

# THE PHILADELPHIAN.

VOL. VI., No. 31.

PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1836.

{WHOLE No. 286.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY  
WILLIAM S. MARTIN.

South East Corner of George and  
Seventh Streets,  
PHILADELPHIA.

Communications and remittances from a distance to be for-  
warded to the publisher, in Philadelphia.

NEW YORK PUBLICATION OFFICE  
AT THE BOOK STORE OF  
ROBERT CARTER, 112 CANAL STREET

TERMS—\$2.50 if paid in advance; or  
\$3.00 payable within six months.

A liberal discount to Agents who become responsible.

No subscription received for a less term than one year. All  
subscribers who do not expressly state to the contrary,  
before the expiration of their respective years, will be con-  
sidered as wishing to continue their subscription, and the  
paper will be sent to them accordingly. No paper discon-  
tinued until all arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the  
publisher.

Notice of removal, orders for discontinuance, and Communi-  
cations must be post paid. Small Notes of solvent Banks re-  
ceived in payment at par from distant subscribers.

Rate of Advertising—For 15 lines, first insertion 50 cents;  
each repetition of 40, 45 cents. Payment for advertisements to  
be made in advance.

Reported for the Presbyterian.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Opinions Delivered in the Case of Mr. Barnes.

Mr. H. M. Hopkins, an elder from the Presby-  
tery of Hudson said, that he came to the As-  
sembly to defend the cause of truth and righteousness,  
and he had been taught from his infancy the  
Catechism, and he found a very great discrep-  
ancy between Mr. Barnes' Notes on the Romans  
and the Catechism.

Mr. J. D. Wickham, from the Presbytery of  
North River said, he would sustain the Appeal  
and Complaint. But he was not prepared to sus-  
tain the Presbytery in the course which they had  
taken. He, with others, regretted deeply their  
course. They had reason to fear, it was true,  
that justice would not be done to Mr. Barnes,  
but they ought to have trusted in God, in whose  
hands are the hearts of all men. But Mr. Barnes  
was not involved in the doings of his Presbytery.  
He could not help it. The Synod ought to have  
stopped when they found they could not obtain  
the records of the Presbytery. According to  
their own showing, they acted unconstitutionally,  
for they had not the book of Mr. Barnes before  
them. He believed, that if the Synod had heard  
the whole case, they would have come to a very  
different issue. The unconstitutionality, irregu-  
larity, and prejudice manifested in the case,  
ought to cause the Appeal to be sustained. Yes,  
even if Mr. Barnes had been proved to be a  
heretic!

As to the doctrines of Mr. Barnes' book, he  
did not believe that they were inconsistent with  
the Confession of Faith. Mr. Barnes received  
the Confession of Faith as a system; and there  
was nothing in it contrary to the system.  
He regretted the endeavour to associate  
Mr. Barnes with Unitarians. Because Unitarians  
had approved of his book it was made an  
argument against Mr. Barnes. But he would  
throw back this argument. Unitarians had  
praised the works of Edwards, and claimed him  
as advocating some of their views, was Edwards  
therefore to be considered as ungodly or in any  
measure a Unitarian? He had one other reason  
for sustaining the Appeal, viz: the injustice done  
to the character of Mr. Barnes. Of this he com-  
plains. To this, it is answered, "this is not the  
case, no injustice or injury is done to Mr. Barnes;  
he may be a minister in some other denomina-  
tion, though not a Presbyterian minister." But  
you fix the stain of infamy upon his character,  
if, while he honestly maintains the system, you  
decide that he departs from it. If you will es-  
tablish the rigid construction principle, do first  
put Mr. Barnes upon the same ground with him-  
self and other brethren. Then we will look at  
this, and if we cannot agree upon the principles  
by which we will walk together, why then we  
will separate.

Mr. Nimmo, of Second Presbytery of Long  
Island, said that he felt that he was placed in  
solemn circumstances. He believed that the Syn-  
od had a constitutional right to try the case,  
though Mr. Barnes was absent and unheard.  
But upon the whole, he would sustain the Ap-  
peal, though it was the fault of Mr. Barnes him-  
self, and of his Presbytery, that he was not  
heard.

Dr. Phillips, of New York, said that he did  
not think it necessary to say much. He trusted  
he felt the solemnity of the circumstances in  
which they were placed, as much as any one.  
An affecting Appeal had been made to their sym-  
pathies, and he felt it. He was a father, a hus-  
band, and a Christian minister, and was prepared  
to sympathize with the accused. But he had  
also sympathy for the truth, for the Church, and  
for the souls of sinners; all of which were en-  
dangered by the doctrines of Mr. Barnes' book.  
He would not doubt the piety of Mr. Barnes  
himself. He would not say that he held error  
enough to vitiate his hopes and prospects as a  
Christian, but that his doctrines had a tendency  
to sap the foundation of a Christian's hopes, he  
most firmly and conscientiously believed. It  
has been said, that if we deprive Mr. Barnes of  
the ministry, and cast him out of the Presbyterian  
Church, he has no where else that he can  
go. Where shall he go? We do not deprive  
Mr. Barnes of the ministry, by confining him to  
suspension. If he will only leave us and join  
another Church, there are many that will be glad  
to receive him. All we ask is, that he would  
leave us, not sincerely adopting or believing our  
standards.

He was surprised to hear so many brethren as-  
serting the error of Mr. Barnes. The assen-  
sible could not be aware of the attitude in  
which they placed themselves before the Church  
and the world! He was glad, however, that  
they were now disposed to acknowledge that  
the dispute was now more about words. It had  
been said that Mr. Barnes and Dr. Junkin were  
at perfect antipodes to each other. He believed  
it. Either Dr. Junkin or Mr. Barnes must have  
departed from the Confession of Faith.

He felt no solicitude about the issue of this  
case. Christ would take care of his Church,  
whatever might be the result here. He rejoiced  
at this occasion of bringing out the opinions of  
brethren. They know now just where they  
stood, and what they believed. He was glad  
they were alarmed at the wide door, opened by  
brethren into the Church. They were opposed to  
all creeds but the Bible alone; but did they not  
know that the Bible was professedly believed by  
Unitarians, and all other heretics, whatever their  
characters? He believed that Mr. Barnes' book  
contained fundamental and important errors, and  
attacks the leading tenets of the Confession of  
Faith, and pronounces the controlling and fun-  
damental doctrines of the Bible, "mere philo-  
sophical theories." The conduct of the Presby-  
tery be considered in the highest degree con-  
tumacious. On this point he had heard but one  
at perfect antipodes to each other. He believed  
it. "Alas! alas! what a poor human nature!"  
Dr. Junkin had made as able an Appeal as he  
ever heard, and yet members pretended to see no  
force in "the vindication." Prejudice had been  
charged against those who were opposed to Mr. Barnes' book,  
but who were the opposers of this prejudice?  
Many of them had signed the Act and Testi-  
mony. But if this was a sufficient ground upon  
which to found a charge of prejudice; what  
shall be said of a Philadelphia Extra, which

had been issued, being a memorial to be signed  
by ministers and members of the Presbyterian  
Church? Were those who signed this unpreju-  
diced? Were they unprejudiced judges, who on  
this floor professed their coincidence of senti-  
ment with the accused? There was no disposi-  
tion, as had been charged, to persecute Mr.  
Barnes. If he would leave the Presbyterian  
Church, as he ought to do, not agreeing with his  
doctrines, they would not follow him with the  
censure of the Church—no one would feel any  
disposition to do this.

