

THE JEWELS OF THE LORD.

"And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels." MAT. III: 17.

Am I, Lord, indeed Thy jewel?
Chosen, claimed, acknowledged Thine?
In Thy diadem of beauty,
Destined evermore to shine?
I, a stone, so deep imbedded
In the pit and mire clay—
Only Thou wouldst stoop to gather
From the rubbish where I lay!
I Thine own peculiar treasure?
Yet to sparkle in Thy crown,
Whom Thou makes up Thy jewels,
And proclaimest them Thine own?
Rough and shapeless and unpolished,
Canst Thou fit me thus to shine;
And with pure and fadeless lustre,
'E'en reflect Thy light divine?
What is man, O Lord of glory,
Whom Thou dost exalt so high?
And of all Thou deign'st to honor,
Who, O Lord, and what am I?
Least of all Thy creatures lowly,
By the blood of Christ brought nigh,
Let me humbly kneel before Thee,
And Thy grace most magnify.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN UNION?

The divisions of Protestantism have been often charged as its *opprobrium*. No one who is governed by the principles of the Gospel can fail to deplore the bitterness and injustice of Christians towards each other, which have too often attended their unavoidable differences. Every right minded Christian, accordingly, rejoices in the legitimate means for increasing and evincing the spiritual unity of the whole body of God's people. Where this can be done without compromising conscientious convictions, we hail it as an unmingled blessing to our common Zion.

The Utopian dream of the manifestation of the unity of spirit of the whole body of believers in a universal church union is, however, just one of the prevalent whims of our day. The modern, and especially the American mind seems to be prone to such epidemic distempers; and we now see the Christian world, in certain populous parts of this country, morbidly excited with the claim that Protestantism must manifest its Christian unity as Popery does; or else be justly obnoxious to the charge of schism, and remain weak before its thoroughly organized adversary.

That all true followers of a common Lord should be one in aims, in spirit, in affection, no one can doubt. The question is, whether their reduction under a single Church government and name is necessary to this Christian unity. Or, to borrow the current phrase of the day, whether an *organic unity* is necessary therefor.

I readily admit, at the outset, that this conclusion is not unnatural, for those who regard it from a certain point of view. And a wide and intelligent survey of the history of the Church will convince you, that this conviction did actually haunt and pervade the thinking of the Christian world for centuries; and that it was one of the most difficult of tasks to make even the Protestant world unlearn it. Through all the ages of the prelate Fathers, and of Popery, men not unnaturally reasoned thus: "Since there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism," must not the visible Church be one? Christ is its head; the Church is His body. Can one head be united to more than one body, except it be a formation as monstrous as the fabled Cerberus? Is Christ divided? This cannot be. If then any sect exists, it and the body from which it is sundered cannot both be Christ's Church. The original body must say to its severed branch: Inasmuch as you refuse to be one with us, your claim to be a Church of Christ must needs unchurch us. If you are Christ's, we cannot be. If we are Christ's, you must be an anti-Christian body; and so, guilty of the damning sin of schism." Such arguments received obviously a new enforcement, when the patristic doctrine was developed, that the graces of redemption are transmitted only through the Church sacraments, and that these cannot be administered at all, save by the men who hold an unbroken official succession from the Apostles, and their deputies. It was now urged, in addition, that as the one Lord had but one college of Apostles, who held the same office, and acted with the perfect unity of a common inspiration, there was but one line of succession, and one body in which the sacraments carried any vital grace. But as these ordinances were in their regular succession, could not be of the Church.

Now when such reasoners looked back, it was not surprising that they should think they saw full confirmation of their conclusion. The Old Testament Church had been one, in outward form as in principles, throughout the ages of the theocracy. The Church formed by the Apostles had been one; bound together by a certain organic unity, as well as by a common faith and love. The great Ecumenical councils, the glory of the clerical orders, had industriously maintained this outward unity. Their creeds and canons claimed the allegiance, not only of the conduct, but of the heart, from the Indus to the pillars of Hercules; and were rendered into the several tongues of the East and West. To maintain this outward unity was the great object of these pompous and costly assemblages, of all the controversies and persecutions, the anathemas and the laws of patristic ages. And when at length the Bishop of Rome usurped the title of Universal Bishop, and God upon earth, it was chiefly to incorporate this visible unity in one office, for all time. It is

not strange, therefore, that to men whose minds were blinded by a false postulate, the idea of more than one visible Church in one spiritual body, should have seemed a self-evident absurdity.

Even the great Reformation failed to disabuse the minds of many Protestants of this delusion; although the precious principles which were its source should have exploded it at once. The notion that Christian unity could not exist, unless all Protestantism was compressed within one Church government, evidently complicated itself with Luther's most frantic opposition to the Zwinglians. In 1527 the great Swiss Reformer addressed the German leader in a fraternal exposition of their disputes touching the Lord's Supper; sustaining his own views, and criticizing those of Luther temperately; and while he intimated that he and his brethren were not prepared to abandon their conscientious convictions, he cordially offered a similar right to the Lutherans, and proposed that the two should maintain a Christian unity and peace amidst these lesser diversities. Luther's answer was in these words: "Well, since they thus insult all reason, I will give them a *Lutheran warning*. Cursed be this concord! Cursed be this charity! Down, down with it, to the bottomless pit of hell! If I should murder your father, your mother, your child, and then, wishing to murder you, I should say to you: 'Let us be at peace, my dear friend!' what answer would you make? It is thus that the enthusiasts who murder Jesus Christ, my Lord, God the Father, and Christendom my mother, wish to murder me also; and then they say, 'Let us be friends.'" How many inconsistent and scandalous persecutions Protestants have since employed against brother Protestants, in the vain attempt to enforce outward conformity, I need not remind you.

All who hold the Scriptural principles of the Reformation, at least, should have remembered, that Judaism was a religion for one little nation; while Christianity is for all continents and languages. They should have bethought themselves, yet more, that there was a practical agency existing in the Hebrew Church, and in the Apostolic, for preserving an organic unity consistent with fidelity to truth; the presence namely, of the infallible Spirit of Revelation, speaking through the *Urvin and Thummin*, and through the prophets in the one, and through the inspired Apostles in the other. Then indeed there may have been reason for holding, that even a diversity in unity was without excuse; because there was present in the Church an infallible umpire, the spirit of prophecy, to which disputants on any point of theology or Church order, however subordinate, might appeal, and from which they would receive the answer of God himself, which made farther difference inexcusable. But now that the spirit of infallible Revelation is confessedly withdrawn from the Church; and God has seen fit to leave Christendom to the guidance of the Bible alone; enjoining at the same time sincerity of conviction and a sacred respect for the spiritual liberty of every soul from every authority in Divine things save His own; how inevitable, how obvious is it that a diversity in unity must emerge, and must be tolerated? The wish to enforce a universal organic unity deserts the formation principles of the Reformation. Does not Rome prove it? She claims the right to enforce that outward oneness; she holds that it is essential; her system is precisely the legitimate result of the delusion I combat; and she tacitly admits, by the claim of infallibility, that the presence of this gift in the invisible Church, is the only reasonable foundation of uniformity.

