and ignore sacred duty to Christ, if it could be shown to be such. We do intend to follow our Lord where He leads! But we do not propose to follow where ignorant and careless readers of the Bible would lead us! Therefore when we are exhorted to "fulfill all righteousness, as Jesus did, by following Him into the liquid grave,"—we cannot consent to do so. Doctrines are rather mixed, and Scripture handled rather loosely in such an exhortation.— What is there so strange in our faith that Christ came and was consecrated according to law, as Priest? The Bible is full of this very doctrine, from David to Paul. And so far from finding an objection in the fact, that Christ was of the tribe of Judah, and not of the tribe of Levi, we find in this a special reason for His consecration. David taught (as already shown) that He would not come from the tribe of Levi. Paul says also, Heb. vi: 14, "For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood." It was all the more necessary therefore that the

law of consecration should be rigidly observed. The Aaronic priesthood had been inducted into office, and so stood (Exodus xl: 15) throughout all "their generations." The law for the Aaronic priesthood excluded all except certain members of the tribe of Levi. Therefore it so excluded Christ that He could not be a member of that priesthood. But if God changed the law, so as to abolish the Aaronic priesthood, and substitute the tribe of Judah for that of Levi, is not this right? It is most arrant presumption to find fault with this ordaining of God. But as the Aaronic priesthood was inducted to office by special consecration, so must be the case with its successor. Else that successor would be an unauthorized and illegal priesthood. This is not only according to reason, but it is entirely and truly Scriptural. So Paul teaches, Heb. vii: 18, "For there is, (in consequence of the appointment of a Priest after the order of Melchisedec, and from another tribe) verily a disannulling of the commandment going before (the law, confining priesthood to Levi) (because of the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." It never did a finished work. It never made any one perfect by its feasts, priests, altar and sacrifices. And it only stood as the type of the coming priesthood of Christ. Neither of Aaron, nor of any of his eighty three successors (as the Jews reckoned to the destruction of the temple) could the words of Heb. vii: 26, be spoken:—"For such an high Priest became us, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." Christ is then pre-eminently the High Priest. As He was superior to Aaron, so He had a superior anointing. Aaron was anointed with oil.— Christ was anointed of God, with the Holy Ghost and with power. Aaron had successors in the line of sinful men. Christ is a priest forever, and has no successor. "He ever liveth to make intercession for us in heaven—the true Holy of holies. And so the apostle argues, Heb. viii: 4, "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests which offer gifts according to the law" of the Levitical priesthood. By this law, if Christ were an earthly priest, He could not be recognized nor admitted to office. "For there were priests of the order of Aaron ordained to do all that service. Jesus Christ was, by the express terms of that law excluded from it." But (vii: 12) when the oath of God (Ps. ex: 4) changed the priesthood from Levi to Judah, the law, which allowed no priest except from Levi, was "of necessity" changed also.— Thus Christ came in strictly according to regular law. And thus the "catch" questions of the objector, mentioned in the preceding article, come to naught. They may catch and deceive the unwary and ignorant. But it is a shame upon any careful reader of the Bible to be misled by them. More is yet to be said.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

The grand work of Dr. Philip Schaff on "The Creeds of Christendom," which has been lately published, throws the clear light of learning, and profound and pious disquisition on many subjects of deep interest. On none will its aid be more welcome than on the claim of infallibility authority in matters of faith and morals, declared to belong to the Pope of Rome, by the Vatican Council of 1870. We propose to give a brief summary.

The Romish Church has always claimed for itself this infallibility. But in what department of the Church it inhered had been a subject of keen debate up to 1870. Some faithful Romanists held that only a General or Ecumenical Council of the Church was infallible, others held that the Pope alone as the Vicar of God, on earth, could not err about matters of faith and duty, while others held that both the Council and the Pope were bound to unite, and to agree, in order to the exercise of this mysterious and divine power.