Mr. Marshall, of the Presbytery of New York,  
made some very judicious remarks with regard  
to explanations, and the manner in which they  
ought to be received by ecclesiastical courts, in  
cases of accusation. He said that what was com-  
monly called explanation, was often times direct  
contradiction. That Presbyterians did not hold  
to the infallibility of their standards, but only  
to the infallibility of the word of God, and hence,  
if a man rejected the standards, they did not say  
that he was not a Christian, but if he denied the  
word of God, they said at once, that he was not  
a Christian. But if a man rejected the stand-  
ards of the Church, he was not a Presbyterian,  
and ought not to claim to be called one.

In his opinion, the charges were proved in the  
main.

Judge Boyd, of New York, said he had very  
few words to say. He had not intended to say  
anything, but he would make a remark or two.  
He would not sustain the Synod in their con-  
demnation of the first edition of Mr. Barnes' book.  
Mr. Barnes had himself, by his own ad-  
missions, acknowledged that his book needed  
amendment. He would not pretend to say that  
the errors of Mr. Barnes were fundamental; but  
they had a tendency to that which was funda-  
mental. If the "Notes on the Romans" were  
of such a character, as to need a commentator at  
the elbow of the person reading them, then they  
were not suitable for young persons, as they  
were intended for them, and they were dan-  
gerous. The doctrines of Mr. Barnes' book, in  
his opinion, had a tendency to lead men down-  
ward.

Mr. M'Elroy, of New York, said he had but a  
few remarks to make. He would not repeat  
what had been said before, nor violate the rule  
which ought to regulate members in giving their  
opinions, and enter into an argument upon the  
doctrinal questions involved in the case. He  
was opposed to sustaining the Appellant in this  
case. The proposed unconstitutionality of the  
proceedings of the Synod, was the principal  
ground on which members were for sustaining  
the Appeal. They were told that the Synod had  
no jurisdiction in the case. He did not know  
why so many urged this reason, except that it  
was a pretty and convenient phrase. But do  
you mean to say that the doings of the Synod of  
Delaware, and of the Presbytery of Philadel-  
phia, were never to see the light? If the Synod  
of Philadelphia had no jurisdiction, who had?  
Would members, who urged this reason, be so  
good as to tell him? But again: they were told  
that the Synod of Philadelphia had no jurisdic-  
tion in the case, and it was said that they  
"ought to have referred it." What? refer a  
case over which they had no jurisdiction? Gen-  
tlemen must certainly forget, that to admit the  
power of reference, was to admit the fact of  
jurisdiction. But still further. They could not  
have referred the case, had they been so dis-  
posed. The book presented them with the re-  
cords of the case without the records of the Presby-  
tery. Look at the 2d Section of the Book of Dis-  
cipline, Sub. Sec. 9th. "In cases of reference, the  
judiciary referring ought to have all the testimony,  
and the proceedings, in substance, before them,  
in perfect readiness; so that the superior judicary  
may be able to consult and issue the case with as lit-  
tle difficulty or delay as possible." The Synod then  
were shut up to the course which they pursued;  
not having the documents which were required  
in case of reference. With regard to what was  
said of Mr. Barnes' book, this he had said  
with little difficulty, as in relation to the jurisdic-  
tion of the Synod. It seemed to him that the  
brethren had taken wrong ground in deciding this  
case. Mr. Barnes' defence, which had no existence  
till after the charges were tabled, nor what he  
had said here in defence of his satisfaction, was  
not the ground upon which the Synod ought to  
go in deciding this case. The proper  
ground upon which to decide, was the book it-  
self. Did it, or did it not contain the errors  
charged? He believed it did. They had heard  
much about subscription for a substance, and  
about subscribing to "the system of doctrine."  
He did not understand this. The book says,  
"Do you sincerely receive, and adopt, the  
Confession of Faith of this Church, as containing  
the system of doctrine taught in the  
Holy Scriptures." If he understood this, (and he  
believed he had some knowledge of what was  
said) it meant that the person receiving the  
Confession of Faith, not as a system, but as con-  
taining the system of doctrine taught in the  
Scriptures. According to the construction which  
was put upon the form of subscription, one  
might deny one doctrine, and another deny  
another doctrine; and thus they would have  
many Confessions of Faith as there were Presby-  
teries.

Allusion had been made to foreign influence,  
and particularly to Associate Reformed influence.  
But he would ask if they had been putting any  
other construction upon the Confession of Faith,  
or upon subscription to it, than had been common  
in the Church before they came into it? Did not  
the fathers of the Presbyterian Church under-  
stand the form of subscription, just as the Ortho-  
dox now understand it? But he would tell them  
that there was a foreign influence of another  
character pervading the Presbyterian Church,  
and endangering her very existence.

Dr. Absalom Peters, of the 3d Presbytery of  
New York, said that he would be brief in the  
remarks which he had to make. He would not  
sustain the Synod in their condemnation of the  
first edition of Mr. Barnes' book. He believed  
the course pursued was unconstitutional. They  
had no right to proceed without the records  
of the Presbytery. With regard to the  
Appeal, Mr. Barnes appealed from the act  
suspending him from all the functions proper to a  
Gospel minister. This Dr. P. considered a ven-  
erous sentence. When he heard of it, and the  
reasons assigned for it, he felt it to be a blow  
aimed at many of the brethren in the Presby-  
terian Church. He would gladly have gone and  
shared the reproach with his beloved Brother  
Barnes. It was a tremendous sentence! It was  
nothing less than suspension from all the func-  
tions of a Gospel minister. It was a tremendous  
sentence, and he had read the report of it with  
shame and confusion of face. He would not go  
into the doctrinal question. Mr. Barnes' doc-  
trines were according to the Confession of Faith.  
Some were charged upon him which he did not  
believe, and these he believed were in accord-  
ance with the Confession of Faith. He would  
not retain Mr. Barnes in the Church by tolera-  
tion. If there was any one to be retained by  
toleration in the Church, it was Dr. Junkin! He  
would retain Mr. Barnes in their communion, and  
he was ready to say to that dear brother,  
"Whether thou goest, will go; and where thou  
lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my  
people, and thy God my God." "By their fruits  
ye shall know them," was a test of character laid  
down in the Scriptures, and he was willing to try  
Mr. Barnes by this, and contrast him with the Syn-  
od of Philadelphia. Mr. Barnes was writing  
books, and rising before the sun to write, while the  
Synod that condemned him were folded in their  
beds. (Some one sitting near to the report-  
er very pleasantly quoted this passage of  
Scripture, "While men slept, the enemy came and  
sowed tares.") It had been said that Mr. Barnes