But the history of this delusion is especially instructive, as it shows us that its advocates from the first were chiefly led astray by disregarding the Scriptural distinction between the visible and invisible Church.—In the controversies of the early ages against the Montanist, the Novationist, the Donatist sects, as in the pretensions of Rome now, this difference is quietly, but totally omitted. Those Scriptures which do, beyond dispute, teach us that the invisible and spiritual Church of Christ is one, "even as He and the Father are one; that it is His body. His Spouse and Bride; Catholic; i. e., the fulness of Him that filleth all in all; that it is holy; that it is indefeasible; all these Scriptures were quoted as though they applied to one organized, visible body of believers; and hence were drawn the tremendous and false consequences of the damning sin of all formal diversity, the necessity of outward conformity, the propriety of pains and penalties to enforce it. Search and see! It is the same false logic, which inspires this modern furor for *uniformity*.

Now a more attentive inspection of sacred Scripture will show us that the word *Church* (Ecclesia), there bears two meanings, related, but not identical. In its higher, truer sense, the Church is the body of the called of the Holy Spirit, the aggregate of Christ's redeemed and regenerate people. Its bond of union is not outward, but inward; a living faith and love. Its attributes are not the organic forms and canons and offices which man administers, but the graces which the divine Spirits in works in the sanctified soul. As the soul of a man is the true man; so this spiritual company, which cannot be numbered nor bounded by human hands, is the true Church of God. But as the intelligent soul for a time inhabits and uses a body inferior to itself, animal, even material, characterized by dimension and figure; so it is the Divine will that this true Church shall inhabit an outward form, a human society, which it makes the rude and imperfect instrument of its corporate func-

tions. And as we naturally speak of a corpse as a dead *man*, (although, apart from the informing spirit it is no *man*, but a *clod*), so the same word *churches* is also applied to the aggregate of these societies, which the Church universal and spiritual now on earth inhabits. You may remind me that still, as there is this relation, there should be some resemblance between the visible shell, and the spiritual body. I freely concede it. The perfection of any one visible Church, or the perfection of the great aggregate of visible Churches is to approach as near as may be to the qualities of the invisible Church. They cannot possess these qualities, for reasons similar to those which forbid the shell to be the kernel, the body to be the intelligent spirit within it. But they will properly strive towards those attributes, so far as the body may towards the properties of the soul it contains. As the invisible Church is truly holy, the visible will seek, by a Scriptural discipline, to be as holy as its outward nature permits. As the invisible Church is one and catholic, the visible will strive towards the same unity. But as the bond of union in the invisible Church is a common faith and love, and no outward organism, so the unity of the visible Church will evince itself in ties of affection and brotherhood, rather than in external conformity. You will pardon my borrowing from an old book, the following words, which express my meaning better than my own.

I. "The catholic or universal Church which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be, gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."
II. "The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion," &c.
(TO BE CONTINUED.)

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL?

It has been decided by one of the Presbyteries in our Southern Church, that a church session may suspend or excommunicate a member of the church, for a crime which in its nature deserves suspension or excommunication, simply upon the report of a committee; when he has not been tried before the court to which he was amenable, for any offence; and has made no confession in the presence of the court of any crime; but has simply confessed his guilt to the committee appointed to converse with him. Can such an action be taken in consistency with the "constitution" of the Presbyterian Church? It would seem to be only necessary to state the question—and every one acquainted with the present "Canons of Discipline" would, without hesitation, decide it in the negative. But, as has been stated, the question has been virtually decided in the affirmative by one of our Presbyteries. I shall undertake to show that such decision is unconstitutional.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

IS THE WORLD GROWING BETTER?

It often occurs to meditative minds—"is the condition of the world of mankind tending towards the result known as the millennium?" Alas, that there should be so little evidence in the affirmative of this question. Yet I think there is some. It is the impression of this writer that God, whose great idea that future millennium is, will order things so that no human corporation can in anywise claim the glory of that result. No more, I think, will any such claim stand good than that the coming to pass of Christianity itself can be claimed as an achievement of the Pharisees, or of any Temple or Synagogue system whatsoever. I behold with wonder the great events of all the past, and see in them the utter futility of all human wisdom, and of all mere human combinations. They have seemed only to mar and spoil, and so alone to exalt and illustrate the power and wisdom of the great author of the plan of all the ages. God, my friends, is going to do everything he ever said he would do. He will fill the world with his glory. He will reign on earth a thousand years. That fact I know, and that naked fact is almost all I do know.

But to our question. And let us take it— a little at a time. First let us ask this: Is the world any nearer God in 1870 than it was at the beginning of this century? It is the knowledge of God that blesses the world, and that knowledge is deposited in the Scriptures. It was in 1804 that the British and Foreign Bible Society was formed. For our purpose it will do to mark that event as the beginning of a great movement to give the Bible to the people everywhere in their vernacular languages. The great hidden faith, of which that movement was an utterance, has declared itself responsibly in many lands. So that I think there are many millions, to day, of enquiring Bible readers more than there were in the first year of this nineteenth century. Our statistics are inferential only. We hardly believe in mathematics in things divine. But from a movement of this kind, continuous now for almost three quarters of a century, on this great western side of the earth, and in Europe, and in Asia, and in Africa too, we infer that God is getting ready for some great thing which he means to do. There is nothing sensational at all. Pagans, long before Christianity came, had a proverb in which they used to say that, "the mills of the Gods grind slowly." Jehovah made the mineral fuel we are burning, long before he made us who are warming ourselves by it. The same Jehovah who slowly revealed himself in his word, is at last, for some purpose putting his word into the hands of the earth's population.

See also other things that have come in succession in connection with the Bible movement of which we have spoken. From Spitzbergen to the great Capes of the South, and from Kamtskatka to California, what a missionary work is at least begun! And I doubt not it is only begun. Men will "burn incense to their own drag, and sacrifice to their own net," and all this. But Jehovah "is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent," and though it be with terrific admixtures of carnal motive, and though the machinery is stone blind and moving in a way it knows not, yet, nevertheless, it is for some great end, and some ever nearing end, that this wonder-working word of God is getting itself into the languages of the countries, and into the hands of their populations, and, through teaching and preaching expounders, is getting it, however slowly, into the knowledge of the

nations. And even though so much of it be of envy and strife, yet what is it all but Christ marching in a cloud into the countries of the earth, to reveal his great spiritual presence there, when the fulness of his time shall come? It is a little as when, a thousand years before his advent, he took several millions of his nominal people, with his first Scriptures in their possession, and began to disperse them among all the nations. It was to make himself "the desire of all the nations."

The two enterprises we have named, are eminently children of the nineteenth century. Their mention will suggest to intelligent readers a number of other and kindred enterprises. This indeed is a character of movement that marks and distinguishes the century during which we all have lived.— And they are like the sign of a living presence, in the world, of the author of the old promises. And they indicate some advance, on his part, towards the state of things expected by faith in that wondrous millennium.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL?

It has been decided by one of the Presbyteries in our Southern Church, that a church session may suspend or excommunicate a member of the church, for a crime which in its nature deserves suspension or excommunication, simply upon the report of a committee; when he has not been tried before the court to which he was amenable, for any offence; and has made no confession in the presence of the court of any crime; but has simply confessed his guilt to the committee appointed to converse with him. Can such an action be taken in consistency with the "constitution" of the Presbyterian Church? It would seem to be only necessary to state the question—and every one acquainted with the present "Canons of Discipline" would, without hesitation, decide it in the negative. But, as has been stated, the question has been virtually decided in the affirmative by one of our Presbyteries. I shall undertake to show that such decision is unconstitutional.