The present Pope, Pius the Ninth, has been constantly growing in his views of the exalted functions of his office, and it is singular that just in proportion as the world of Christendom has grown in liberal intelligence, and in every element which would laugh to scorn any such claim, the Pope and his obsequious worshippers have stolidly claimed a right which, if recognized, would reduce every monarch to the condition of a vassal to an Italian Ecclesiastic, and every man to a state of religious slavery.

Harried on by his blind ambition and zeal, the Pope disregarded the mutterings of the storm which Italian patriotism had already raised around him, and began to take measures for calling a General Council, of which the chief purpose was to announce authoritatively the dogma of Papal infallibility.

He first intimated this purpose June 26th, 1867, (said to be the day of St. Peter's martyrdom), and the servile Bishops having received the intimation with due humility, and predicted that, in this time of extreme danger, it would bring a new splendor to the Church, the Pope on the 29th of June, 1868, issued his Encyclical letter convening the Council.

By a very ingenious but equally insidious and suicidal policy, the Pope for this grand occasion issued two special letters bearing date September 8th, and September 18th, 1868, by which he invited the high dignitaries of the Greek Church, and of the Protestant Churches, to send delegates to the Council for the purpose of signifying their return to "the only sheep-fold of Christ" (ad unicum Christi ovile) "for the salvation of their souls." The Eastern Patriarchs spurned the invitation as an insult to their time-honored rights and traditions, and the Protestant

communions ignored or respectfully declined it. Dr. Cumming, of London, signified a willingness to attend if the Pope would allow a discussion of the reasons for the separation from Rome, but was informed by His Popish Highness through Archbishop Manning that such discussions could not be allowed. Thus the Council was confined to the Roman Catholic Church, and was therefore not Ecumenical any more than was the Council of Trent.

It assembled at the Vatican on the 8th of December, 1869. The ringing of bells and the thunder of cannon from St. Angelo, were the human manifestations of welcome; frowning skies and a furious rain storm were the tokens from heaven. During its deliberations as many as 764 prelates of all classes attended, but on the fatal July 18, 1870, the number had dwindled down to 585, and afterwards continued to decrease until barely 180 saw its closing session.

The discussions were all in the Latin language, and were, as far as possible, kept secret, but enough leaked out to show that all was not harmonious within. On the evening of the 13th of July, 1870, the minority in the Council who were opposed to the dogma of Papal infallibility, sent a deputation to the Pope to remonstrate. This minority embraced a large number of prelates distinguished for learning and ability, such as Schwarzenberg, Cardinal Prince-Archbishop of Prague; Rauscher, of the same rank from Vienna; Darboy, Archbishop of Paris; Mathieu, of Besancon; Ginoulhiac, Archbishop of Lyons; Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans; Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence; Strossmayer, Bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium; Conolly, Archbishop of Halifax in America; Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, and others equally distinguished.

The deputation called on His Holiness, and with earnest entreaties implored him to advocate some modification of the decree.— They asked only that his infallibility should be limited to those decisions which he should pronounce "invisus testimonio ecclesiarum"—supported by the testimony of the Church.— The Pope was obstinate and claimed that the whole Church had always believed in the unconditional infallibility of his Head. Then the Bishop of Mayence threw himself on his knees before the holy Father, and implored him to make some concession for the peace and unity of the Church. All was vain: Manning, Archbishop of England, and Senestrey, Bishop of Regensburg, held up the tottering firmness of the Pope by the threat that if he made any concession he would be disgraced in history!

Finding their opposition vain, fifty-six prelates sent a protest to the Pope and left Rome. On the evening of the same day they were followed by sixty other members. Had these one hundred and sixteen men been firm, they could have by themselves, deprived the decree of all pretence to Ecumenical authority. For it would have been wanting in the test acknowledged by Rome herself in the celebrated canon of faith, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est"—What always, what everywhere, what by all has been believed."