was indiscreet in publishing again the same senti-  
ments which were condemned by the Assembly  
of 1831. But he denied that the Assembly had  
condemned Mr. Barnes' Sermon on the way of  
Salvation as containing any errors. It was true  
that they recommended him to be more guarded  
in his phraseology, but they did not condemn his  
sermon at all, or the sentiments which it con-  
tained. But what shall be the discretion of  
Dr. Junkin in bringing charges, which had  
once before been made, and of which Mr.  
Barnes had been acquitted by the Assembly.

Would they not be allowed to speak in the  
language of the 19th century? Must they con-  
tinue to speak in the antiquated phraseology of  
the dark ages? Many were disposed to condemn  
the phraseology of Mr. Barnes, but for his part  
he held to the very language of Mr. Barnes' book  
in general. He liked the language as well as  
the doctrines. He would be happy to record his  
name, as long as his name had any influence, in  
favour of the doctrines and language of Mr.  
Barnes' book on the Romans.

Dr. Skinner, of the third Presbytery of New  
York, said he was in favour of sustaining the  
Appeal and Complaint. Mr. Barnes complained  
that he had been injured, grievously injured by  
the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia. He  
would not enter into the constitutional question.  
He could not sustain the Complaint upon these  
grounds that the Constitution of the Synod had  
erred from the law of Jesus Christ. Ought not  
the Synod to have proceeded cautiously, kindly,  
and gently, in the case of Mr. Barnes? In sus-  
taining his Complaint he stood upon the high  
ground of the Gospel. The sentence was a very  
severe sentence. They ought to have dealt with  
him, but it was not only severe, it was emi-  
nently unjust. Sleep departed from his eyes  
when he first heard of it. It was a sentence  
which was designed not only to affect Mr.  
Barnes, but others also, and not necessary to  
affect Mr. Barnes. His pronouncement was  
commenced to see whether certain doc-  
trines were any longer to be tolerated in the  
Presbyterian Church. He had been 23 years in the  
Presbyterian Church, and during all that time  
there had been two parties in the Church, usually  
known by the designations, "New-school," and  
"Old-school." He would take the liberty of  
stating some of the principal points of doctrine in  
which both schools were agreed; and then some  
of the points on which they differed.

It has been said that there was no trouble in  
Philadelphia before Mr. Barnes came here, I,  
Sir, had troubles there, and I will take up my  
doctrinal sentiments. How could it be said that  
there were no troubles there until Mr. Barnes  
came, when I was spoken of as the first of that  
kind in the city? If you condemn Mr. Barnes,  
you condemn all of us! And why would you  
condemn us, if we were not guilty of the same  
not good lives? Are we not the friends of re-  
vivals? Are not our labours blessed of God?  
Has not God, given us seals of our ministry?  
Why then will you cast us out? I feel assured  
that the time of our dissensions are fast drawing  
to a close. We will not go until you cast us out,  
and then you do, I believe, in God's name, take  
us up, and prepare for us a tabernacle in the wilder-  
ness.

These are our peculiarities. They do not ex-  
clude us from the Presbytery Church. Now  
the question is whether this class shall any longer  
be tolerated in the Presbytery Church. Mr.  
Barnes is a member of the class, and he is a  
fair sample of the class. We do not consider  
him as by any means an ultra among us. His  
sentiments were much the same as those of Dr.  
Wood's of Andover. Dr. Thomas McAuley, said  
in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, that the  
Synod of Philadelphia could be accused of was,  
moderate Unitarianism.

Those who have lately been designated the  
New-school hold and preach in common as they  
suppose with their Old school brethren.

1. That God exists in three equally Divine  
persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.  
2. That Adam was created in the image of  
himself only, but his posterity also in depravity,  
guilt, and condemnation. That this occurs by  
an arrangement of infinite wisdom, sometimes  
called covenant, and sometimes constitution, en-  
tered into in respect to Adam and them, before  
the Fall.

3. That the race of man could not consistently  
with the Divine glory and justice, and the perfec-  
tion of the Divine Government, be recovered from  
sin and ruin, but by the incarnation, obedience,  
and death of the Son of God, Jesus Christ. That  
Christ by his obedience unto death, made a vicar-  
ious and propitiatory sacrifice for sin, on which  
account Mr. Barnes and his Church are justified  
from all ungodliness.

4. That the ground of the justification of sinners  
is exclusively the work or the righteousness of  
Christ, and that faith is concerned in justifying  
us, only as it instrumentally receives and ap-  
propriates the benefit of Christ's righteousness.

5. That the influence of the Spirit of God in  
effecting the justification of sinners, is not  
as to the mode of its exercise, is incomprehen-  
sible.

6. That those who in time, are effectually called  
by the Spirit of God, were chosen to salvation  
through Christ, and that this election is sovereign,  
not grounded on foreseen holiness in the elect,  
but on holiness or that they might be holy.

7. That the renewed, persevere in holiness to  
the end, and are preserved in holiness to the  
ple of holiness in themselves, but by the indwell-  
ing power of the Holy Spirit, working in them to  
will and to do, and thus securing their activity  
and perseverance.

8. That the happiness of the elect, is perfect  
and eternal; and the non-elect for their sin, are  
punished in hell forever.

In all these points, and others which I need not  
mention, we of the New-school agree with our  
Old-school brethren. In these points Mr. Barnes  
agrees with them,—according to our full, and we  
think intelligent conviction.

Now, Sir, as to peculiarities, or those  
things which we differ, as we supposed, in some  
extent, from our brethren, but not from the Con-  
fession of Faith. We think, in respect to these  
points, we are more in accordance with the Con-  
fession than our brethren.—namely: "We hold  
that the imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin  
(not the first sin itself) we use in this respect,  
more exactly with the Confession than our brethren  
do. We hold that though Christ's righteousness  
is reckoned to believers for their justification, it  
is not so theirs, as to make them personally de-  
serving in any view whatever, of the divine fa-  
vour, but leaves pardon a part of justification, or  
does not render justification inconsistent with pardon.  
Among men, if a person be justified, he  
is not to be considered as deserving of pardon, but  
justification of sinners through Jesus Christ.  
There is nothing in this justification which ex-  
cludes pardon but, as Scripture and our Confes-  
sion expressly teach, pardon is a part, though  
not the whole of justification.