I. The Constitution makes no provision for a specific rule, for the suspension or excommunication of a church member without judicial process. In the new Book of Church Order, there is a chapter on "cases without process," but even there, there is no authority given to a court to find a person guilty of crime and pronounce sentence against him, *in his absence*. The rule of the new Book secures to the offender, though he be found guilty upon his own confession, "the privilege of being heard." It says, "in cases in which any person . . . comes forward and makes known his offence to the court, a full statement of the facts shall be recorded, and judgment rendered without process, the offender always having the privilege of being heard." Not only is there no constitutional rule for condemning an accused person in his absence from the court and without a judicial trial, but—

II. The requirements of the Old Book forbid the taking of such a course. In the Book of Discipline, chapter iv, entitled, "Of actual process," the first article reads, "when all other means of removing an offence have failed, the judicatory to which cognizance of it properly belongs, shall judicially take it into consideration." What are the other means of removing an offence? They are stated in chapter ii. Will it be said that the suspension or excommunication of a member of the church upon his confession before a committee of his guilt, is a means of removing the offence, though not specifically alluded to in the Book? If so, then the 1st article of chapter iv, would teach the absurd conclusion that when all other means of removing an offence, whether private admonition, affectionate counsel, or suspension upon confession before a committee, have failed, the judicatory "shall judicially take it into consideration." And if the condemnation of a person upon the report of a committee be called a taking of it judicially into consideration, then the *mode of trial* as prescribed in the Book has been violated. It is said in the 2nd article of this 4th chapter, that "there are two modes in which an offence may be brought before a judicatory; either by an individual or individuals who appear as accusers, and undertake to substantiate the charge; or by common fame." And the whole chapter precludes the idea of such a trial as is supposed when the accused has never been present, nor has ever been cited to be present before the court.

III. If a member of the church, thus condemned without trial chooses to appeal to a higher court, he can always appeal upon the just ground of "irregularity in the proceedings of the inferior judicatory." For the Book says that, "An appeal is the removal of a cause already decided from an inferior to a superior judicatory," and that, "all persons who have submitted to a regular trial in an inferior, may appeal to a higher judicatory." Such an appeal might sometimes be taken. An individual might feel himself aggrieved by the action of a court in his case, and believe and affirm that the statement of the committee to the court, upon which he was condemned, was not in every respect the same that which he made to the committee, and that the committee either intentionally or unintentionally mistook his language and his meaning.

IV. If such a course can be taken by a session towards a private member of the church, the Presbytery may take a similar

COURSE TOWARDS A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

V. The General Assembly has decided that such action is unconstitutional. That court in the year 1833, *Resolved*, As the sense of this house, that no man or body of men, agreeably to the constitution of this Church, ought to be condemned or censured, without having notice of the accusation against him or them, and notice given for trial."

I might easily show good reasons why such a course as the one I have condemned, is highly improper; not only because of its unconstitutionality, but because of its liability to secure unjust decisions and to promote strife in the Church. But this article is already too long. The matter will come up by memorial before the next General Assembly. P. T. P.

TRIALS OF OUR MISSIONARIES.

In the *Missionary* for May is a letter from the Rev. B. Helm, containing an account of the troubles encountered by brother Stuart and himself at Gutsin, last winter. . . . They had passed the fall comfortably, but the rooms they had rented would not answer well for permanent quarters, and the Chinese landlord they found to be a very depraved man. As he occupied part of the same house and had been a source of great annoyance, they determined to seek other quarters. But this was no easy undertaking. "Generally, missionaries have apprehended and experienced difficulty in getting into a house and continuing there. But our trouble was to get out of a house." Here follows an account of the schemes and threats of this bad man to thwart our brethren and to extort money from them; the whole illustrating the perils and the difficulties which a missionary's life is tried in that country. Chinese trickery is not surpassed by cunning and deceitful men in this or any land. After detailing the negotiations they had made for renting and moving into another house, we have the following account of the up-shot of the contest:

"That evening the soldier heard of our renting, and we met him in the house, when he said it could not be rented, etc. So he set himself to work, and was busy till late at night, when he retired, in the assurance, as we afterwards saw, that he had destroyed in one night what had cost us half a month to effect. In the morning I finished our packing up, brother Stuart being out to see the house and call the carriers. Soon he arrived, with thirty men, and reported all right. The soldier stopped the men at the door, and refused them permission to take our things from this house. We told them to come on, and not fear him; but his being a proprietor, and talking of yamens, kept thirty men, like sheep, at the door. I exhibited the old nature yet alive, but I only sinned and accomplished nothing. The soldier now said if we would give him \$20, he would let the men have our articles. This extortion we of course utterly refused to submit to, and it was well we did, as events proved. Soon a few of his friends came in, and ere long the middle man entered, much flurried. He had just been sought by the husband or guardian of a woman, who, it was found, was owner of the property. He was informed they were unwilling to rent, so he proposed to refund the money, etc.—Off he went and sought our middle man, who, after some talk, thrust money and deed of rent into my bosom and put off. We told them we understood the whole piece of rascality, and made statements to them that none but a Chinaman would have had grace to have borne. While this was going on, in came the "Ti-pao," who ranks about as a policeman. He was announced as an old citizen who came to talk the "dao-li"—doctrine. We were new comers, did not know the "Li" of the place. This wiseacre, "as mild a mannered man as ever scuttled a ship or out a throat," with much assumed importance, with many words explained the difficulty. We were ignorant of the "Li," and had not given the soldier the "Li." This wonderful "Li" now proved to be the twenty dollars he was trying to extort, telling his friends he had expended it in our behalf, hiring a sedan (twenty cents), and inviting his friends to eat with him. The theatre being now fully opened, in came others. At length one came blustering and swinging his arms, and big with talk of Yamens, etc., as if he had all the authority of the "Son of Heaven" vested in him. The scene now became so comic, that, in spite of it being so tragic to our hopes, we could not but laugh; and, ordering dinner, retired up stairs—leaving the sharks who had collected around the victims to their own company. They were elated that they had thwarted our plan, but sadly chagrined that they had not made a *quenze* where they had counted on a big "squeeze." Again and again did the soldier come to us that day to negotiate and to squeeze a few dollars. At least he pretended the Ya-men had sent to inquire about the day's proceedings, and offered to tell a straight out falsehood if we would pay him well. We had already sent off the ti-pao so abruptly when he put in a claim for services, that he forgot his "Li," and did not say, as a Chinaman always should, "I have been of little company," though he might have said so and told one truth. So now we sent off the soldier, with the assurance that we came to teach morality, and not to bribe to lie.