On the memorable 18th of July, 1870, only five hundred and thirty-five members remained and these all voted for the decree except two, viz.: Bishop Ricio, of Sicily, and Bishop Fitzgerald, of Little Rock, Arkansas. They had the courage to vote "Non placet—It does not please." After the vote they declared their submission. Thus was established the final dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, to wit: that the Roman Pontiff when speaking from his chair (ex cathedra) to the Christian world on subjects relating to faith or morals, is infallible, and that such decrees are in themselves and not in consequence of the consent of the Church, final and irresistible. This is a faithful version of the Latin decree.

At the time when the votes were taken, a fearful storm of thunder and lightning shook the Vatican palace, so that, in the words of a spectator, "Every placet seemed to be announced by a flash and terminated by a clap of thunder." So gloomy and portentous was the darkness that when the decree was passed and carried to the Pope that he might announce it, he was unable to read it, and a servant was called to hold a lighted candle by his face that he might announce "his own investment with the attributes of God!"

The day after the decree was announced, Napoleon III., of France, the ally and supporter of the Pope, opened that war with Protestant Germany which in a few months resulted in the overthrow of the French armies and Empire, and the establishment of a Protestant Sovereign as the leader of Europe. And within a time so short that the Council had not adjourned, King Victor Emanuel entered Rome with his armies, and the temporal power of the Pontiff vanished. "His own subjects forsook him, and almost unanimously voted for a new sovereign whom he had excommunicated as the worst enemy of the Church."

The declaration of this dogma, claiming infallibility for a feeble and sinful man, was literally the "passing of the Rubicon" for the Church of Rome. Henceforth the Pope is the enemy of all civil and religious liberty, and the enemy of every man and woman, everywhere on earth, who values these blessings. Obsequious Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Jesuits may submit to and seek to uphold this insolent claim, but its announcement has struck the Papacy a blow from which it will not recover.

H. R.
A firm persuasion that we are in the true way to heaven, will be the best motive to stand fast and persevere therein.

OUR ENEMIES, AND OUR DEPORTMENT.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

My Dear Sir,—You have asked the views of an old friend upon a very important subject. The following reflections about our enemies and our own deportment are penned to you as they arise. But the substance of them, long entertained, is believed to be agreeable to the Word of God, and the spirit of a sound mind.

If I have an enemy, he may only hate me, or he may both hate me and have done or attempted to do my name, or myself a wrong. The wrong, injury, indignity, dishonor, is but the outward manifestation or fruit of his hate. Veracity is, I suppose, the most precious element of character. They, therefore, who assault one's character for truth, or, which is the same, by their public course question it and abandon confidence in it, are chargeable with grave wrong to that one, if he be a man of truth, or a man whose veracity in the matter questioned is sustained by recognized facts. Let this be a case; then, towards all such persons, *What should be my conduct?*

Paul, in his large experience in such and greater sufferings, says, "Be courteous to all men." If one strives daily to dwell in God, and to be filled with the company of His presence, such things will not move him much, except with pity. From that height one can look down serenely upon an enemy, with an eye of compassionate dignity, thinking sorrowfully of the evil disposition, of hate, of envy, which is capable of doing its possessor far more harm than it can ever do him; and so finds it no hardship to be courteous at all times.

Courtesy, however, is not cordiality. It is friendly notice and a return of civilities, in which eyes of love look out from a face of dignified reserve. Such a person, (or society of persons, if it be an organized society which has by his own course cut himself off from right to expect your cordial intimacy, and association. Every man chooses his company. He chooses those whom he believes to be friends, and avoids such as are doubtful.— Mutual respect, love, congeniality determines our fellowship both in this world, and in that which is to come. A sense of propriety and self-respect restrains one from putting himself forward intimately where he has reason to believe he is not loved, respected, believed in. Besides, it would be discourteous to do so,—disrespectful to your enemy and his feelings.