We hold, that while the power of the Holy  
Spirit is necessary to effectual calling, and the  
exercise of faith, and every part of the ground  
of this necessity, is not the natural facul-  
ties, or powers, or comprehensibility of natural  
ability, (for we never mean by this phrase, any

thing more than the natural faculties which phys-  
ically capacitate man to obey his Maker, and  
influences of his Spirit,) but an aversion to God  
and holiness, too strong to be overcome except by  
the omnipotent energy of the Holy Spirit."

Mr. J. Ford, of the Presbytery of Newark, N. J.  
said that he was happily relieved from the neces-  
sity of saying much in the present case. They  
were told that this was the crisis of the  
Presbytery Church. It was said that they  
should either have a separation, or their brethren  
would secede from the Church. He did not be-  
lieve this. The result would be that they would  
understand each others views better, and go to-  
gether in greater harmony. He would show that  
they did not differ so much as was generally sup-  
posed. He was prepared to sustain the Complaint  
and Appeal for three reasons. The 1st was, that  
the Presbytery ought to have referred the case to  
the General Assembly, when the records of the  
Presbytery were withheld. For this Dr. Breck-  
inridge had pleaded, and he was of the same  
opinion. His 2d reason was, that minor differ-  
ences ought to be allowed—not the 29th part of a  
pound, as Dr. Junkin had left himself down to  
say. The Biblical Repository, which was pub-  
lished under the sanction of all the Professors at  
Paterson, pleaded in favour of toleration in regard  
to minor points. His 3d reason was, that Brother  
Barnes did not essentially differ from the Confes-  
sion of Faith. He had not time to review all the  
charges. But Mr. Barnes was not guilty of the  
1st charge, viz: "That all sin consists in volun-  
tary action." He was amazed when he exam-  
ined the logic of the Rev. Dr. J. (Junkin) He might  
say that actions, which were esteemed at the time  
every one therefore consistent in motion? The argu-  
ment of Dr. Junkin with regard to the first charge  
was the same. Here was an effort to make Mr.  
Barnes deny the doctrine of original sin, at which  
he was amazed. The Confession of Faith said  
that original sin, and actual sin consisted in vol-  
untary action, Edwards, Turretin, and even  
Calvin himself taught the same. (Here Mr. F.  
went into an argument about voluntary action,  
which the reporter could not understand: a mem-  
ber inquired if the speaker was in order, to which  
the Moderator replied, that he was in order as far  
as his understanding went.)

With regard to the 2d charge. When he read  
this charge, he was amazed at Dr. Junkin! He  
thought of the microscope which had lately been  
exhibited throughout the country, which magni-  
fied objects five millions of times above their nat-  
ural size. It made the wing of the smallest in-  
sect larger than Dr. Junkin's arm. (Great laugh.)  
Dr. Junkin must have been looking through this  
microscope when he penned the 2d charge.

With regard to the 10th. He was more amazed  
at this, than at any other of the charges. (Here  
Mr. F. read extracts from Mr. Barnes' book,  
for the purpose of showing that there was no founda-  
tion for this charge.)

With regard to the 9th charge, in his opinion,  
explained each other. (upon these charges Mr. F.  
went into an argument which was utterly incom-  
prehensible. A member inquired if they were  
bound to understand the speaker?)

There was another point which he wished to  
direct the attention of the Assembly, viz: The  
doctrine of imputation. The 5th, 6th, 7th, and  
8th charges were all on this point. There was  
no grace in our salvation, if Dr. Junkin's views  
of this doctrine were correct. Were Mr. Barnes  
and his brethren to be cast out for explaining this  
doctrine in a different way. The Confession of  
Faith did not teach the doctrine of representation  
as held by Dr. Junkin. Neither did the Bible,  
nor the Confession of Faith teach that Christ bore  
the penalty of the law. How could he? He did  
not suffer despair, nor remorse, nor eternal tor-  
ments, and these constitute a part of the prop-  
erty of the law. With regard to the extent of  
the atonement, Mr. Barnes was a limited atonement  
man. Mr. Barnes was the last man he should  
have thought would have been tried for heresy.  
"It" (said Mr. F.) "you condemn Mr.  
Barnes, you will have a great work to do before  
you go home. You will have to throw overboard  
the Confession of Faith, and the Bible, and say  
you say go home and hang your harps upon the  
willows. The land will mourn! The glory of  
America will have set! and the millennium will  
have been thrown back a thousand years!"

Mr. W. B. Barton, said he could bear testi-  
mony to Mr. Barnes' Christian department. He had  
been associated with him in the same Presbytery,  
and in the same Church. He had never heard  
thought Mr. Barnes departed essentially from the  
standards. It was his belief, that Mr. Barnes' views  
in the Notes on the Romans, and his views  
expressed before the Assembly in his defence,  
did differ. He and his Presbytery thought Mr.  
Barnes ought not to have published his Notes on  
the Romans, and that the General Assembly of 1831,  
certainly did condemn his sermon on the Way of  
Salvation. He ought not to have published views  
contrary to the Confession of Faith.

He could not vote to sustain the Complaint,  
because he believed the Synod had jurisdiction in  
the case. Every evidence necessary to the trial  
was present. Mr. Barnes' speech was in his  
pocket. He could vote to sustain the Appeal.  
Though he believed some of the charges were  
sustained; yet as he believed the sentence, con-  
sidering all the circumstances, too severe, he  
would vote to remove the suspension.

Mr. J. M. Ogden, of the Presbytery of Eliza-  
abethtown, said, that by Mr. Barnes, among others,  
he had been induced into the ministry. As he  
believed that Mr. Barnes had not departed from  
the Synod, he was prepared to sustain the Com-  
plaint and Appeal.

Mr. P. A. Johnston, an Elder from Morristown,  
N. J., said, that as a member of the Assembly he  
would claim his right to make a few remarks.  
He had had the pleasure and satisfaction of  
being early acquainted with the Rev. Albert  
Barnes. He was a member of Mr. Barnes' first  
congregation. Though he differed in some things  
from Mr. Barnes, yet they had always lived to-  
gether on terms of intimacy and friendship. He  
belonged to the Old School, but he was not pre-  
pared to condemn all of the New School who used  
a different phraseology. The blessing of the  
Spirit of God, was upon the New School, and  
believed, on account of their peculiar doctrines.  
He proceeded to speak of the revival at Morristown,  
under the ministry of Mr. Barnes—when  
the Moderator expressed his opinion that these  
remarks were not to the point—and Mr. Johnston  
concluded by saying, that he would sustain the  
Complaint and Appeal.