We were perplexed, but not in despair. So many had been the mercies of God during the past month's trials, we felt now we could trust him to lead where we could not see the road. So we quietly settled down. It may seem there is but little here for more than a good laugh and compassion for the debased heathen man. But when it is remembered that we knew not how far he could and would carry out his threats, and remembered other cases where a little report had raised mobs and expelled missionaries, with our spirits harassed by the man's presence and tyranny, and our entire work apparently a blank for a month, it tried us. But God's good hand

was seen in all. We learned afterwards that the soldier had bribed the middle man with \$20.00, move us into the street, and when we could not enter the other house, ask more to let us back into his. We now kept perfectly quiet for a few days, and again committed our cause by prayer and fasting to God, when He so moved the fears of the soldier that he came to far better terms than before he had refused. Every advance we made previously to this time, even in acceding to his propositions, seemed but to excite an insatiable cupidity, and he changed his terms about as often as Laban did Jacob's wages. Now he agreed to move out, give us complete possession, with reduction of rent \$1.00 per month—we paying down three months' rent in advance. Thus, while God saw in us cause to withhold a fine and cheap piece of property, he has answered our prayers in delivering us from the presence and espionage of this evil man. For his great mercies we cannot sufficiently thank him. We are now more comfortably fixed up than at Hangehow last winter, though our paper ceiling and papered walls rattle coldly in the northern breeze. We still feel the evil influence to a slight extent of the soldier, for, like the Bohon Upas tree, it affects that in its vicinity even. He will not permit our teacher, who fears him, to return unless he gives him \$2.00 out of \$7.00 a month. Now, the cause of my writing this personal letter is that you may see the sad depravity of this poor people among whom we live; may know them better and our wants more, so that the people of God may be constant in prayer for us, and this people, "Brethren, pray for us," and glorify God with us for his great mercies' sake.

Life to Come.

It may seem strange that our Lord says so little about the life to come—as we call it—though in truth it is one life with the present—as the leaf and the blossom are one life. Even in argument with the Sadducees he supports his side upon words accepted by them, and upon the nature of God, but says nothing of the question from a human point of regard. He seems always to have taken it for granted, ever turning the minds of his scholars towards that which was deeper and lay at its root—the life itself—the oneness with God and his will, upon which the continuance of our conscious being follows of a necessity, and without which if the latter were possible, it would be for human beings an utter evil.

When he speaks of the world beyond, it is as *his Father's house*. He says there are many mansions there. He attempts in no way to explain. Man's own imagination enlightened by the Spirit of truth, and working with his experience and affections, was a far safer guide than his intellect with the best schooling which even our Lord could have given it. The memory of the poorest home of a fisherman on the shore of the Galilean lake, where he as a child had spent his years of divine carelessness in his father's house, would, at the words of our Lord *my Father's house*, convey to Peter or James or John more truth concerning the many mansions than a revelation to their intellect, had it been possible, as clear as the Apocalypse itself is obscure.

When he said "I have overcome the world," he had overcome the cause of all doubt, the belief in the outside appearances and not in the living truth: he left it to his followers to say, from their own experience knowing the thing, not merely from the belief of his resurrection, "He has conquered death and the grave. O Death where is thy sting? O Grave where is thy victory?" It is the inward life of truth that conquers the outward death of appearance; and nothing else, no revelation from without could conquer it.

These miracles of our Lord are the nearest we come to news of any kind concerning—I cannot say *from*—the other world. I except of course our Lord's own resurrection. Of that I shall yet speak as a miracle, for miracle it was, as certainly as any of our Lord's, whatever interpretation be put upon the word. And I say the nearest to news we come, because not one of those raised from the dead, gives us at least an atom of information. Is it possible they may have told their friends something which has filtered down to us in any shape?

EXCELLENCE is never granted to man but as the reward of labor. It argues no small strength of mind to persevere in habits of industry, without the pleasure of perceiving those advantages, which, like the hands of a clock, whilst they make hourly approaches to their point, yet proceed so slowly as to escape observation.—*Sir Joshua Reynolds*.

A LITTLE water may spring in the bottom of the well; but if it do not increase so as to fill the cavity and freely overflow, it will become fetid where it lies, and more or less than when it dries. It is quite possible, as to emotion, to be very languishing over the misfortune of others, and yet to do the unfortunate as little good as the misanthrope who laughs at human sorrows.—*Rev. William Arnold*.

God hath two dwelling places—the high best heavens and the lowest hearts; that is the habitation of His glory; this of His grace.

THE IMAGE of gold is sure of worshippers, if it be only a golden calf.

THE SAME SPIRIT that breathed reason into us, breathed revelation among us.

How to be Miserable.

Sit by the window and look over the way to your neighbor's excellent mansion, which he has recently built and paid for and fitted out, and say, "O that I were a rich man!" Get angry with your neighbor, and think you have not a friend in the world. Shed a tear or two, and take a walk in the burial ground, continually saying to yourself, "When shall I be buried here?"

Sign a note for a friend, and never forget your kindness, and every hour in the day whisper to yourself, "I wonder if he will ever pay that note!" Think every body means to cheat you.— Closely examine every bill you take, and doubt its being genuine until you have put your neighbor to a great deal of trouble.— Put confidence in nobody, and believe every man you trade with to be a rogue. Never accommodate, if you can possibly help it. Never visit the sick or afflicted, and never give a farthing to assist the poor. Buy as cheap as you can, and screw down to the lowest limit. Grind the faces and hearts of the unfortunate.

Brood over your misfortunes, your lack of talents, and believe that at no distant day you will come to want. Let the work-house be ever in your mind, with all the horrors of distress and poverty. Follow these recipes strictly, and you will be miserable to your heart's content—if we may so speak—sick at heart, and at variance with the world. Nothing will cheer or encourage you; nothing will throw a gleam of sunshine or of warmth into your heart.

Learning on God Alone.

Sir William Hamilton was doubtless the most learned Scotchman of our century, the omniscient Lord Macaulay not excepted. He was familiar with every branch of philosophy; he had analysed, with wonderful power, all religions into their simplest elements. He was an inspiring teacher—one of the few masters of philosophy and letters; an admitted leader of his generation. But while at home in the learning of all ages, and exciting the wonder of his contemporaries by the bold sweeps of his genius, no less than the vastness of his attainments, he sat as a little child at the feet of Jesus. He was a sincere believer. His mind rested on the great truths of the Christian system. There is an exquisite pathos in the record of his last hours, that when his spirit was hovering on the borders of the unseen world, just ready to penetrate its great mysteries, he was heard to murmur, "Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me!"

A little learning often breeds scepticism. Profound knowledge leads back to Jesus.

Dr. McCosh in Boston.

The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Intelligencer* says: "The Rev. Dr. McCosh, of Princeton, has delivered before the Methodist Theological Seminary of Boston, a series of lectures on the 'Relations of Science to Religion.'" He made a very favorable impression upon his hearers. One of his lectures was upon "Free Thought in Boston," which upon the whole was a good thing, and yet it is very evident that Dr. McCosh does not understand New England. He seems to think that Boston is a diminutive Germany, where philosophic systems prevail, and can be classified. With some who understand the fragmentary and indefinite beliefs of this region, his sober and elaborate effort to annihilate them seemed a joke. If the learned President and philosopher had treated the so-called philosophy of Boston, as the stub or ball of some English or Continental systems, he would have been more effective. The fact is, that Dr. McCosh's serious dealing with the skeptics of this region results chiefly in making a few conceited men swell and stretch under the complacency such a notice of them awakens. The Evangelical thinkers of Boston are thoroughly acquainted with the evils prevailing, and they are too familiar with the second-hand and shallow philosophy adopted, to dignify it with a distinct name as a system. They know it to be but the tag-end of imported systems. We question whether Dr. McCosh has added to his laurels by this particular lecture, although the others of the course maintain his high repute as a master in Christian philosophy."

A Suggestive Thought.