In regard to those circumstances in which one not only may, but ought to minister good to an enemy, good sense with heavenly-mindedness can alone dictate as to time and place, and the manner of its performance. If it be in his time of trouble, let the offer be suggested by some natural want which his immediate friends can not so well supply as yourself. Otherwise instead of accomplishing good, the act may be taken as a public exhibition of your superior charity. And then let it be modestly offered without great show of regard, as if half doubting its reception, and as privately as possible, lest your kindness be too much at first for him either to heartily accept, or to reciprocate. Gradually he may learn from reserved profers of your good will to appreciate them and bear more. Thus coals of fire are heaped upon his head, i. e., his hate is put to trouble.— But sudden, profuse, ostentatious displays disgust a weak palate.

I have observed that these profuse demonstrations in talk and movements come commonly from the party which has committed the wrong, which is finally disturbed in conscience about it, and being too proud and ignoble to make a clean breast by retracting and disapproving the steps taken, which could be done in a few plain words, such as, "I was mistaken," and conscious that they are not pursuing the right road to friendship, feel that they can make up for it in excessive wordiness of another kind.

And I believe it to be true that such persons generally are less troubled about the wrong their course was calculated to do, and would have done had their efforts been successful, than about public condemnation. The heart may not be much in love with you after all. Their demonstrations may proceed less from love of you, than from love of themselves. The approval of the public for consistency as professing Christians may become the dominant motive, and in its eager pursuit every other feeling, even hate itself, is temporarily obscured.

Men often fear punishment more that they love God and hate evil; and thus results formalism, which is more contemptible than open enmity. A true enemy is better than a false friend.

All such things, however, though sometimes trying to the Christian, he must school himself to regard with patience and compassion. He can only do so when occupying his high plane of motion,—the heavenly orbit. Without questioning the motives of an enemy's conduct, charitably considering them if not unmistakably revealed, he must reciprocate kindly sentiments expressed, civilities extended, and calls of courtesy made. This may seem to you as mere skimming, while the foundations are wrong. Well, be it so; but duty requires it. And the sense of the apparent inconsistency of an enemy to a truth-loving, sincere, and sensitive nature of times makes it a very unpleasant duty. Remember only, "Be courteous to all men." Not cordial, forward, or bearing yourself with levity or pleasantry, which would be inconsistent in you with the reserve proper in the presence of those who refrain from giving you the best evidence they possess that they have again become friends of your good name. The best evidence that an enemy is

unchanged, is that his record against you is suffered to remain unchanged, when it is within his power to rectify it.
(TO BE CONCLUDED.)

A BURIAL.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

In town there is something painful in the rush of vehicles, the noise of the streets, the crowds of careless unsympathizing people, and the hurried return from the grave; but in the country all things seem in sympathy with the closing scene. The very face of nature has a sober look, and all the surroundings are suggestive of solemn and tender thoughts. Late in the fall, the woods no longer re-echo the screams of the blue jay, or resound with the singing of thrush and robin; but the stillness of the forest is now broken only by the dull thud of some choppers axe, or the rustling of the leaves beneath your horse. Even the shout of the plow-boy, scolding at his team, loses its sharpness, and is softened as it comes across the field. And nature's dress is changed to grayer hues. The hills, once brilliant with golden-rod and stick-weed, are now clothed in quiet gray; the frost has touched the leaves and changed their red and yellow to russet brown; the pastures lie bare and naked; and a smoky haze rests over all the landscape, like a veil. In the autumn air, all sights seem mellowed and all sounds subdued.

It was in the evening, when, after a long ride, I reached the farm house; but most of the neighbors had been there all day. The men were sitting in the porch, or standing in groups about the gate; while the women sat in the house where the body was, and talked in low whispers. The coffin had not yet been finished, (such things are badly managed in the country,) and we must wait. But notice the behavior of the people. Observe their serious faces. See how that man is received, who has just arrived. As he passes from group to group, one after another greets him in silence, pressing his hand without a word; thus showing how deeply is felt the solemnity of death.

And now the simple burial service is performed. Solemn words are spoken, for comfort and for warning, and the body is carried to the grave. A few old trees, surrounded by a rotten fence, mark the place of the family burying ground. And here just as the last rays of the sun lit up the pines, and gave warmth and beauty even to the broom-straw fields, he was buried.