Dr. Miller, (Dr. M. had commenced deliver-  
ing his opinion before the reporter entered the  
house in the morning)

He referred to the 18th chapter of Matthew,  
which certain members of the Assembly had  
contended ought to have been observed by the  
Synod in the case of Mr. Barnes. He main-  
tained that it had relation to private wrongs, and  
not to public offences, as was the present case.  
He illustrated his argument by the case of a  
drunkard, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin, and  
admonish him with regard to his evil tendency; and  
he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his  
congregation, and converse with him upon his sin,  
and admonish him with regard to his evil tendency;  
and he should confess his sin, and weep gallons of  
tears, could he in any sense be said to have  
given his brother? Would this wipe away the  
stain from the Church, or answer the ends of  
discipline, in supposing he should go to his

as if in good standing! Do they not affect a man's standing? With regard to Mr. Barnes' doctrine, he was not metaphysical, but he was not able to see that Mr. Barnes had contradicted any of the established doctrines of the Church. True, he does not agree with Dr. Jenkin in the *city's* and *refuge's*! but with regard to the facts, they were agreed. The whole book of Mr. B. and not detached passages ought to be considered. To take the pincers and tear out pieces from their natural and necessary connection, and then judge of the whole book by these mutilated extracts, was unfair. He protested against such a course in relation to Mr. Barnes' book. He would sustain the Complaint and Appeal.

J. Stonerod, of the Presbytery of Redstone. Moderator: I cannot sustain the Complaint and Appeal of Mr. B. because I honestly believe that the Synod of Philadelphia in their peculiarly difficult and trying circumstances, acted entirely according with the spirit of our Constitution. I admit, indeed, that were it not for the unheard of policy and unprecedented maneuvering of the "Affinity" Presbytery, the letter of the Constitution would have dictated a course somewhat different. But, Sir, shall the regular and salutary operation of Ecclesiastical Discipline be completely foiled by such unparalleled shuffling and evasion as were most manifestly practised by the presbytery of Mr. B. Establish this principle, and farewell forever to the authority and discipline of the Church. My deliberate opinion is that the policy pursued, and the management evinced by that Presbytery, in the premises, would have been derogatory to the character even of a political caucus. Any apparent irregularity, therefore, in the proceedings of the Synod is rather to be attributed to the Presbytery than to Mr. Barnes, who was strongly inclined to opinion, that the provisions of our constitution, fairly interpreted, would have justified the Synod, after due citation, in suspending, for contumacy, the entire Presbytery. Still, however, Mr. Barnes, as was his right, should have demanded the records in his case, and, if they had been refused, Mr. Barnes would have been exasperated. But as he did not make this demand, evincing thereby, his acquiescence in the doings of his Presbytery, he is, of course, involved in the blame.

Again: The Synod did right in proceeding to issue the Appeal. To this they were bound by the Constitution. For the sake of the Church, Sec. 4. Moreover, all the testimony adduced by the prosecutor, was in the "Notes" to the Romans; so, also, was all the rebutting testimony adduced by Mr. Barnes. The charge, of course, that he was suspended on *ex parte* testimony, is illiberal and unfounded, and by no means accordant with the "Notes." Nothing was done, but to refer the matter to trial, and the contumacy of the Second Presbytery, occurred to give even the shadow of irregularity, to the entire proceedings of the Synod. Besides, the same course of argument which would prove the illegality of the proceedings of Synod, in the case of Mr. Barnes, would prove, also, beyond question, the illegality of its reference to the General Assembly. And had it come up by reference to this Assembly, the reference would, doubtless, have been objected to, by the friends of Mr. Barnes, as being entirely unconstitutional.

Again: I cannot sustain the Appeal of Mr. Barnes, because with the Princeton "Repertory." I most honestly believe that Mr. Barnes' doctrinal system is not only inconsistent with, but in several important features, directly at variance with the Confession of Faith; and that, in these "Notes," he studiously kept in view the doctrines of our Confession and designed to assail them. I believe, moreover, with the Repertory, that this attack upon our standards, was not only "unnecessary and unprovoked, but violent," and surely not to be expected of a Presbyterian minister; and, that the Notes on the Romans, contains radical departures, even from the system of doctrines contained in our Confession. Any unbiased and enlightened mind will, on a comparison of the two systems, at once perceive the truth of this statement.

The quotation from the Repertory, read by Mr. Barnes, was calculated, if not designed, to mislead: the impression, received by many, from this quotation, was that the commendation expressed in it, directed his Notes to the Romans; which was not the fact. The Repertory, in that quotation, had exclusive reference to his Notes on the Gospels. Did not Mr. Barnes know this fact?

But to glance a moment, at the doctrinal sentiments of the Appellant: he maintains that all sin consists in a *transgression*; he does not, *merely actual sin, but all sin.* Now this language, to say the least, seems to infer a denial of original sin; it seems to say, that none are sinners, in any sense, but those who are *actually* sinners. Now this is clearly opposed to the Confession and the Scriptures; our Catechism says, "the posterity of Adam sinned in him," &c. I know, indeed, Mr. Barnes sneers at this statement; with how much consistency in one who, under all the solemnity of an oath, professed to receive it, *ex animo*, let this Assembly judge. The phrase "sinned in him," does not, as has often been said, involve the notion of a "personal identity" with Adam, which is, *prima facie*, absurd; nor does it involve a transfer of moral character, which is equally absurd. It implies merely, that the legal obligation resting upon Adam, to endure the penalty of the law, was, by virtue of his representative character, transferred to all his posterity, *previously* to the possibility of actual sin. But sacred Scripture also declares, that "judgment was by one, to condemnation," and, that "judgment came upon all men, by one man, and that, by one man, all men are made sinners," &c. Besides, the doctrine of Mr. Barnes supposes that the *will alone* is disordered by the fall, which is both unscriptural, unphilosophical, and absurd; all the faculties of the mind and the dispositions of the heart, are, most unquestionably, perverted by sin.

Sinful voluntary action, moreover, is an effect, and must, of course, proceed from a *sinful cause*; for "like produces like," throughout the universe, and the sacred Scriptures declare that "out of the heart proceedeth evil thoughts," &c. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Barnes greatly errs, in supposing that *all sin consists* in voluntary action.

Again: If faith is *only an act* of the mind and not a principle, as Mr. Barnes teaches, it follows that no man is, or can be a Christian, *only while* the mind is performing those acts. Of course, no man, according to this doctrine, can be a Christian, when asleep; as those positive acts of faith are surely not then performed; nor, indeed, at any time, when the entire activities and energies of the mind are differently employed; for instance, upon any subject of investigation or intense thought.