Suppose it were possible to convert all the men in a single place, and leave the women just as they were; I believe that in the second generation you would see little or no improvement—the great wave of conversion would have passed over that place and left but little trace. But suppose the reverse of this. Suppose all the women were converted, and the men left untouched. I think I should be found right in saying that a large proportion of the second generation would be Christian men and women, and an immense and permanent improvement would be found to have taken place. How is this? Simply because God has entrusted into the hands of women the nursery, the house, the moral influence, and the formation of the character of the rising generation.

People's Magazine.

WHY NOT?—We usually take three meals a day for the body. Would it not be as well to give the soul as many?

MOST OF THE SHADOWS that cross our path through life are caused by our standing in our own light.

KEEP A LIST of your friends; and let God be the first in your list, however long it may be.

CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1870.

Vol. 5.—No. 43.

Whole No. 251.

TRUST TO-DAY.

Bear the burden of the present,
Let the morning bear its own;
If the morning bear its own;
Why the coming night be born?
If the darkened heavens lower,
Wrap thy cloak around thy form;
Though the tempest rise in power,
God is mightier than the storm.
Steadfast faith, and hope unshaken,
Animate the trusting breast;
Step by step the journey's taken
Nearer to the land of rest.
All unseen, the Master walketh
By the toiling servant's side;
Comfortable words he talketh
While his hands uphold and guide.
Grief, nor pain, nor any sorrow,
Rends thy breast to Him unknown,
He to-day, and he to-morrow,
Grace sufficient gives his own.
Holy strivings nerve and strengthen,
Long endurance wins the crown;
When the evening shadows lengthen,
Thou shalt lay the burden down.

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN UNION?

CONCLUDED.

But let us not rest this important distinction upon mere assertion. I refer to the New Testament to find the meaning of the word church; and I there find clear evidence that in its true and full sense, the church is the spiritual and invisible company of true believers. The word church is the "out-called," (ecclesia.) But the true calling of God is not an outward profession, or the assumption of outward forms, but the work of the Holy Ghost in the heart bringing men to Christ in true faith. 2 Tim. i: 9. "God hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace." Heb. iii: 1. They are "partakers of the heavenly calling." Rom. viii: 30. "Whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Now the argument seems almost as plain as a truism, that the church (ecclesia), is the body of the called (klytoi); and as this call is the grace which converts, the church is the company of the converted.

The church is "the body" of Christ. Eph. v: 29 and 30; Col. i: 24. Christ is the source of spiritual life. The influence by which he animates his body are gracious and spiritual. The body must then be a gracious and spiritual one. Who can tolerate the assertion that any member of this body, united to this divine life-giving Head, is yet dead in trespasses and sins? Is the sacred whole infected with gangrene? It would be impiety to think it.

The Church is the temple of Christ. 1 Pet. ii: 4, 5. "To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious; ye, also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood," &c. And this figure of speech Peter uses, after the example of his Redeemer. Matt. xvi: 18. "Upon this rock will I build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Now since the Church is a spiritual house, and its members living stones, it is plainly an invisible and spiritual company. It is also here declared to be an indestructible body. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." It is Christ's shepherd, "which none is able to pluck out of his Father's hand." But a part, alas, of every visible Church, according to our Saviour's own testimony, does perish. Of the ten Virgins who outwardly meet to the bridegroom, five were foolish, and were shut out. Hence this true Church must be the hidden company of the Redeemed. See also Acts xx: 28.

Again, this Church is the Bride and Spouse of Christ. Eph. v: 23. "For the husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church," &c. Does Christ unite impurity or death to himself in this intimate and spiritual union? Surely this spouse can be none other than the sanctified! But let the Apostle settle this, vs. 25-27. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Now, as there is, and can be, no visible body of professed Christians, on whatsoever theory organized, which is without spot, wrinkle or blemish upon its holiness; but the purest of such bodies include many men who live and die in sin; this Church, which is the spouse of Christ, must be the spiritual company of the regenerate. Let the Apostle John decide this: He witnessed in prophetic vision, the day when the "marriage of the Lamb came, and his wife made herself ready. And to her it was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; and the linen is the righteousness of the saints." Rev. xix: 7 and 8.

And once more; the spiritual and invisible nature of this body is proved by the definitions of its character. Luke xvii: 21. "The kingdom of God is within you." Rom. ii: 28. "He is a Jew who is one inwardly," &c. xiv: 17. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." The Church of God in its true sense then, is not a society of men separated from the world by the hands of man, through outward governments and forms, but the hidden company of the regenerate. This is the glorious body, completely visible to the eye of God, partially discernible by the eye of man, but impossible to be strictly separated and defined by any human marks; this is the Church, which is catholic, which is one,

which is holy, which is indestructible; out of which there is no salvation. It is by seizing these attributes of the immortal, spiritual body of Christ, and attempting to apply them to the poor earthly shadow, a particular visible Church, that all the mischievous errors of spiritual despotism have been evolved.

Yet it is of divine appointment, as well as of necessary consequence, that visible organized societies shall exist, for the gathering together and inhabitation of this spiritual company; and to these societies the same holy name is by accommodation given, in the plural number. The Scriptures call them churches. As with the true body, of which they are shadows, their highest bond of union is not an outward organization, but a bond of faith and affection. They together constitute the visible Church catholic. None of the parts are perfect. Some of them have from time to time become so corrupt, as to cease to be true parts of Christ's visible kingdom. The more they approximate the Bible standard, the more will they approach each other, not only in community of faith and love, but even in outward form. Meantime, their separate existence beside each other does not mar the catholicity of the visible Church as one whole, but is the inevitable and designed result partly of the separation of the human race by seas, continents; civil governments and diversity of languages, partly of the excessive limitations of the human understanding, and partly of the sinful prejudices of the heart; prejudices which, although not justifiable, will assuredly continue to operate as long as man's nature is only partially sanctified. The native good sense of the people has happily expressed the truth here, by calling these different societies, not sects, nor schisms, but denominations of Christians. Pounds and guineas, shillings and crowns are all money, the lawful coin of the realm; these are only different denominations of money. Cavalry, infantry and artillery are but different denominations of soldiers, making one patriot army. The fact that some fight on foot, and some on horseback makes no necessary schism; but all cooperate.—This is the proper conception of the distinction between us Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, in the one visible Church catholic. We are but different denominations of citizens in one kingdom.

And this I hold to be the conception of the visible Church which the Apostles designed to convey. This I hold to be the development of the visible Church, which they expected and designed. The very symbols of prophecy confirm it. Under the old dispensation, the candlestick or lamp which symbolized the Church, was one. In the Revelation there are seven. (i: 20. "And the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are seven churches.") The nomenclature of the New Testament is significant of the same truth. So long as the word church is employed as the name of the spiritual body of the redeemed, it is always in the singular number. And when applied to a visible society of Christians living in one city, and capable of having actual communion with each other in public worship, the word is also in the singular number. But the moment it is used to denote any wider aggregations of Christians in organized bodies, it always, save Acts ix: 31, becomes plural. We read of the seven churches of Asia; not of the Church of Asia; of the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Macedonia, the Churches of Judea; but the New Testament says nothing of any visible national Church.