When fall of years, the Christian dies, and is gathered to his rest, like the ripple sheaf to the garner, there should be little bitterness and anguish in our grief. The fading leaf, the wilted flower, and the cold rains cast a gloom upon our lives; but we remember the spring, when the earth shall be renewed again; so death, with its painful partings and its horrors of corruption, casts a deep shadow on our hearts; but the darkness is made light by the knowledge of a glorious resurrection. The end of the righteous is not harrowing; it has the quiet serenity of an autumn evening. It is serious and solemn; it is not sad.

But this man was not a Christian. In spite of instruction at his mother's knee; in spite of earnest warnings from pious friends; in spite of all the privileges and associations of a godly neighborhood, he had put off the salvation of his soul. Such a death is harrowing. Even the weeds shall grow again though they were cut down by the frost; but there is no hope in the death of the ungodly. It was very sad—as we turned away in the gathering night, one spoke of how he had loved him from a boy, and another said in faltering tones, "he was always a good neighbor;" but there was no comfort in such words for the depth of this grief. Reader, are you ready for your end? Put it not off.

"Our age is but the falling of a leaf,
A dropping tear,
'Tis not for man to trifle; life is brief,
And sin is here."
J. M. R.

Nobility of Service.

Every true Christian should daily and hourly say to himself: "I am in the world that I may serve." Of serving—the most honorable thing of all,—almost all are not ashamed. Every one desires to rule and enjoy. And this spirit has created a new difficulty in the social process, a sort of modern world problem in the adjustment of the relations of labor and capital.

But the truth is, men of all conditions must learn to regard themselves as servants, else the world cannot stand. A queen who wishes only to rule and not to serve, is not worthy to be entrusted with the care of a people. A bishop who does not take up his office as a service, will not be fit for a door-tender in heaven. The Hohenzollerns on Prussia's throne have become the most honored and mightiest princes on earth, because, for the most part, they really governed in the sense, as Frederick II. expressed it, that "The king is the first servant of the State." That was a language born wholly of the spirit of Christianity. But Louis XIV., of France, built the scaffold for his successors and the whole house of Bourbon, because the soul of his government was this: "I am the State, and it is all for my sake." Whoever will not, in his turn, serve those who serve him, will go under, and as in the small so in the great.

Verily, he has the highest condition on earth who best serves his fellow-men with what he is and has. Napoleon I., once in the street very meekly gave way to a heavily-laden sack-bearer, and in an earnest tone said to his surprised attendants, "Respect the burden!" Yes, if all had felt so, we should now see a very different state of things in the world. Let Christians, then, strive to bring serving on earth to honor again; every one at his post, every one striving up and using the gifts which God has given him for the common good.—*New York Observer, from the German.*

DR. WILSON'S ADDRESS ON FOREIGN MISSIONS AT THE SYNOD OF VA.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

No subject, of more importance to the Church, than Foreign Missions, can claim your attention. The cause in our Church is surrounded now by serious difficulties, out of which, however, the united efforts of all will deliver us. At the beginning of our work as a Church in the foreign field, there were hearty efforts for the prosecution of this work, in our serious embarrassments after the war, which have scarcely a parallel in the history of missions. This work for the heathen had had a most happy reflexive influence upon the Church in the promotion of its spiritual strength and progress. Beginning with the Indians of the West, we soon had missions established in various foreign lands. Young men and women readily offered themselves for the work; and they have learned eight foreign languages in all of which the gospel is preached. This work has met with great favor from the Head of the Church. Every mail brings us accounts of conversions. But there comes also appeals from all these missions for more laborers; and what is the response which this lame hand of mine has had to indicate to these appeals? It has been that the Church has not provided the means to send them, though the laborers are ready to go. We have licensed many ministers to labor at home during the past year, but have not sent one abroad for the great field yet to be supplied, nor to take the place of those who have died, or returned home disabled.— Moreover we are \$7,000 in arrears for the year. At this rate we shall in a few years be without a representative in the foreign field. There is danger of the cause perishing in our hands because we have not piety and spirituality to maintain it. How could we then hold up our faces among our fellow-men? How lift up our eyes to the Mediatorial throne, when we have abandoned the cause for which He sits upon that throne?