Again: If there is any thing vital to the Calvinistic system, it is the doctrine of imputation; which I define to be a *transfer of legal obligation*. This is the grand principle, upon which the entire superstructure is reared; the very keystone of the whole arch. Now the whole doctrine of imputation, in its threefold character, as immemorably explained and understood, by all genuine Calvinists, Mr. Barnes most unequivocally rejects. The idea of *imputed sin* he regards as "imputed nonsense," and, in a note appended to his sermon on the "Way of Salvation," he calls it "a notion of modern invention." Now every one knows how frequently and explicitly this doctrine is taught in the Confession of Faith. And if there be no imputed sin, there is, of course, no imputed righteousness, and consequently, no just ground of hope and salvation to rebel man.

Again: Mr. Barnes denies that Jesus Christ endured the penalty of the law. This is one of the most obvious features of his book. Now, Sir, I ask, if the law of God is not immutable in its claims? I ask, if the justice and holiness of the Divine government and character, have lowered their claims to meet a deficiency of atonement? Did Jesus Christ exhaust the cup of his Father's wrath, or did he drink but a part? Can God be just, in justifying sinners, when the claims of justice are not fully met? Assuredly not. In a perfect government, can a violation of

law, by any possibility, escape the endurance of the penalty? Shall the lost, in hell, endure the full penalty of the law, while, for the elect, but a part of the penalty has been endured? Will not the Judge of all the earth do right? Verily, such a principle as this would unhinge the stability and impeach the justice of the Divine administration. Despair, remorse, and eternal suffering, are incidental, and, by no means, essential to the penalty of the law: they arise entirely from the *finite nature and sinfulness* of man. But who will dare to say that the immaculate, eternal Son of God incarnate, could not, and did not, in the sufferings of thirty-three years, and, by a most ignominious and excruciating death, fully exhaust the penalty of the law, in behalf of his people.

Now, Sir, it is obvious, from a slight inspection of some of the doctrines of the "Notes," (and I have had time to notice only a part) that the difference between the "Notes" and the Confession, is not a mere logomachy; it is real and most momentous. There is vastly more than a mere difference of phraseology; and, of course, the removal of the offensive phraseology, as it is done, would "hurt" but slightly the hurt inflicted upon the Church by the publication of the "Notes." Indeed, Sir, it is obvious to all, that two conflicting systems of theology have been openly avowed upon this floor: Mr. Barnes' book, with all its doctrines, to the perfect astonishment of many in this Assembly, has been publicly and repeatedly endorsed.

I am free to declare, Moderator, that until this doctrinal question is settled, collision and strife, with all their concomitants, must not only continue, but increase. The idea of producing a coalescence between two systems is, in my judgment, an infinite absurdity. Every succeeding General Assembly, while this state of things continues, instead of throwing, as it should, an all-powerful influence around all its deliberations, becomes the signal for theological combat and ecclesiastical strife. Must this unhappy state of things continue? Who does not see that the evil of this separation, would be small compared with those which must originate from such unnatural connexion.

Even those peaceful brethren, who love to expatiate upon the meekness and gentleness of Christ, become often "fierce for moderation," and exhibit on this floor the sad predominance of unholiness.

There have been several strong appeals to our sympathies, both by Mr. Barnes and his coadjutors, which were strongly adapted (and perhaps designed) to influence the vote on the final question. What else could have been the meaning of the oft-repeated statement, respecting his Sabbath-school, Bible-class, the respectability of his congregation, the breaking up of his plans, &c. &c. All this is utterly foreign to the question directly before the house; and, is doubtless designed as an *ad captandum* affair, and we fear with considerable effect.

Finally, Sir, it cannot have escaped the notice of this house that Mr. Barnes, and those who act with him, have been frequently exhibited on this floor, and that too, by some of themselves, ("Tell it not in Gath,") as concentrating nearly all the piety and ministerial diligence and usefulness in the Presbyterian Church. It was a wise man, Sir, that said "Let another praise thee and not thine own lips." Sir, when I hear such vainglorious boasting, I am compelled to ask the question, if such exhibitions of a Pharisaic spirit have not a strong "Elective-affinity," for the doctrinal sentiments with which they are uniformly found in close connexion. But I forbear any further remarks.

THE PRESBYTERIAN.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1836.

REMOVAL.

The Publication Office of the South-East Corner of George and Seventh streets, a few doors above the former office, on the opposite side of the street.

TO SUBSCRIBERS AND AGENTS.

Subscribers who may receive their bills in the paper of to-day, will confer a favour by remitting the respective amounts due by them per Mail, at our risk and expense, or paying it over to any of the Agents, a list of whom may be found on the last page. All of our subscribers who are in arrears for the current or past years will have their bills forwarded to them, in their papers, in the course of a week or two, and we hope they will all see the propriety of answering them promptly.

We hope our readers will profit by the article headed, Working Orthodoxy.

LIBERALITY.—We learn with great pleasure, that a few gentlemen of this city have contributed upwards of \$3000 towards the purchase of a house and lot at Princeton, N. J., for Dr. John Breckinridge and family, to whom it is to be conveyed in fee-simple.

While we take pleasure in recording such an act of munificence, we may at the same time be permitted to say, that there is no gentleman in the Church better entitled to such a tribute of friendship and affection; no one who has devoted his time and talents more intensely and efficiently to the great cause of religion than Dr. Breckinridge.

CURIOS.—The majority of the late Assembly professed great anxiety that a full account should be rendered to them of the most minute transactions of the Board of Education, comprising a schedule of the number of beneficiaries, their names, places of study, amount of money received and expended and how expended. One of the leaders of the party was so full of hope in the detection of a plot, that he let the secret escape, that they expected on an investigation to discover that the money of the Boards of the Church had been expended in the support of the Presbyteries! Voluntary societies which are responsible to no one, may and perhaps do expend their money in hiring electioneering agents to travel through the Church to muster obsequious voters for the Assembly, but it is not a practice of our ecclesiastical Boards. One thing we can assert with the most perfect truth, that the Presbyteries has never received one farthing from either of the Boards of the Church, not even in the way of compensation for advertisements. We strongly suspect however, that the New-school men had an additional reason for demanding this schedule. It is to be presumed that many young men who receive temporary aid from the Church, while prosecuting their studies for the ministry, and who intend to refund whenever their circumstances will permit, are reluctant, from motives of delicacy, to have their names published to the world as beneficiaries of a charitable institution. Has it not therefore been the design of the New-school to injure the Board of Education and deter young men from applying to it for aid, by proclaiming the fact, that their names and necessities are to be scrutinized at every meeting of the General Assembly? We think it is highly probable, especially since we know from their own public avowals, that their enmity to ecclesiastical or orthodox societies is implacable, and that no means will be neglected to do them a disservice.