But did not the organized bodies of Christians of the same nation and language, soon after the Apostolic times, have a more comprehensive bond of outward connexion? They did. And I am not unwilling to admit that the liberal and modest rule of the early Synods and councils was a legitimate substitute for the regulative authority of the Apostles, now removed by death. But two things are admitted touching these Synods; that in the purer ages of the Ancient Church, they neither claimed, nor did the Christian people concede to them any power of enjoining duties or making moral laws beyond the authority of Sacred Scripture, and that each Synod was coordinate with, and independent of, all the others. No governmental tie bound them together; they were united by no other ties than those of mutual respect and affection; yet members or ministers from one province received admission to frequent communion with the Christians of another. It is a striking fact that even after metropolitan powers were generally conceded to the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, there were large communions, (those of North Africa, Persia, Chaldea and Britain, for instance,) which did not send delegates to the Archepiscopal councils, nor pay allegiance to their canons; yet were they not regarded as schismatic, but were considered as parts of the Church catholic, until a more corrupt age. The associated Christians of different provinces then presented practically very much the aspect which is shown by the evangelical sister-denominations of the Protestant world. They did not observe a complete outward uniformity; but were distinguished by differences, in different countries, at least as broad as those which separate us. They did not pretend to preserve any organic unity. Yet they never dreamed, during the purer ages of Christianity, of charging each other with schism; and they considered the aggregate of the whole, united only by Christian courtesy and community of principles, as the visible Church catholic. The most learned Christian antiquaries will be least inclined to dispute this view of early Christianity.

And this structure of Catholic Christianity, I assert, is the designed development of the Apostolic institutions, because there are causes, beyond the power of man to remove, which render it unavoidable. These causes existing, the attempt to compel an organic unity only results in greater mischiefs. To evince this, I only have to compare three facts. One is, that the Church has, among men, no infallible expounder of that Bible, which is its sole rule of faith and order.—The second is, that God hath left the conscience of his people free from the doctrines and commandments of men, and requires of believers that conduct which is dictated by their own intelligent and conscientious convictions. And the third is, that men, being fallible, always have differed, and always will honestly differ in details. How vain is it to expect anything else, when we look soberly over the past history of opinion; when we remember that the different races are reared under different climes, languages, political institutions, and social usages, all of which have an unavoidable effect upon their habits of thought; when we consider the limitation and weakness of man's understanding; and above all, when we bear in mind that he is at best a sinner imperfectly sanctified, with passions and prejudices still subsisting. Men cannot be made to think exactly alike, if they think honestly; and this, simply because they are men. In those communions which enforce an external unity the differences of belief are wider than between any two evangelical Christians in this hall; and if those divergencies are suppressed, it is only at the cost of a grievous tyranny over the conscience.

We must remember also, that each visible Church is a witnessing body.—"It is a pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. iii: 15. [See also Is. ii: 3; lxx: 21. Matt. xxviii: 19, 20. Acts xx: 24. Ps. lxxviii: 5. Rev. xii: 11, 12 and 17; xix: 10.] The great duty and function is to testify for God, and bear his message to an apostate world. To fail of this is to cease to be a Church at all. But I ask emphatically, how can men testify for God, unless they testify what they understand God to say? They must speak; to be silent is treason. And in honesty, they can only speak what they honestly believe. Hence it is, to the fair mind, the plainest thing in the world, that the only practicable scheme of church association, is that which unites in one denomination those who are honestly agreed, while it leaves to all others who differ from them, the same liberty of association and testimony. Does a certain separation of the parts of the visible Church catholic result? I answer, it is the least of the possible evils.

Especially would I protest against the remedy for this partial separation, which is proposed by that latitudinarian view now called Broad Churchism. This is an expedient only less unprincipled and mischievous than persecution. "Why," asks this marked infidelity, "may not the same visible Church embrace within its pale me, and the man who believes wholly unlike me; allowing us both our equal liberty? I answer: Because then the Church bears no testimony for her God. The great, the sacred, the exalted, I had almost said the sole organic function, for which the visible Church exists, witnessing for saving truth, is gone. No man could propose such an expedient seriously, who had not already imbibed a Sadducean contempt for Divine truth, and become blind to its preciousness. And no Church can commit itself to this dishonest policy, without being infested with a blank and sardonic infidelity. History and common sense have both spoken on this point, too plainly to be misunderstood. Commend me forever to an honest, wrong-headed bigot, with all his faults, rather than to a Broad-churchman. The one has at least reverence and manhood enough in his nature to value truth; and when he supposes he has found the priceless jewel, to do it hearty homage. The other is so coldly and meanly indifferent to his sacred claims, that he is as willing to lend his associated power to sustain its foul enemy, falsehood, as truth itself. Broad-churchism delights to hurl the charges of Phariseism, hypocrisy and malignity against the honest votaries of truth. But examine its animus, and you will find that it is as hypocritical and bitter as it is cold. Selfish indifference does indeed make it very tolerant of all that which, if it had any sincerity, should excite its moral indignation; the only thing erroneous enough in its eyes, to arouse its intolerance, is honest conviction and zeal for God's truth. And against this, it harbors all the gall and bitterness which it imputes to us.

I advance also this consideration; that the advocates of ecclesiastical amalgamations in our day show neither the temper, nor the success to encourage our confidence in them. We see no proof that their zeal for organic unity is prompted by true Christian charity. Let it be clearly understood that we except a number of well-meaning Christians, whose kindly hearts (more kindly than considerate,) are beguiled by the professed cry of peace. But the spirit of the major part appears to be anything else than that moderation, fairness, and gospel affection, which promise a real union among Christians. We see no evidence that catholic wisdom and justice which are large enough to embrace the whole kingdom of God on earth; but, while the pretence is catholicity, the action has sometimes been as fanatical, as full of narrow prejudice, and as divisive as that of any sect which has ever really marred the unity of Christ's body. Thus we saw the great Evangelical Alliance of Protestant Europe, as it proudly styled itself, fully sufficiently latitudinarian to embrace parts of the Re-

formed Church of France, which flout the most sacred principles of the gospel, the divinity and vicarious satisfaction of the Lord Jesus Christ, the fall of man, the work of the Holy Ghost, spurn American churches, the purest in creed and membership on earth, because they would not declare that relation of domestic servitude criminal, in which all the patriarchs and apostles lived, and which Christ and his Apostles authorized! Such pitiful follies and wrongs as these give little promise that those hands will be the ones to heal the breaches of Protestant Christendom. At a later day we have seen a journal, which called itself the Christian Union, circulated with vast zeal and expense, avowedly to advocate this cause of peace and love. But its tone was the most truculent and threatening which has ever been heard in America.

The plans likewise of these men do not appear to be the result of devout faith and reliance on God, but of arrogant worldly wisdom and unbelief. They manifestly have little faith in the power of the truth, unsupported by material power, to subdue the world to Christ. They have forgotten our Saviour's declaration that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" they wish to have men cry, "Lo, here; and lo, there." They are anxious to exchange strict integrity of conviction and purity of doctrine, and the secret but mighty power of the Holy Ghost through his words, for human eloquence, numbers, wealth, combination and power. They expect and prepare to convert the world, as they built the Pacific railroad, and as they conquered our country by a mighty aggregation of money and numbers. There is, my brethren, more of the lust of power than of disinterested love, in these overtures for fusion.