But there is no necessity for any such dire calamity. The Church is able to carry on the work, notwithstanding depression. The sum of \$75,000, which is about 75 cents for each communicant, will do the work. This can be done if others will do as liberally as some have done. There are individual churches that have contributed from \$1 to \$6 per member; and Ladies' Societies have given \$3 or \$4 per member, raised by the work of their hands. Sabbath Schools have given in some instances \$1 per scholar. It is only needed that our ministers put this cause upon a proper footing as to its importance; that they present it from their pulpits, circulate the *Missionary*, and give information as to this great work.

The Foreign Missionary work cannot stand still. It must go forward or decline. Though expensive, the Church must, if the work is not to come to naught, sustain it, at least until the foreign churches become self-supporting; and this cannot be hoped for in less than fifty years. If ministers die and others are not sent to take their places, the work which they have done is lost. If we establish schools, and suspend them for a time, it will be both difficult and expensive to revive them again. A few strokes may feel a tree that has required many years to attain its growth. It is expensive to give missionaries their outfit, and to transport them, and furnish them books and tracts for distribution; but Jesus knew that it was expensive when he assigned this work to the Church; and He intended by it to draw out our hearts to Him, and to give us the honor of being co-workers with Him in His earthly kingdom.

The speaker would present briefly some motives which should stimulate the Church in this work. Jesus himself approves the cause. Other Churches, who see and feel the importance of doing their part, are getting far ahead of us. Look at Brazil, India, China, Japan, and Africa. The speaker referred to a recent geographical discovery of Stanley in Central Africa, ascertaining the route of the Congo River. It looks as if this great river, the second in size in the world, was placed there as a great highway for missionaries to reach the thirty million people that live along it and its tributaries in the interior. The venerable speaker would that he were young again that he might bear the gospel into that bright region.

In conclusion he said, we are in great straits; and he hoped every one would lay the matter to heart, and before retiring to rest to-night, press it at the throne of grace, and see what can be done.

THE *Christian at Work*, mindful that it is published in the midst of the Week of Prayer for young men, urges them to earnestly covet two things—intelligence and courage. Under the first it says:

We are in the very midst of a conflict in which all the cardinal points of the faith are assailed. The doctrines of the inspiration of the Scriptures, the sacrificial and vicarious character of the death of Christ, the resurrection of the body, and the eternity of the awards of future punishment, are debated about and denied; and there is a disposition in many quarters to maintain that even the pulpits of the churches should be open to the proclamation of any opinion on these and kindred questions. Now what are our young men doing to meet this state of things? In many instances it is to be feared that they take no interest whatever in such things.— They trifle away their time in pursuits which are at the best only an excuse for idleness; and everything that would lead to reflection or stimulate to thought is voted stupid. The societies which they institute for mutual improvement degenerate too often into mere stages for self display, or apologies for having a good time; and the great books of the world's greatest thinkers lie on the shelf beside the Bible equally unstudied. They say, indeed, that they believe evangelical doctrines, but they hold them in the nerveless grasp of a feeble and traditional faith, and not with the firm grip of a personal conviction. While, therefore, others are praying for our young men, we cry to them to awake and bestir themselves. "Throw away your novels and your light literature and set yourselves to study. You are called to-day to meet the antagonistic forces of unbelief in the subtlest forms which they have ever assumed, and unless you make yourselves familiar with the bulwarks of the faith, you will be silenced, or perhaps you may even capitulate and go over to the enemy. It is not needed simply that you be Christians. The times demand that you should be intelligent Christians, able to give to every one that asks a reason of the hope that is in you, and diligent personal investigation is the price which you must pay for such intelligence."