BOARDS OF THE CHURCH.—The Annual Report of the Board of Education and Missions, just published, affords cheering indications of their increasing prosperity. They are entitled to the confidence of the Church and they have obtained it; and we have but little doubt that they will soon occupy fully the whole Presbyterian ground, leaving the voluntary societies to operate among Congregationalists, their own appropriate field.

During the past year the Board of Education have had under their care six hundred and eight beneficiaries. The degree of favour with which its operations are regarded, may be best seen in the amount of its receipts. From May 15, 1835, to May 11, 1836, Fifty Thousand and Sixty-four dollars have been contributed to its funds. We cannot refrain from copying the following paragraphs from the report.

"The Board has been charged with being sectarian in its character. We are not sure whether we know what this charge means. The Board views itself as the organ of the General Assembly for the education of PRESBYTERIAN ministers; and in the performance of the duties assigned us, we are not aware that in any respect we are more sectarian than the General Assembly itself. It is true, we are unwilling to place the beneficiaries of the Board at institutions where other doctrines are taught than those contained in our Confession of Faith. And if a young man is known not to be a Presbyterian in sentiment, we do not feel at liberty to educate him with the funds of the Presbyterian Church. Voluntary Associations have a right, if they think proper, to educate men belonging to other denominations of Christians, but surely it cannot be expected of the Board of Education of the General Assembly, that they should take this liberty. Nor have they any wish to do it. They are not aware that they are more sectarian than the General Assembly itself. It is true, that in the Presbyterian Church the Church of Christ exists in its purest form, and that they can best promote the cause of Christ by building up that Church. As a Board they wish to be known as Presbyterian, and only Presbyterian; and to know no party but that which maintains the integrity of our Standards."

The Board of Missions during the past year have employed two hundred and fifty missionaries, and have furnished with ministerial labour, about five hundred congregations and missionary districts, in twenty different states and territories. Under the care of their missionaries, two thousand and fifty persons have been added to the Church on confession and certificate; twenty new churches have been formed; fifty houses of worship erected; three hundred temperance societies, comprising thirty thousand members; four hundred Sabbath schools, employing two thousand teachers, and containing fifteen thousand scholars; and two hundred and fifty Biblical and catechetical classes, with four thousand learners, have been reported; and yet these reports are by no means complete. The receipts of the Board during the past year, have amounted to Thirty Thousand and Eighty-five Dollars; this amount has been collected without importunity, and has flowed into the treasury from free and liberal hands.

We rejoice to see the progress of these Boards during the few past years; their successful conflict with difficulties; their triumph over enemies; and their firm establishment in the confidence and affection of every true Presbyterian.

ARITHMETIC.—As our friend of the Boston Recorder calls upon us for more of our arithmetical proofs, we hasten to furnish them. We have recently examined the Report of the Home Missionary Society for the present year, and compared it with that of last year, and as the result we present the following: In the following states in which Presbyterianism is established, viz. New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Alabama, Kentucky, Delaware, District of Columbia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Mississippi, Maryland, Georgia, Virginia, and North Carolina, the Home Missionary Society has received about \$11,000 less this year than it did in the preceding year. This is a pleasing fact, inasmuch as it proves that the Presbyterian Church is justly losing confidence in that Institution, as the source of most of the mischiefs which have entered the Church. Even New York has contributed \$5000 less to its funds this year than the last, and Pennsylvania, notwithstanding all the efforts made to corrupt it, one half less. The same is true of their strong hold, Ohio, and indeed of all the other states above enumerated, with a few exceptions. And yet in the above states they pour in the same number of missionaries to keep Orthodoxy in check.

We have another fact of importance. From the New England states, viz. Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island, the same Home Missionary Society has received upwards of \$23,000 more this year than the last, while the number of their missionaries in these states has been but slightly increased. This fact we say is important, inasmuch as it proves, what we have often asserted, that the Home Missionary Society is essentially a New England Society, and that its funds and exertions under New England influence, are specially employed to corrupt the Presbyterian Church. In the last Assembly the vote from the interior of New York was almost undivided in favour of Mr. Barnes and against the standards of our Church, but this is explained by the fact that the Home Missionary Society has at present 183 missionaries in that state.

INTERFERENCE IN LONDON.—Mr. Buckingham anticipated that fourteen of the largest gin shops in London had been visited in one week by 269,437 persons, men, women, and children! This is worse than the Cholera.

INSTALLATION.—On the 19th June, the Rev. Joseph Bruce Adams, was installed Pastor of the Churches of Hebron and New Hope, Green County, Alabama. The sermon was preached by the Rev. William H. Williams, of Tuscaloosa. The constitutional questions were put, and the charge delivered to the Minister and people by the venerable R. M. Cunningham, D.D. The exercises were remarkably appropriate and excellent.

SUPPRESSED REPORT.—Our readers are already acquainted with the fact, that when the Report of the Board of Education was presented to the late Assembly, strong exceptions were taken to certain portions of it, which were eventually expunged through the prevailing New-school influence; but they have never been informed what the exceptional passages were. We feel constrained to present to them a detailed account of the matter, as it furnishes a strong illustration of the spirit which has uniformly actuated the party which has so long waged war against the Institutions of our Church.

The Presbyterian Education Society, which is a branch of the American Education Society, was instituted and received its peculiar name, for its express purpose, as we have reason to believe, of

countersigning and supplanting the Board of Education. The Agents of this branch, relying on its Presbyterian name, which was evidently the suggestion of policy, attempted to gain admission to Presbyterian and Orthodox Churches, representing their Board as the true Presbyterian Organ, and actually in some instances receiving money designed for the Board of Education. We were careful to expose the artifice at the time, and the exposure rendered all future attempts to impose on the Orthodox unavailing. When this spurious and sadly misnamed Society discovered that the Churches were on their guard, and would not receive their Agents, it made loud complaints of the unhappy collisions and interferences resulting from two Societies occupying the same ground, with the same objects. Its chief Agent instead of perceiving and acknowledging the propriety of retiring from the field on which he had intruded, proclaimed many things in prejudice of the Board of Education, alleging that it was disposed to perpetuate the strife, by refusing all terms of union. According to his representations, the Presbyterian Branch, so called, was anxious for an amicable adjustment of the difficulty by a union with the Board of Education; but the latter was so filled with the spirit of sectarianism as to discountenance and reject all friendly overtures. This representation often repeated was producing an impression unfriendly to the latter Board and prejudicing it in public estimation.

At this period the Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, with the informal approbation of the Executive Committee, addressed the following letter to the Rev. Wm. Patton, the General Agent of the Presbyterian Education Society.