And this suggests the last point which I propose to urge in this discussion. Pretensions which so plainly betray the cravings of ambition are ominous of danger to religious liberty. The employment of force to produce conformity has always been the natural corollary of the principle these men assert. Consider: They say that the visible oneness of Church Government is necessary to realize a Christian unity. Outward conformity, then, becomes an imperative Christian duty. He who refuses it rennds the body of Christ. All separation is schism, according to them; and tendency of their premises is, of course, towards the extreme conclusion that schism is a sin that necessarily damns the soul. Now the dangerous trait of this creed is that it obviously sets the sin of division, as they term it, in such a light that its forcible prevention and punishment becomes reasonable. For the practical argument against the persecution of errorists, supposing them really in error, was not that men are irresponsible for the false opinions they sincerely entertain.—They are responsible to God. Nor was it that the crime of heterodox belief is not mischievous; it may be infinitely mischievous. Why then, supposing the crime of false belief clearly ascertained, why may it not be as reasonably suppressed by force, as horse-stealing, or murder? The answer which Protestantism gives is this; that the man of evil belief is responsible, but to God only, and not to man, because God is the exclusive Lord of the conscience; and that a belief which is not intelligent and sincere is worthless to God and man, whereas the stocks, the rack, the scourge have no tendency to reconcile the mind and heart of the sufferer to the creed of those who are persecuting him. But now see how the dogma of the necessary unity of the visible Church evades all this just logic. It replies: Very true, the stocks, the rack, the scourge are not means to produce light in the understanding, and love in the heart for a creed before rejected and hated; but they are very proper means to compel acts of outward uniformity. And according to this system these are as necessary to the salvation of souls as faith and sincere conviction.—Again, if a visible Church claims this exclusive and necessary supremacy, *jure divino*, who can fail to see how natural will appear to it the claim of authority to enforce it? Such a Church assumes to be, in a certain sense, an earthly Redeemer; it will no longer admit that men are responsible only to their Redeemer in heaven for their opinions.

I beseech you here, my brethren, to ponder well the lessons of your Church history; they are most instructive. You will there learn that whenever the Church has condescended to argue her right to persecute, (many religious persecutions have been the license of mere blind hatred and fury, or of ruthless and unmasked ambition,) the claim has always been argued from the false postulate that the visible Church must necessarily have an external and organic unity. Was it not on this plea that the Bishops of Rome crushed out the primitive Churches of Britain and Ireland? But the most significant fact to my mind, in the whole history of religious liberty is this, that the first assumption of the right to persecute, by the Christian Church itself, was made against the Donatists of North Africa in the 5th century, and on the arguments of the great St. Augustine. These sectaries, as they were called, were charged by the Catholic Christians with no error of doctrine; they held the same creed. They had separated themselves from the rest of the Church, on points of church government. The division was finally suppressed by persecutions, at the advice of the Father I have named. He set a man by no means cruel or arrogant in temper; and few, of any age, have doubted his eminent piety. He was also committed by his own published declarations, as well as by his genuine feelings, against the em-

ployment of force in religious disputes.—But at length the erroneous principles of the age, as to the necessary unity of the visible Church, asserted their natural force over his conclusions; and he convinced himself, and the rulers of his day, that force was reasonable and useful. From that day to this, these arguments of St. Augustine have been the most plausible plea of religious tyranny; and all the more mischievous, because of the deserved honor attached to his venerable name.

False principles, like leaven in the meal, always tend to work out their logical consequences, and to lead their votaries to their results. These may be very unexpected; they may be very unpopular; they may be bitterly repudiated, even by those who are unconsciously tending towards them. But in due time they come, and are at last boldly avowed. Unless the seminal errors are purged out, this must be so; because the human mind must reason consistently from its postulates. Persecution for opinion's sake is disavowed in theory by all in this age and country. Whether the persecuting temper is not present already, the observant man can judge. But let this project of Church unions advance to a certain stage, and the claim will be again avowed. The ground on which the work of fusion is urged, remember, is that the true Church must be visibly one. It will not be hard for the growing party to convince itself that it alone is the true Church. It will be equally clear in its eyes that those perverse people who refuse to conform to it are very great sinners, because they obstruct the approaching glorious unification. And now, as the character of this great mass is corrupted, and its arrogance inflated by wealth, numbers and conscious power, it will not fail to persuade itself at last that as it has the might, it has the right to compel our allegiance.

For all these reasons, then, I am convinced that a general organic union is no means to promote Christian union. As I began, so I end by affirming the inestimable value of the latter. A true Christian union, which should make the parts of the visible Church catholic "first pure, then peaceable," would indeed increase the moral and spiritual power of God's people for good. I do not look to the mere increase of numbers and wealth as any power whatever for the world's conversion. The true union of principle and love would make Christians holier and happier. It would economize much effort now expended in the rivalries of Christians against each other, which should be directed to aggressions against the common enemy. It would remove the dishonor sometimes done to the gospel, not by the necessary existence of denominations, but by their unnecessary contentions.

How then may this worthy object be now furthered by us? The answer will indicate my views of what is practical and practicable. First; where denominations of Christians exist separately in the same regions of the Church, which are really agreed in principles, and are kept asunder only by unessential differences of usage, they should fuse themselves into one organization. In such case the inconveniences of separation are compensated by no gain of peace or of conscientious integrity. The testimony of the two is the same; and they may properly join in uttering it.

Second; where the differences are such that there cannot be a peaceable and honest fusion into one, each denomination should recognize in the others a valid Church character, and concede to them the same right of independent and conscientious testimony, within the pale of the visible Church, which they claim for themselves.

Do you ask how far this recognition shall be extended? I answer, to all communions which retain those features which are the marks of a visible Church—the word, the ministry, and the sacraments of Christ, even to that degree which is fundamental to the great end of the Church, the redemption of souls. We all admit that of the doctrines and instrumentalities of Christ's kingdom, some are fundamental in a sense in which others are not. Some may be unknown, or even disbelieved or disused, without destroying the soul. Others are so essential, that without them salvation is impracticable.—Now, we should receive those communions which honestly hold and employ the latter, as valid, though imperfect parts of the visible Church catholic.

Do you ask again, Who is to decide in a particular case, which doctrines and ordinances are essential to the being of a true visible Church? I reply, each communion must, as far as its intercourse with others goes, decide this for itself. If it decides too strictly, and refuses to recognize some whom the Scriptures recognize, this is their error. There is no human remedy. This, their uncharitableness, though their error, does not unchurch them, and should be treated by other communions as other lesser blemishes are treated. And as long as these others refrain from retaliation, and stand prepared to reciprocate the communion of saints as soon as it can be done on equitable terms, the responsibility of the separation thus made rests exclusively with the first party. We thus see that it is not the right of conscientious differences on the lesser points, and of denominations formed thereon, which incur the guilt of schism; but rather the refusal of that right on unscriptural and inadequate grounds.

Third; Each denomination should recognize the validity of the ministry and sacraments of every other evangelical denomination. The intercommunion of their ministers

as ministers, and their members as members, should manifest this brotherhood on all suitable occasions.

Fourth; The disciplinary acts performed by one communion should be held valid by every other. All denominations having agreed on these two prime principles, that the Church has no statute-book binding the consciences of God's children but the Bible, and no penalties for transgressions but the moral and spiritual, a sentence passed on these principles by one denomination upon its unruly member, should be respected by all others. Just as a man under censure migrating from one Presbyterian congregation to another, cannot be reinstated by the second, against the verdict of the first; but is required to reconcile himself to the same body which he had offended; so should it be throughout the Church catholic.

Last, and chiefly; all Christians should study moderate and charitable feelings towards others, and should sincerely seek to grow in the knowledge of revealed truth.—As they approach nearer that infallible standard, they will approach nearer to each other. "The wisdom which is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace, of them that make peace." Jas. iii: 17-18. "Let us therefore be thus minded; and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing." Phil. iii: 15-16.