PHILADELPHIA, Office of the Board of Education, } October 16th, 1835.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—I have just learned from your very valuable and worthy fellow-labourer, the Rev. Wm. Chester, that an interesting and important conversation was lately held between yourself and him, on the subject of the Union of our respective Institutions. His remarks have recalled very vividly, an interview which I had with you on board the Steam-boat, about this time last year, on the same weighty subject, as we were going to Albany.

It has always been a matter of deep regret to me, that there should be two such organizations in the bosom of the same Church, and no man would hail with more hearty pleasure than myself the event which, without agitation on the one hand, or the surrender of radical principles on the other, should consolidate the interests of education for the ministry in our beloved Church into one great institution.

Such an event if wisely and righteously brought about, would not fail very greatly to promote the peace, strength, and usefulness of the Church, as well as the economy and success of the Education cause.

It has necessarily here to dwell upon the unhappy circumstances which first led to separate organizations and rival action in this department of Christian benevolence among us. The question proposed is, Can this state of things be brought to a close by re-union, and if so, how is this to be done?

As you are aware that in this matter we have no power to act for our Board, and indeed that body is only itself the servant of the General Assembly to carry certain principles and plans into operation, not to change or compound them.

Yet at the same time, I am fully persuaded that the Board is ready to recommend to the Assembly, and that they will be disposed to adopt any union which will not destroy the radical principles, or impair the successful operation of the institution committed by the Church to its care.

There are three great points (omitting details and minor matters) upon which all the friends of the Board were so warmly united as to insist as vital to its true character and proper influence. 1. The rejection of the system of loans under bonds, and pledging the return of the money by the students aided, and 2. The sustaining of the doctrinal standards of the Church.

As to the first, it is a part of our being. We are the creatures of the principle, and without it cease to exist as a Board, and not only our being but our well being is supposed to depend upon it—I go not into the merits of the question now. It would be out of place, I only state the principle and the importance we attach to it.

Of the second, there is a growing aversion to it every day in our Board and Church. We esteem it a dangerous and oppressive system, not in the intention (far from it) but in its tendency and actual effects.

The third needs no explanation. Among us there are men in our midst who hold institutions among us fast by (the Theological Seminary of New Haven) which propagate dangerous errors, and that it is the solemn duty of all Education Institutions in our Church to refuse to train candidates under such men and in such institutions, if known to teach said or kindred errors, and also, that it is equally their duty to avoid this—no schools and plans may be fully known by the whole Church.

These views I explained to you at some length in the interview referred to above; you will remember also that I expressed them with frankness, before the last General Assembly, when a collateral question was pending before that body. And I am now prepared to say that whenever your Society will consent to meet us on these grounds, my poor efforts shall not be wanting towards an amicable and entire union of the two Institutions. It is also my decided opinion that the Board of the Church and the Church itself will ardently consent to such an arrangement.

If however your Society cannot agree on all or on any of these points to adopt our views, it is not for me to decide for you, I presume not to do so. Yet when a proposal for union is repeatedly and kindly made, it becomes our duty to our brethren as well as to our Board and ourselves, with great distinctness to state the grounds on which we suppose and desire that such an overture may be met. If we cannot here unite, each body must firmly and righteously, yet kindly, stand by its principles and take the consequences whatever they may be. If holding these principles on our part, or rejecting them on yours, will expose us or you to the charge of hindering a proper union, or of seeking one that will be evil and unwholesome, then must we be ready respectively to meet the result.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

I am sure you will appreciate my motives in writing this letter. It is meant to be a kind but frank response to recent and former overtures on the subject of union, and it seemed due not only to you but to the Church at large, as well as to the Board of Education. Our Agents are not unfrequently asked on this subject, and we have of late especially been publicly assailed for the expensiveness of our Agencies, (not I am persuaded with the privacy of your worthy Board) as if we sustained operations of needless extent and cost, and as if we alone were responsible for all that separate action of the two Boards, which makes the duplicate Agency necessary. With the explanations before your mind you will be prepared, as I trust you will ever be disposed, to state to all who ask for it the true relative position of our respective Institutions.

and we are greatly deceived if it has not the effect, of alienating the Church—the true Presbyterian Church—from all connexion with the irresponsible and voluntary associations which have brought our Zion to the verge of ruin.

RELAXED VIEWS OF TRUTH.—The Editor of the Charleston Observer, in an apology for the rigidly Orthodox, refers to the unhappy effects on truth produced by the vain attempt of the great Baxter to cement a union between truth and error, and quotes the following paragraphs from "Orme's Life of Baxter."

"In illustration of the influence now adverted to, it must be remarked, that the first stage in the process of deterioration which took place among the Presbyterian Dissenters, was generally characterized by the term Baxterianism; a word to which it is difficult to attach a definite meaning. It denotes an separate sect or party, but rather a system of opinions on doctrinal points, verging towards Arminianism, and which ultimately passed to Arianism and Socinianism. Even during Baxter's own life, while the Presbyterians taxed the Independents with Antinomianism, the latter retorted the charge of Socinianism, or at least with a tendency towards it, in some of the opinions maintained both by Baxter and others of that party. To whatever cause it is to be attributed, it is a melancholy fact, that the deterioration which began even at this early period in the Presbyterian body, went on slowly, but surely, till from the most fervid orthodoxy, it finally arrived in England, at the frigid zone of Unitarianism."

"I wish not to be understood as stating that Baxter either held any opinions of this description, or was conscious of any such tendency in his own mind towards such a fearful consummation; but that there was an injurious tendency in his manner of discussing certain important subjects. It was subtle, and full of logomachy; it tended to unsettle, rather than to fix and determine; it generated strife rather than godly edifying. It is not possible to study such books as his *Methodus*, and his *Catholic Theology*, without experiencing that we are brought into a different region from apostolic Christianity; a region of fierce debate and altercation about words, and names, and opinions; in which all that can be said for error is largely dwelt upon, as well as what can be said for truth. The ambiguities of language, the divisions of sects; the uncertainties of human perception and argument, are urged, till the force of revealed truth is considerably weakened, and confidence in our own judgment of its meaning greatly impaired. Erroneous language is maintained to be capable of sound meaning, and the most Scriptural phrases to be capable of unscriptural interpretation, till truth and error almost change places, and the mind is bewildered, confounded, and paralyzed. In this mode of discussing such subjects, was this most excellent man led, partly by the natural constitution of his mind, which has often been adverted to; partly by his ardent desire of putting an end to the divisions of the Christian world, and producing universal concord and harmony. He failed where success was impossible, however plausible might have been the means which he employed. He understood the causes of difference and contention better than their remedies; hence the measures which he used frequently aggravated instead of curing the disease."

CEREMONY AT THE PROPAGANDA IN ROME.—At the Epiphany celebration in Rome, sermons are delivered in no less than thirty seven different languages! A recent traveller says that the English sermon was preached by a young American from Philadelphia. [Probably the Rev. Peter Con