FOR THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN.

THE REMEDY AGAINST STAGNATION IN OUR CHURCHES.

Dear Brother Brown,—I wish to call attention to a recent work by Dr. Anderson, entitled "Foreign Missions." I have seen nothing so readable and stimulating, for a long time. There is a general and lamented stagnation in our churches. Christians grow rapidly to a certain height, but after that, we fail—with all our agencies and anxieties—to add to their stature a single cubit. The truth is that our people are already as pious, as spiritual, as holy, as good in every respect as they can be, until they do more than they are now doing for others. We must look for a remedy, not in revivals merely, but in missions. Many a church grows in size, through repeated gatherings, but remains selfish and weak, for the want of outlet and stimulus.

Is it said that we cannot become interested on behalf of others? Not so. We have all been interested on behalf of the suffering in the recent dreadful crash at the Capitol. And we have the fact that multitudes daily sink into perdition, to arouse us. We can find work stimulating enough, if we will only explore the world for it. Only let the churches be encouraged in the direction in which they are most interested. If they want to establish a mission at the North pole, let us bid them good speed in the enterprise. No matter where the field, or what the work, so that they can be stimulated by it to do for others.

Now, it has been found that Domestic Missions alone do not develop the energies of the Church. Call attention to the home fields, and you see that is the inevitable result. Our venerable fore-fathers did not know this, and hence they have left eight hundred millions of heathen on our hands—to testify against our following their example in ecclesiastical affairs.

The care of the Sandwich Islands confirms what has been said. "In 1847, 27 years after the commencement of the mission to these Islands, the Committee and Secretaries of the American Board, were surprised by a discovery of what seemed like a threatened collapse of the mission.—There was a deficiency of religious stimulus. All the islands had been alike christianized. Had one of them remained under the influence of paganism, as the whole had been; as for instance the Island of Hawaii, then the four Christianized islands might have been aroused to send the Gospel to the 75,000 benighted people of Hawaii. Whereas there was no rich pagan island within less than two thousand miles. To be sure there was much real home missionary work on each of the Sandwich Islands. But it was found there, as it had been in our own country, that the motive power of the home missionary plea alone, is not of itself sufficiently awakening.

It was precisely this discovery which gave rise to the mission to the Micronesia—a group of islands two thousand miles westward; and also to the sending from this country in 1856, of the missionary packet "Morning Star," to facilitate the forming of the mission; and to the employment of native Hawaiians, as missionaries on those islands—who should look for their support to their own Hawaiian churches.

We have here, therefore, an illustration of the principle that it is impossible for churches to reach their highest state, without the aid of what is to them virtually a "Foreign Mission."

Dr. Anderson's book thus shows what is the true and only remedy against stagnation in our churches. Yours, W. E. B.

A SAINT has sometimes enough in this life to say, "It is good to be here;" but never enough to say, "It is best to be here."

If God is good to them that seek, how much better to them that find him.

THAT can never be a grace to the body which is a disgrace to the soul.

Something about Wheels.

The Vermont Chronicle relates the following incident about a sermon which might probably be repeated with profit: "A brother in the ministry took occasion to preach on the passage in Luke xvi. 10: 'He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much.' The theme was; that men who take advantage of others in small things, have the very element of character to wrong the community and individuals in great things where the prospect of escaping detection or censure is as little to be dreaded. The preacher exposed the various ways by which people wrong others: such as borrowing; by mistakes in making change; by errors in accounts; by escaping taxes and customs duties; by managing to escape postage; by finding articles and never seeking owners; and by injuring articles borrowed, and never making the fact known to the owner when returned.

"One lady, the next day, met her pastor, and said, 'I have been up to Mr.—, to rectify an error he made in giving me change a few weeks ago, for I felt bitterly your reproof yesterday.' Another individual went to Boston to pay for an article not in her bill, which she noticed was not charged when she paid it.

"A man, going home from meeting said to his companion, 'I do not believe there was a man in the meeting-house to-day who did not feel condemned.'

"After applying the sermon to a score or more of his acquaintances, he continued; 'Did not the pastor utter something about finding a pair of wheels?'

"'I believe not, neighbor A. He spoke of keeping little things which had been found.'

"'Well, I thought he said something about finding a pair of wheels; and supposed he meant me. I found a pair down in my lot a while ago.'

"'Did you?' said his companion, 'know whom they belong to? Mr. B. lost them a short time ago.' The owner was soon in possession of his wheels.'

Rule of Benevolence.

The gospel rule of benevolence is to bestow money, time, labor, property, any thing we possess. Christ gave himself. God is always giving. He does not give equally to all. He places plenty and want side-by-side, one to ask and the other to respond, saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." If one Christian would give the proceeds of a piece of land; another a portion from his flock; another a few days' labor; while the poor would offer what is equivalent to two young pigeons, in the shape of a few fowls, or some articles of their own make—then would all experience this blessedness.

A brother once said to me, "Our Church is too poor to give anything for missions," and he was smoking a cigar when he said it. Those who can afford to smoke cigars, or indulge in any other luxury, can afford the luxury of giving. Many churches ever suffered from a want of benevolence. A good minister once said, "I could hear of such a church, I could go on a pilgrimage to the place where it was, and there, with my hands lifted to heaven, I would exclaim, 'Blessed be the dead that die in the Lord.'"

He who breathes, but never lives, Who much receives, but nothing gives; Whom none can love and none can thank, Creation's blot—creation's blank.

New York Annual.

The Late Rev. William C. Barnes.

One of the scenes of Mr. Barnes' grandest spiritual campaigns was in the City of P'arth. He came there when he was only twenty-five—a ruddy muscular youth, in powerful health, a good sleeper, and a splendid horseman. He could ride like a dragoon, and preach like a Boanerges. In his robust body there were great volumes of animal heat.—This is indispensable to the man who would move the masses. It is one secret of the power of Spurgeon, of Chalmers, and of Gough. When Barnes came to the church to preach, he commonly found the house so packed that it was no small feat to reach the pulpit. But the greater the crowd the more calm and collected was the preacher. He came to the pulpit from his knees, and brought the serenity of his intercourse with God in the heavenly expression of his countenance, and the indescribably solemnity and weight of his utterance. He prayed as one who had an interview with the Almighty. One day a gray-haired sinner came weeping out of the house, exclaiming:—"O! it is the man's prayers! I cannot stand his prayers."

How a Woman Keeps a Secret.

It is an old quip upon women that they cannot keep secrets; but the fact is they are the only part of humanity that can. A wife keeps a husband's secret incomparably safer than he does hers. We calculate that there is one drunken wife to about four hundred and ninety-nine drunken husbands. In gambling, licentiousness, lying, cheating, hypocrisy, covetousness, there is pretty much the same proportion. Yet of the four hundred and ninety-nine wives, four hundred conceal, cover up, silently endure the terrible secret, while the one husband mourns over his wife's frailty in the study of his pastor, and to the ear of his friend, and probably complains of it to a court of law. It is the same between brother and sister. The secrets a woman talks about are of the kind that are unimportant and mostly agreeable to hear. But of serious secrets she is reticent as the grave. This is our observation, and in our various relations of physician, minister, and unordained lawyer, we have had room for a great deal of observation.—Baltimore Church Advocate.